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(On record)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, please, do roll call, Sue, and appreciate that.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Okay.

Don Striker, Park Service.

MR. STRIKER: Good morning everyone.

MS. DETWILER: Greg Siekaniec or Vince Mathews, Fish and Wildlife Service.

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, this is Vince Mathews.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Vince.

Glenn Chen, BIA.

MR. CHEN: Yes, Glenn is here, thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Chad Padgett, BLM.

MR. PADGETT: I'm here, thanks, Sue.

MS. DETWILER: Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

MR. SCHMID: Hey, good morning, Dave's here and I do have a hard conflict 11:30 to 12:30 so if we're still going, Wayne will be filling in then but I'm on, thanks.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: I'm here, good morning.
MS. DETWILER: Morning.

Public Member Charlie Brower.

MR. BROWER: Here.

MS. DETWILER: Chair Tony Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, I'm on,
Sue, good morning.

MS. DETWILER: Good morning. So we
have eight members here and at the last call we had --
from four Regional Advisory Councils we had either the
members of the Council or folks acting on behalf,
DeAnna Perry acting on behalf of the Council. It's --
are there any other Regional Advisory Council
representatives who did not sign in earlier today.

MS. DEATHERAGE: Hey, this is Karen
Deatherage. I'm acting on behalf of the Acting Chair
for the Western Interior Alaska Council.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. And I believe we
still have Ben Mulligan and Mark Burch from Alaska
Department of Fish and Game on, as well as Ken Lord
from Department of Interior, Solicitor's Office. So I
believe that is the roll call as we have it right now,
Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
thank you, Sue, appreciate it. Good morning everybody.
It's the final day of our Federal Board meeting and it
looks like we have one or two agenda items left before
us. Appreciate all the hard work yesterday,
deliberation and making sure we got all the record
straight. All the people who've called in and publicly
testified, you know, hats off to you for continuing to
serve your people and the resources. And so I just
like to always remember that they go hand in hand and
appreciate that.

Before we get started, I know Orville's
off today, so I'd like to start the morning with an
invocation and if we can just take a moment. We've had
a few passings in our community and that's why I've
been having to get off and on the last few days as I
had one of my nephews pass away from cancer at 26 years old, and so I'd just like to extend a moment of silence after my invocation to my local people here that we've been -- we also lost an esteemed elder, and -- we lost three people basically in the community in the last two days and so I just wanted to take a moment of silence after I say a prayer, and just appreciate your patience.

(Invocation)

MS. DETWILER: Mr. Chair. Operator, have you brought in -- have you opened up the lines so that the public can hear as well. I'm sorry to break in here.

OPERATOR: Yes. So I did just want to go ahead and advise everyone that the call is being recorded and if you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. And we will have a public comment session in today's call. If you'd like to have a comment, you may dial star one on your phone to make a comment. And I will go ahead and turn the meeting over, thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

(Moment of silence)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And so that concludes the mourning stuff, let's go ahead and get started with the order of business today. And at the beginning of each day we provide an opportunity for the public to call in and speak to non-consensus agenda items. And so we'll start the day with that and so, Operator, again, if there's somebody who would like to be recognized online, now is the time.

Thank you.

OPERATOR: Thank you. This will be a public comment session. If you would like to make a public comment, you may dial star one, unmute your line and record your name, it is required to introduce you. If you would like to withdraw the comment you can dial star two. Again, star one to make a comment.

(Pause)
OPERATOR: Just one moment for those to come through.

(Pause)

OPERATOR: And a comment here will come from Rick Smeriglio, your line is now open.

MR. SMERIGLIO: Good morning. My comment was for an agenda item and I thought that would come later in the proceedings.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, were you calling for the nonrural to testify then?

MR. SMERIGLIO: Yes, sir, I was.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. We could recognize you then if you wish to be recognized then.

MR. SMERIGLIO: At this time.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Well, I would entertain both, if you want to do it now or if you're going to come back and do it during that, then I would say maybe during that time would be best.

MR. SMERIGLIO: I'd rather do it when it's best so I guess I'll just withdraw.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. To make sure we don't miss you, again, what was your name?

MR. SMERIGLIO: Rick Smeriglio, I live in Moose Pass.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, Rick. We'll make sure that you're available and we're going to jump right into that after the testimony this morning so it shouldn't be more than I'd say 20 or 30 minutes.

Any others online that would like to be recognized at this time for nonconsensus agenda items -- or nonagenda items, sorry.

(Pause)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Operator, were there any other.....
OPERATOR: And I do have.....

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: .....testimony
from the public online?

OPERATOR: I do see Charlene Stern.
Charlene, your line is now open.

MS. STERN: Thank you. Can you hear me
okay?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, loud and
clear.

MS. STERN: Okay. Thank you, Chairman,
members of the Board and agency Staff. I would like to
especially thank the public members who provide
insight, knowledge and accountability while being
under-funded and un-supported by the Program, my hats
are off to them. And an early Happy Birthday also to
Board Member Rhonda Pitka.

My name is Charlene Stern. I am
originally from Arctic Village. I am an enrolled
tribal member of the Native Village of Venetie tribal
government, and I'm also serving as Vice President of
Tanana Chiefs Conference.

I am here today to respectfully offer
testimony on the operations of the Federal Subsistence
Management Program and the Federal Subsistence Board,
whose daily activities and decisions significantly
impact our tribal citizens, our communities and our
well-being. Our Hunting and Fishing Task Force, Ben
Stevens, Bruce Irvine, and Brooke Woods have also
tested on behalf of TCC and I recognize their
contribution.

The TCC region covers an area of
235,000 square miles in Interior Alaska, which is equal
to about 37 percent of the entire state. We encompass
six subregions including the lower Yukon subregion, the
upper Kuskokwim subregion, the upper Tanana subregion,
the Yukon Flats subregion, the Yukon/Koyukuk subregion
and the Yukon/Tanana subregion. Within our six
subregions are 37 Federally-recognized tribes and 42
tribal communities. We are charged at TCC with
advancing tribal self-determination and enhancing
regional Native unity. We provide many services while
also balancing traditional Athabascan and Alaska Native values with modern demand. We work towards meeting the health and the social service needs of our tribal members and beneficiaries throughout the region. TCCs vision is for healthy, strong, unified tribes and our mission is to provide a unified voice in advancing sovereign tribal governments through the promotion of physical and mental, education, socio-economic development and the culture of the Interior Athabascan people.

Alaska Native hunting and fishing practices, including the harvesting and sharing of fish, game and other resources and the ceremonies which accompany those practices are essential to the social, cultural, spiritual and economic well-being and survival of Alaska Native people. Alaska Natives have served as stewards of their traditional lands and resources maintaining healthy and productive ecosystems for thousands of years. We maintain the belief that human beings are an integral part of natural functioning ecosystems and not separate from them. Maintaining a balance in population dynamics have always been a critical element of traditional management practices.

I want to especially mention and give a thank you for the protection of our traditional sheep hunts in the Arctic Village Sheep Management Area. During your regular meeting last year, there was action taken, and we really commend that action, and thank you for it, we had several of our young hunters this fall do a successful hunt of sheep. And seeing the photos and the joy and the pride that it brought to them to be able to successfully harvest sheep and feed our elders was one of the most amazing things that I will never forget. And so, you know, this action really demonstrated, I think, the ability of the Federal Subsistence Management Program and the Federal Subsistence Board to really meet the intent of ANILCA, Title VIII, and we thank you.

We also want to thank you for acting on the special request for the Organized Village of Kake, that they may provide for their food sovereignty. Again, this demonstrated the ability of the Federal Subsistence Management Program and the Federal Subsistence Board to meet the intent of ANILCA, Title VIII, and, again, I thank you for that.
We are disheartened that due to legal manoeuvering from the State your hands were tied in acting on other decisions and we hope with the new Administration that this is quickly remedied. We also hope that you are taking swift action on developing the necessary criteria to consider future SARs as you directed OSM last summer and that you are consulting with tribal governments in doing so.

Both of these actions demonstrate two issues we find critical to the protection of our ways of life, to the Federal Subsistence Management Program and the Federal Subsistence Board meeting the intent of ANILCA, Title VIII.

First, I want to mention that the level of engagement in the Federal Subsistence Management Program and the Federal Subsistence Board by the State of Alaska remains of significant concern. As we all are well aware the State is currently suing you all in an effort to question and limit the authority that you hold, yet at the same time they have levels of engagement and authority within your Program that tribal governments are not afforded. They sit on the InterAgency Staff Committee, they sit at the table with you, they are able to pull proposals off the consensus agenda, and as we heard yesterday, they are deferred to when taking action on regulatory proposals. There was always the understanding that the State would work in good faith to find a path forward to meet the intent of ANILCA, Title VIII and assume subsistence management in Alaska. In over three decades, the State of Alaska has made no change to comply with Federal law, as a result we are left with a broken dual management system that disenfranchises our tribal citizens and turns our hunters and fishers into criminals for feeding our families, and it fails to meet the Federal trust responsibility that each of your agencies have to Federally-recognized tribes.

Today, we specifically request that the current MOU with the State of Alaska be shared with tribal governments and that tribal governments are afforded a seat at the table in the negotiation of any future MOUs. This MOU has a direct impact on our tribal governments and by Federal policy we have a right to a seat at the table.

Second, the Federal Subsistence
Management Program and the Federal Subsistence Board must improve the relationship with tribal governments. It is clear that some of the proposals under construction have not received adequate consultation from tribal governments that would be significantly impacted. We wholly and support and appreciate Mr. Orville Lind, this is not the work of one individual and he is woefully under-supported and under-Staffed. This is not acting in good faith and we look forward to more clarity of exactly how the Department and the Board are currently implementing this policy. It is challenging for our remote tribes to continually monitor the proposed changes that could affect our traditional territories and our ways of life and then stretch limited funds and Staff to attend these meetings. We do not have the resources of the Federal or the State government.

This brings us to a key takeaway and it has been clearly displayed year after year and meeting after meeting that tribal governments hold the knowledge and ability to adequately steward our tribal citizens and critical resources that provide for our people. Although we have seen no movement in taking seriously uplifting this role and voices of tribal government within Federal subsistence management, those whom we know clearly Title VIII of ANILCA was intended to provide for. After decades of Federal Subsistence management, we see no development or implementation of ANILCA .809 agreements or Indian Self-Determination Education and Assistance Act, Title IV agreements to create more effective implementation of a program for Alaskans. This is a failure. The time is now.

So at this time I just want to also mention that the RAC, many of them are vacant, OSM positions are vacant, there is a failure to meet the intent of Title VIII of ANILCA and a failure of the Federal agencies to enforce Federal subsistence fishing regulations. The Secretary recognized this failure in 2010 and little has changed. We are thankful for Chief Rhonda Pitka and Elder Charlie Brower, but they, alone, cannot change the system. We urge you to take seriously the request to enter into ANILCA .809 agreements and Title IV self-governance agreements to implement Federal Subsistence Management Programs. We are exhausted by the roadblocks and we ask you to help us, let us help you.
We know that our globe, our nation, our state faces a global pandemic. We know that Alaska is leading the way in response to vaccinations. We have no doubt that this is due to the leadership of Alaska Natives, the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium and the resources that we leverage and bring to the table in the state. This should be an example, a model, a demonstration of our capacity and commitment to excellence and to a healthy stronger future for Alaskans.

We urge the Board to actively work and enter into agreements with us as tribal governments, to push your agencies and your department to do so. We urge you to see us as equal partners and act and a solution.

In closing, TCC offers an invitation for Board members to coordinate village visits to better be able to understand the impacts of your decisions on the people of the Interior. TCC urges the Board and the Office of Subsistence Management to adequately implement your adopted Tribal Consultation Policy which would allow us to address many of our longstanding issues that continually come before you. Together, in respectful consultation, we are more likely to develop solutions that we can all advance.

And, with that I want to just say Mahsi Choo again, and that is the end of my testimony.

Thank you.

OPERATOR: And the next comment here will come from Karen Linnell. Karen, your line is now open.

MS. LINNELL: Good morning, this is Karen Linnell, Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission representative of eight Ahtna tribes in the Copper River Basin, and two ANCSA corporations in the Ahtna region.

I just wanted to thank the Board for your diligence and hard work. Again, looking forward to seeing some of the -- although it's a minor change, but there -- that you took our request under consideration yesterday with the fish proposals, and, again, just thank you. I know it's not an easy job
that you have and wanted to express my thanks for the action taken yesterday.

Although we didn't get everything that we asked for it is a step in the right direction.

We look forward to working with you folks again and seeing you in person sometime in the near future, Lord's willing, and that's all I have for this morning.

Thank you, so much.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

MS. LINNELL: And, Anthony, I just wanted to say I'm so sorry for your life. I know it's really difficult at this time to be able to try to comfort one another when you can't get in the proximity, it's just changed so much for everyone, and we feel for you and we are saying prayers for peace and comfort for you all.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Karen, I really, truly appreciate that. And it definitely is a struggle at this time to go through our proper protocols and definitely there's a whole level of disconnection happening all around but I see promise and hope and light at the end of this tunnel, and thank you for your good words and recognition of the Board's work in the past few days. Thank you, Karen. And also appreciate your diligence and staying the course for the people and the resource.

Operator, is there anybody next that would like to be recognized?

OPERATOR: Yes. So the next comment here comes from Brooke Woods, your line is now open.

MS. WOODS: Good morning, can you hear me okay?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You got the floor, Brooke.

MS. WOODS: Great. First off I'd like
to say thank you, Chair, and members of the Board for putting in so many days for the meeting.

The one thing that I do want to mention is I'm extremely disappointed that FSB and the Yukon River Panel were scheduled for the same time. One of our most valuable Yukon River Panel members is also on the Federal Subsistence Board and her presence was dearly missed. And I would also like to say Happy Birthday to Rhonda.

So before I start I just want to let you know my name is Brooke Woods, I'm from a very small village on the Yukon River and I am representing myself today. So between serving on the Yukon River Panel and trying to listen in to the Federal Subsistence Board there are some things that I would like to say that were very concerning for me. The vacancies at OSM. The RAC appointments, we have highly qualified and willing, traditional fishermen and hunters. And also I do not understand why several RAC members were not reappointed. And I feel like that's falling on deaf ears and there's no accountability there.

As you all know this spring we experienced the global pandemic and we are still very much in the global pandemic. And during that time many tribes had requested the opportunity to provide for their communities. Shortly after that our summer season started and we needed to be able to harvest our king salmon and our chum and they did not come. And I really encourage you all to participate in the weekly YRDFA call. They were devastating, heartbreaking, frustrating when you hear a grown man pleading and crying because he cannot fish and he does not understand what is going on.

Another thing that I have noticed and heard is agency -- upper level agency members saying why do these people live in these villages if life is so hard but I would like to let -- remind you and let you know that these are the most beautiful places in the world. And you may vacation in Hawaii but I go home to my village in Rampart and it is the most beautiful place there. So it might be fighting words for those listening and those on the Board but I just want to reiterate that our traditional territories are where are where our roots are and our hearts, our culture, our people and if you do not understand that
you need to go out into the village. And I really
encourage Ben Muller [sic] and Chad Padgett, Greg
Siekaniec, to put yourself in many tribes' position.
You are out there and it's a pandemic, you and the rest
of the community do not have access, affordable access
to commercial food and the State has told you, no, you
cannot have an emergency hunt during a pandemic. And
we called the grocery store where food prices are
inflated, and we called the airline, there's no
disruption, and you're waiting for your king salmon to
come and they don't. And like many people on the Yukon
River, when there's no king salmon you wait for the
chums and the numbers are so devastating there is
absolutely no opportunity to get chum.

So as you may all be aware the State
denied 12, I believe 12 villages the right to provide
for their communities. Doug Vincent-Lang said there
are not surplus harvestable animals to open these hunts
without jeopardizing future hunt opportunities. I
mentioned that our traditional territories are the most
beautiful places but they are also places that have
provided for our people for 10,000 years and there will
be no tribes that take the last animal and there will
be no tribe that jeopardizes any resource.

From there many, many tribes went to
the Federal Subsistence Board requesting the
opportunity to provide for their tribes and when you
look at the language 36 CFR 242.19 it says provide all
necessary authority to the FSB to take immediate action
on emergency special requests and provide for the
intent of ANILCA, Title VIII. And in an emergency
situation, if necessary, to ensure the continued
viability of fish and wildlife populations and to
continue subsistence use of fish and wildlife or for
public safety reasons, the Board may immediately open
or close public lands for the taking of fish and
wildlife for subsistence uses or modify the
requirements to take for subsistence use. And when you
look at Alaska Fish and Game laws and regulations, they
read 5 AAC 92.400, emergency taking of game. Nothing
in 5 AAC prohibits a person from taking game for food
during a closed season in case of dire emergency as
defined in 5 AAC 92.990. If it is reasonably possible
to do so, the person taking game under this section
shall salvage all edible portions. And when you look
at the definitions, a dire emergency need, a situation
in which a person is in a remote area; check; if
involuntarily experience an absence of food required to sustain life; check; well beyond able to perform the functions necessary for survival leading to a high risk of death or serious and permanent health problem if wild game is not immediately taken or consumed, you will never find a tribal member that gets to that point, but do we need to get to that point to be able to provide for our community.

And prior to the pandemic happening, we -- I, myself, was preparing for Board of Game, and I was reading the ADF&G Staff analysis in preparation for Board of Game and I found a very large number of harvestable surplus documented for several of the communities that requested hunts.

I want to thank Federal Subsistence Board for providing the traditional hunt for the Organized Village of Kake. I know many residents from Kake, I saw the photo, I saw the sharing and passing out of that food. And when you look at the court documents there is one section that says the Organized Village of Kake is a Federally-recognized Indian Tribe with the power of self-governance and jurisdiction over its tribal citizens and such subsistence resources. Now, when I'm participating in Federal Subsistence Board, many of the agencies are silent on this situation or saying thank you for suing me, and there's no accountability, especially for those SARs that were paused. So I really push you to have these conversations and understand how incredibly important these requests were to many villages and, you know, these situations are more dire. I explained how devastating the salmon run was and the lack of those emergency hunts to provide healthy nutritional, traditional foods for our people.

I would like to read out ANILCA Section .804 which you all likely should know by heart with the work that you do but I'll briefly just read a few points. Customary and direct dependence upon the population as a mainstay of livelihood; local residency and availability of alternate resources are some of the things that really stick out for me.

And, .801, the continuation of the opportunity for subsistence uses for rural residents of Alaska, including both Native and non-Native.
The situation in Alaska is unique, in that, in most cases no particular alternative means are available to replace the food supply and other items gathered from fish and wildlife, which supplies rural residents dependent on subsistence uses. Continuation of the opportunity for subsistence uses of resources on public and other lands in Alaska is threatened by the increasing population in Alaska with resulting pressure on subsistence resources by sudden decline in the population of some wild species which are crucial subsistence resources by increasing accessibility of remote areas containing subsistence resources. These are just some real opportunities for you to meet the needs of our people out that depend on these resources.

And when you look at the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, as amended Public Law 93.638, tribal government purposes promote the sovereignty of Federally-recognized tribes, tribal government services carry out this policy by supporting and assisting Indian tribes in the development and maintenance of strong and stable tribal governments capable of administering quality programs and developing economic of their respective communities.

When I look at this and I read these out to you, these are real opportunities for you to work directly with tribes if you're unable to do it yourself. I look forward to working with Holly Carroll, she's been on the river, she understands the need and the continuation of this friendship that we have developed with her, and I look forward to implementing self-governance with her.

Another tool that the State of Alaska may not be aware of is the policy on government to government relations with the Federally-recognized tribes of Alaska. This policy articulates and reinforces a government to government relation between the State of Alaska, Fish and Game, Boards of Fisheries and Game, and the Federally-recognized tribes in Alaska through consultation on significant matters of mutual concern. These are very beautiful words to me. This policy, the Department and the Boards are committed to consulting with tribes in Alaska as early in the Department's decisionmaking process as practical and is permitted by law prior to taking action or undertaking activities that significantly or uniquely affect a tribe or tribes. There is one section that says inter-
Department cooperation. The Department will work cooperatively with other State and Federal agencies to accomplish the goals and responsibilities of this policy, request for consultation determined to be out of the Department's purview will be referred to the appropriate "see contact" of another State Department.

And before I close I would like to say President Biden has released a memorandum of tribal consultation and strengthening of nation to nation relationships. Indian tribes and Alaska Native Tribe nations are sovereign governments recognized under the Constitution of the United States, treaties, statutes, executive orders and court decisions. He says, it is my priority of my Administration to make respect for tribal sovereignty and self-governance, commitment to fulfill Federal trust and treaty responsibilities to tribal nations and regular, meaningful and robust consultation with tribal nations, cornerstones of Federal Indian Policy. The United States has made solemn promises to tribal nations for more than two centuries, honoring these commitments is particularly vital now as our nation faces crises related to health, the economy, racial justice, and climate change, and these are all things that harm Native Americans.

If you would like a copy of this, feel free to reach out to me, my email is blwoods@alaska.edu.

And, with that, I would like to thank you so much for letting me testify in front of you today and I look forward to reinstating the importance that you have there together as so many agencies with good work ahead of you and tribes that are really depending on you, but also have to uphold their traditional ways of life, they can never be taken away. And when I look at the struggle of our tribes today, I feel the pain that my great-grandmother had during the assimilation period and I just wish that things would be better, we are all equal governance. We are all human. We come from different backgrounds, but we are all here together and I really look to you to honor so many of our tribes that are needing you today and in the next 100 years.

Thank you so much for your time.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hello. Thank
you, did that conclude your testimony?

OPERATOR: Excuse me, we do have another comment here and that comment will come from Mary Peltola.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. And, before Mary gets on, I just wanted to say I appreciate you calling in and expressing, you know, what ANILCA is and having that in-depth knowledge and sharing that with us here today, so it's always good to recap on that and then also to share the struggle that you have out there, because the struggle is real and we hope we can get back on track to providing that meaningful role, both for the rural user and, us, as the Federal Board, to provide for the needs of rural Alaskans and so just appreciate you taking the time to call in and present as you did.

Thank you.

And, then, Operator, I'll just go ahead and move on to Mary Peltola, and welcome you to the Board. Mary.

MS. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, hear you loud and clear, and hope you're having a Happy New Year.

MS. PELTOLA: Okay. Thank you so much. And condolences to the people in Hydaburg and Prince of Wales for your losses.

Thank you Mr. Chairman and members of the Board. My name is Mary Peltola. I'm the Executive Director of the Kuskokwim River InterTribal Fish Commission. This morning I want to speak about the State's lawsuit against the Federal Subsistence Board. But before I do that I want to thank the Federal Subsistence Board for the special meeting conducted on May 1st of 2020, which did Federalize the Kuskokwim River by a 5/2 vote. It really saved the chinook run this summer and I want to speak to that in my comments.

Recent litigation initiated by the State of Alaska against the Federal Subsistence Board
contends that there are negative impacts of Federal
subsistence management on non-Federal subsistence uses.
What is omitted in this discussion is the fact that the
total estimated annual harvest of fish and wildlife in
Alaska, only .9 percent is harvested under State and
Federal subsistence hunting and fishing regulations.
An even smaller percentile is provided by Federal
subsistence harvest. And I want to say that again, of
all the total harvest of fish and game in Alaska, .9,
less than one percent, is subsistence harvest on State
and Federal lands. And I'd be very curious to know
what the actual, you know, infinidental percentage is
of Federal harvest on Federal land for subsistence
uses.

We, the Kuskokwim River InterTribal
Fish Commission therefore contend that the impact of
Federal subsistence management has very negligible
impacts on commercial, sport and recreational fishing
and hunting activities. Federal subsistence management
is not about recreation or a family vacation, trophy
hunting or fishing, Federal subsistence management is
literally creating an efficiency of harvest, feeding
our families and ensuring food security. Other options
to replace our nutritional, economic, cultural and
spiritual dependence on the fish and wildlife outside
of our traditional territories do not exist. And I
think that the Ahtna Executive Director -- the Ahtna
InterTribal Resource Commission Executive Director,
Karen Linnell, spoke to this very well yesterday when
she talked about not being able to just move to another
river. It's very much the same way with folks on the
Kuskokwim. Even though we live in the Yukon/
Kuskokwim/Delta, there is not much back and forth
between our rivers, we are tied to the places where we
know how to fish, where we feel like that's, you know,
our setnet site, or our harvesting locations. Recent
 correspondence also suggests that the Federal
Subsistence Management Program puts at risk the
sustainable management of fisheries and wildlife in
Alaska because of actions by the Federal Subsistence
Board. These complaints about the impacts to Federal
subsistence management on the health and sustainability
of Federal decisionmaking also fail to recognize the
detrimental approaches promoted by the State of Alaska
on the Kuskokwim River.

In May of 2020, the Department of Fish
and Game recommended opening subsistence chinook salmon
fishing on the Kuskokwim for 24 hours every other day
without taking into consideration the large amount of
uncertainty associated with their 2020 preseason
forecast. In both 2019 and 2020, Fish and Game's
forecasts were off by 100,000 chinook salmon. In 2019,
the preseason forecast that Fish and Game published
underestimated the chinook run by 73 percent, as
100,000 more chinook returned than were forecasted. In
2020 Fish and Game's preseason forecast over estimated
the return by 100,000 chinook, which is about 100
percent error based on the preliminary data resulting
in a much lower escapement than desired by the Fish
Commission and only four 12 hour fishing opportunities
during the chinook season occurred, and we still came
in under our escapement goal of 110,000. The 2020 Fish
and Game preseason forecast also predicted an average
return of chum, while in fact the 2020 chum run was one
of the lowest on record. Without the actions of the
Federal Subsistence Board regarding chinook and the
cooperative in-season management between the Refuge and
the InterTribal Fish Commission Fish and Game would
have once again failed to meet the drainage-wide
chinook salmon escapement goal. And their bottom end
is only 65,000 chinook and that's success to them.
That would have repeated the disastrous State of Alaska
management of the 2013 Kuskokwim River season in which
the escapement was only 37,000 chinook. Instead
Federal subsistence management of the 2020 chinook
season resulted in a much more sustainable management
regime that would not have occurred if the State of
Alaska managed the Kuskokwim River fishery.

We further want to address the
protections afforded to rural Alaskans under the Alaska
National Interest Lands Conservation Act, ANILCA, are
not weight-based. Section .801 specifies that the
cultural and social aspects of subsistence are provided
for the Alaska Native and non-Native rural residents
alike. The term used while providing a subsistence
preference is, "Federally-qualified user" and pertains
to all people who have lived in the harvest area for at
least one year and intend to remain in the harvest
area. On the Kuskokwim River many of the proponents of
the special action request to the Federal Subsistence
Board are non-Native, as many of you know, who are
Lamont Albertson and Dave Cannon, the Kuskokwim River
InterTribal Fish Commission, as our name suggests is a
tribal consortium, however, three of our tribally
appointed fish commissioners have been non-Native. On
the Kuskokwim River there are longtime residents that
harvest salmon resources who's families integrated from
Korea, Taiwan, Albania, Macedonia, Poland, and
elsewhere. We have people from across the country that
share in our way of life -- we have people from across
the country that share in our way of life. All people
living in rural Alaska are welcomed and encouraged to
harvest wild foods including during times of
conservation.

Furthermore, promises made to the
Alaska Natives by the United States Federal Government
to protect hunting and fishing rights associated with
Alaska statehood, Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act
and ANILCA continue to be broken. The Secretary of
Interior has been given broad authority by Congress to
reserve lands and waters in Alaska to protect food
sovereignty and food security of the Federally-
recognized tribes in Alaska.

And, you know, the other thing I want
to mention is that we did submit -- we didn't, but a
member of the -- a stakeholder from the Kuskokwim,
Lamont Albertson, submitted a special action request in
June to the Federal Subsistence Board regarding chum
salmon and, again, it was a disastrous year for chum
salmon, the OSM Staff indicated to the Board members
that if the special action request was not acted upon
that ANILCA, you know, the job that you're supposed to
be doing under ANILCA would be broken, and it didn't
happen. And, interestingly, the Refuge manager that we
had at the time, your Federally-appointed in-season
manager promoted us fishing for 50,000 more fish before
we even really knew -- could assess all the indices,
the in-season indices that revealed that it was 100
percent off of the prediction and -- you know the
forecast prediction, he really wanted to open it up and
hand it back to the State and, luckily, you know, thank
God, Nick Smith, who was the acting area manager -- who
is the area manager for the Kuskokwim on the State
side, he chose to keep the run closed after seeing how
bad the return ended up being, and he actually kept the
river closed until, I think, the 9th, 8th or 9th of
July, which is extremely late but it really shows the
direness of the situation of the actual run return
comparing to the forecast. So I just really want to
thank the members who voted to Federalize the chinook
run last summer, it made all the difference.
I do continue to have concerns that there is entirely too much deference and concern and almost an obsession with what the State thinks and feels, when clearly the Federal Subsistence Management Program and the way that the State prioritizes its uses are not in compliance with one another. The State's actions are not in compliance with the Federal law. And to hear the Solicitor for the Federal Subsistence Board at the beginning of the meeting say the State is actually doing us a favor by suing us is very alarming. And I'm surprised no one else, especially members of the Board, would take contention with the State is doing us a favor. The State is not doing the Federal Subsistence Board or the Federal Subsistence Program, or Federal subsistence users any favors. And this was -- we're actually talking about two moose and five deer, and some of the deer are only as big as a large dog. I mean some of those deer don't have a ton of meat on them, so, you know, I just don't think that people really understand that no favors are being done while the Federal Subsistence Board is caught up in litigation, it's essentially a waste of time, because everyone here knows that the Federal law supersedes State law in every case.

So thank you very much for your time, Mr. Chairman, and Happy New Year.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, thank you, Mary, appreciate that and taking the time to call in and express the concerns from the region and to help us understand the position out there. Any questions from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, thank you, Mary, and wish the best to you guys out there. Operator, anybody else who would like to be recognized at this time online.

OPERATOR: Thank you, yes. So we do have another comment from Adolf Lupie, your line is now open.

MR. LUPIE: Good morning, Chairman and Federal Subsistence Board. Adolf Lupie from Tuntutuliak, I'm a tribal member for recognized tribe of Tuntutuliak Native. And I am a representative for...
Kuskokwim InterTribal Commission for two years now. And I am in support the two ladies before me that made a testimony, it's a heartfelt, eloquently speaking out for me. And I'm happy that the Board is listening and hearing and I hope you ask what we're doing.

Tuntutuliak, whenever there's a regulation that's changed, or fishing season open, we announce it to the village there will be no fishing today, use the restriction meshes, please abide by them. We are conserving fish. And there were 32 commissioners in Kuskokwim and our theme was working together and we are all working together.

And just last week there was announcement, do not hunt caribou, caribous are declining. Those who hunt every year, please do not hunt this year. Please comply with the conservation. And we did.

And the most thing that all through the pandemic we experience that when they were closed to moose hunting, if somebody here, our grocery stores, they are closed, please do not come in and some days in bad weather we're low on food and when we want to hunt the regulation says we cannot hunt, it's restricted, even you are Native you cannot hunt. And I think on here in my generation it's my domain throughout the generation why cannot I hunt in my domain, I was raised by my father and forefathers. I wasn't raised by Ape and I'm not Tarzan.

Thank you, and good morning. Please have a good day.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions. We appreciate you taking your time to call in.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Operator, would anybody else like to be recognized at this time.

OPERATOR: Yes, thank you. Next we do have Ben Stevens, your line is now open.

MR. STEVENS: Thank you, Operator and thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. I
really do appreciate the opportunity to share with you
the perspective from where we come from.

There are a couple of things I wanted
to mention before I have to shift over to another
meeting. The Stevens Village Tribal Council is still
waiting for that response to their request to gather
food. They'd appreciate that response.

In addition, I would like a response as
to how we are going about preparing or satisfying the
need for guidance. It's been like almost a half a year
now and I think that if there's some guidance being
developed is to help -- help us find this straight
route to the resources we need for food, then by all
means we would be interested in helping you. Moreover,
I think as you have seen from our performance in the
past, we can help. I mentioned a couple of days ago
that when the system requested our help in procuring
additional applicants for the RACs, we did. We turned
to our folks and we said, you know, we need your help,
we need your opinion, you're the real deal, sit down
here and help expand our horizons. And from what I
understand you received a record number of applicants
for those RACs. We helped do that. We can do that
type of thing.

And so we stand ready to help you help
us.

That, Mr. Chairman, is what I can offer
at this moment. We're still waiting for those
responses. But as I thank you for your time and all
your help, I do want to provide just a brief reminder
that the subsistence management system is made for us
and it just seems to me like we're all -- we tend to
get sideways a lot when we hear folks like Ben and Chad
talking about making sure that our system adheres to
theirs and I do not think that that is the correct way
to start a discussion. I think what we need to do is
we need to take a look at how can we help the people
that this program was designed to help, and not
necessarily push them aside so we can sit down and be
in alignment with State regulations. And so the
deference to the State is, I think, a dangerous thing
for us because they're not interested in what is good
for us. That is up to us. And so I want to put out a
word of caution that that deference is going to get
probably weighty in the near future.
With that, I will, again, thank you for your help, your attention, such incredible amount of time that each and every one of you have had to dedicate to try and help us, and so that is noted and we want to say Mahsi.

So, with that, I'm finished.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Ben. Appreciate your guys' kind words today and we'll continue to do what we can do to support all of our rural residents. And I also thank you for your personal support, Ben, it goes a long ways brother, Amen.

Operator, is there anybody else online who would like to be recognized at this time.

OPERATOR: I am showing no one left in que to be recognized so I will turn the call back over.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. And I just want to say thank you to all the people who called in this morning and testified, that was a very powerful string of people calling in with some really good topics and considerations for the Board here as we look forward to how we do business in the future and also, you know, how we do business with each other and keeping our eyes on the resources that are so important to the people. So thank you all for taking the time this morning to educate this Board and to give us some insight into the lives that you have out there in rural Alaska.

With that, Sue, we'll move on this morning to the nonrural proposal, RP.....

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead.

MR. BROWER: This is Charlie, thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to thank the speakers that spoke this morning on behalf of their constituents, Dr. Stern, Brooke Woods, Ben Stevens, Karen Linnell, you guys spoke truly the need for subsistence rights and so on and I appreciate that. So I will continue to work with you guys in the future and things will get better.
Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Charlie. Appreciate the comments for the people who called in. And any other Board member who wants to make a comment at this time.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, thank you for those words, Charlie, and, again, thank you everyone who took the time to call in.

We'll go ahead, Sue, and we'll move on to the nonrural proposal RP19-01, and I'll turn it over to you to call on Staff.

MS. DETWILER: Yep, thank you, Mr. Chair. Robbin LaVine is starting the presentation on that.

MS. LAVINE: Good morning, Mr. Chair. Members of the Board. For the record, my name is Robbin LaVine and I'm an anthropologist with the Office of Subsistence Management.

Today I'm presenting the analysis for nonrural determination Proposal RP19-01 which is a proposal to rescind the nonrural status of Moose Pass, and you can find the analysis on Page 302 of your Board book. And for those of you listening online you can find the Board book on our website. Go to the Federal Subsistence Board tab and click on the meeting materials.

So RP19-01 was submitted by Jeffery Bryden of Moose Pass and he asks the Federal Subsistence Board to consider Moose Pass as rural community, independent of the greater Seward area. Moose Pass was formerly aggregated with Seward as part of the Seward nonrural hub. The proponent argues that Moose Pass is a distinct rural community with its own unique culture and character and should be considered on its own merits, separate from Seward.

Before discussing the proposal, I'll give you a brief overview of the nonrural determination process. You can read a detailed discussion of the rural/nonrural regulatory history starting on Page 305.
When the rural determination process was established in 1990 it included a process for aggregating communities that it determined were socially and economically integrated before assessing the community or area for rural or nonrural characteristics. The Board aggregated Moose Pass with Seward in 1990 and, again, during the decennial review in 2000. Both times the Board determined that the Seward area had primarily nonrural characteristics and created Seward a nonrural area, and that map can be seen on Page 306 of your Board book. In 2017 the Board approved a new policy on nonrural determinations, which enables the Board to be more flexible in making decisions and to take into account regional differences found throughout the state. The policy provides guidelines for determining the nonrural status of a community. It's important to note that the new nonrural policy does not provide explicit criteria or a checklist. The text on Page 309 was taken directly from the policy and it shows bold and underlined wording that highlights the guidance upon which this analysis is focused. Specifically the Board will use a comprehensive approach, information provided by the public, information within the administrative record, so meaning testimony and discussions from public hearings, Council and Board meetings, the Board will use evidence and considerations presented in the proposal, the discretion to modify the geographical extent of the area and most importantly, confirmation from the Regional Advisory Councils that relevant information accurately describes the unique characteristics of the effected community or region.

Because both the policy and Council guidance highlight the importance of information provided by the public, the analysis incorporates public testimony provided at the public hearing and the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council meetings from the fall of 2019. In addition to public testimony, the analysis relies on State technical papers and reports and local historical accounts.

Throughout this presentation, I will refer to the Moose Pass area. For the purpose of this analysis the Moose Pass area is inclusive of the Moose Pass census designated place, or CDP, the Crown Point CDP and the Primrose CDP. The proposal, as written, identifies just the Moose Pass CDP as the area for consideration. Residents from Crown Point CDP and
Primrose CDP have expressed interest in being considered in the proposal as residents of the Moose Pass community, which many say is broader than the Moose Pass CDP.

So now I'm going to go present the proposal and analysis.

The proponent describes the area for consideration as extending from Mile 25 to Mile 37 of the Seward Highway. He explains that south of Mile 25 has a different postal code and a separate electrical service than north of Mile 25, and that no one lives north of Mile 37 until the start of the Sterling Highway. The proponent asserts that under the new Federal Subsistence Board's nonrural policy Moose Pass will qualify as rural. He writes that Moose Pass residents rely upon fishing and hunting and they gather natural resources from the Forest Service lands that surround the area. These Federal lands limit population growth and have allowed the community to keep the rural feel and culture that drew him to the area in the first place. The proponent argues that because Forest Service lands are open to subsistence harvest activities Moose Pass residents should be eligible to harvest local resources as Federal opportunities allow.

So on Page 304 you can see Figure 1, and that's a map of Federal lands in Unit 7.

If you turn to Page 313 you will find a map of the Moose Pass area. The milepost markers stretch along the Seward Highway from Milepost 37 to Milepost 15.5, which marks the Snow River Hostel, and the last structure in the Primrose CDP, there are approximately eight miles of uninhabited road stretching between the Snow River Hostel and the first Seward-connected settlement within the southern portion of the Bear Creek CDP. Importantly you'll notice that the shaded yellow area describes the proposed Moose Pass community boundary in the original proposal.

So now I want to draw your attention to the section, the extent of the Moose Pass community and it's midway on Page 311.

Some Council members and residents of the Moose Pass area, from the public hearing, requested
the Board consider an extension of the geographic
definition of the community, to include residents that
live within the boundaries outlined in the original
proposal. The public hearing in Moose Pass was
attended by 46 people. 12 people provided public
testimony. 6 of those people were from the Moose Pass
CDP, 5 were from the Crown Point CDP and one person
provided testimony who was a resident of the Primrose
CDP. Most public testimony at the hearing indicated
that a sense of community among the residents is more
broad and inclusive and that residents of Primrose and
Crown Point CDPs are considered and consider themselves
part of the Moose Pass community. The analysis also
reviewed documents from local organizations, clubs,
commissions as well as preliminary research conducted
by UAA graduate student, Christine Brummer. All
sources indicate that the Moose Pass community is
expansive and inclusive of residents living from
Milepost 15 of the Seward Highway to Milepost 37, or
the Y, and in some cases beyond, some people said to
Summit Lake at Milepost 45.

The Moose Pass has its origins in the
development phase of the early Gold Rush period on the
Kenai Peninsula during the early 1900s and was part of
an important mining district.

On Page 314, Table 1 describes the
Moose Pass area population from all three CDPs since
1990. The population of the entire area is 391 people
and demonstrates relative stability of the area
population over the recent years.

At the bottom of Page 316 is a section
Moose Pass as a rural community. Based on policy and
Council guidance a valuable assessment of the status of
Moose Pass as rural comes from the community itself.
All 12 people who provided testimony defined their home
as rural and described a community and way of life that
relied heavily on hunting and fishing, was defined by
limited amenities and services and emphasized the rural
character of their community as something that they
valued and looked to protect.

Beginning on Page 318 is the section
use of wild resources. In this section, use of wild
resources is demonstrated through public testimony,
subsistence surveys, and ADF&G permit harvest reports.
All sources demonstrate consistent harvest and use of
wild foods by residents under the opportunities available to them. And public testimony captured the value of being able to gather firewood and food from the lands bordering their homes.

At the bottom of Page 319 is the section communities with rural status in Southcentral Alaska. There are numerous communities in areas within Southcentral Alaska that are designated as rural under Federal regulations. In this analysis we seek to understand Moose Pass in comparison to communities with rural status on the Kenai Peninsula. Nonrural communities are included in these comparisons to provide context for identifying the threshold between rural and nonrural communities in the immediate area.

And now for the effects of this proposal.

If this proposal is adopted residents of Moose Pass will be able to hunt and fish under Federal regulations that are inclusive of all rural residents. However, it's not guaranteed they will qualify for all harvest opportunities on Federal lands in their region. For that to occur the community will need to submit customary and traditional use proposals for fish and wildlife species in their area.

If this proposal is not adopted, the status of Moose Pass will remain nonrural and residents can continue to hunt and fish under State of Alaska regulations.

The OSM conclusion is to support Proposal RP19-01 rescinding the nonrural determination for Moose Pass with a modification to define the community of Moose Pass as encompassing the Moose Pass, Crown Point, and Primrose census designated places.

The justification is as follows:

Moose Pass shares experiences and characteristics similar to other Southcentral rural communities. Public testimony, harvest surveys and harvest reports demonstrate consistent participation in hunting and fishing opportunities. All residents providing testimony described the importance of wild foods in their diet and home and as a main reason for living in their community. Moose Pass has limited
local amenities and a geographic isolation that can
hamper access to important hub communities with
critical services during extreme weather events.
Residents point to a lack of local amenities, services
and businesses as a key distinguishing feature between
their community and the nearest nonrural hub of Seward.
Significantly, Moose Pass is surrounded by Federal
public lands upon which residents rely for most of
their wild harvest. Residents consistently mentioned
these lands as bordering their properties, providing
resources and contributing to the rural character of
their community.

Finally, public testimony and available
sources indicate that the community of Moose Pass
extends beyond the boundaries described in the original
proposal. It is important to note that half of the
public testimony that describes Moose Pass as rural and
that helps identify the unique characteristics of the
area was provided by residents from Crown Point and
Primrose.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the
Board. I am ready to take any questions.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Robbin, appreciate that. Any questions from the Board
for Robbin.

MS. PITKA: This is Rhonda.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Rhonda, you
have the floor.

MS. PITKA: Yes, I just wanted to thank
you for your really thorough analysis on this proposal.
I appreciated reading how clearly it was laid out.
That was excellent, thank you. I definitely used all
this information.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
other questions from the Board.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, this is

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Greg,
you have the floor.
MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you. Yeah, Robbin, thanks for the very thorough presentation. And can you remind me, has there been any communications between the original applicant of this who had recommended that it was the Moose Pass area in regards to this proposal? And why I’m asking is the addition of the Primrose and the Crown Point, is that -- did the applicant -- have you had any discussions with the original applicant regarding that?

MS. LAVINE: Thank you. Through the Chair. Mr. Siekaniec. The proponent of this proposal is aware of the OSM recommendation to modify the original proposal. I believe he's online and can actually speak to your question but it's my understanding that he could speak to what he understood his boundaries to be and that was the original Moose Pass CDP.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Okay.

MS. LAVINE: Again, that's something that he can potentially provide information on.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thanks. Thank you, Robbin. And then just maybe an addition to that is I see the Regional Advisory Council also is recommending to stay with the original proposal, I wonder if they are on as well to provide some thoughts.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg, we will run through the full spectrum of proposals before us and so we will continue to provide opportunity of summary of public comment as well as open the floor for public testimony and call on our Regional Advisory Council Chairs.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Okay. All right, thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: In fact, that's the next order of business so once the Staff is done we'll open up the floor for summary of public comment and then I would entertain at that time anyone online that wants to get on and speak to this proposal. And so, I'll call on the request for summary public comment.
MS. PERRY: Good morning, Mr. Chair and
members of the Board. This is DeAnna Perry, Council
Coordinator for the Southcentral Regional Advisory
Council. We did receive one written public comment on
this issue on January 4th of this year from Lisa
Lipetzky. It's my understanding that Ms. Lipetzky had
intended on reading her comment or providing a summary
of her written comments to the Board herself. I know
she was online yesterday afternoon to do that but not
sure if she's on this morning. So since this was the
only public comment received, you could perhaps move on
to public testimony and see if she's available. If not
I would leave it to the Board if you all would like me
to read her comment on the record.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Is she online
Operator, if she is online would you please clear her
line.

OPERATOR: Yes, if you would like to
speak, please dial star one with your name so I can
open up your line for your comment. Thank you.

(Pause)

OPERATOR: And I do not see Lisa
opening up her line so I will turn it back, thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
I'll ask that you read it into the record then, please.

MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Again, this is a written comment from Lisa Lipetzky to
the Southcentral anthropologist and the Southcentral
Council Coordinator received January 4th.

I am not entirely sure who to email
regarding the Moose Pass proposal but I had reached out
to Christine Brummer, whom we interviewed with and she
suggested I start here. Please forward my comments and
concerns as appropriate or let me know whom I should
reach out to.

I have to say that as a member of the
Moose Pass community, but a physical resident of Crown
Point, after a very promising start to this process it
has become confusing, frustrating and discouraging.
Here's why.

After reading the draft Staff analysis, I initially felt like those of us who live in a Moose Pass community but are in Crown Point to Primrose areas who testified were, in fact, listened to and clearly the boundaries of the original proposal were wrong. The wide breadth of research put into this proposal from history, subsistence, socio-economics, school use, postal and fire service, Moose Pass Sportsmen Club bylaws, et cetera, makes it clear as day to everybody that we are all a part of the Moose Pass community and that the separate CDPs used for nonrural determination were fundamentally flawed from the start.

So we were very unhappy to read at the end of the draft document -- or I'm sorry, let me scratch that -- so we were very happy to read at the end of the draft document OSM preliminary conclusion to support Proposal 19-01 with modification to define the community of Moose Pass as accompanying the Moose Pass, Crown Point and Primrose census designated places.

Imagine my astonishment later listening to the Southcentral Regional council meeting in October 2020, I was flabbergasted at the statements by the Council members at the end of the discussion stating that they would not consider expanding the proposal boundaries to include Crown Point or Primrose and that Crown Point should have written our own proposal. Even more of a shock was some of the comments from the RAC saying things like I would love to give Moose Pass their nonrural determination but I don't know what I would vote in favor of the other communities, I haven't really given that any thought -- wait, what, so many folks from Crown Point to Primrose participated in meetings, phone calls, written comments and even in-depth interviews to support the rural determination but, also, correct, the original proposal to reflect our actual community boundary. It had been brought up repeatedly by many people. Did the Southcentral RAC even read the incredibly thorough, well researched OSM staff analysis that was readily available before their meeting? We were told the boundary could possibly be modified when the process began and proceeded through the public comment period under the idea that there was still a chance to correct the proposal.

To go from reading the OSM draft Staff
analysis supporting an expanded boundary to then
hearing the Southcentral RAC say they hadn't even
considered it was like a slap in the place.

I thought it was great that Jeff
Bryden's proposal opened the door to this new
discussion for a process that had never been done
before. The redetermination of an area from nonrural
to rural, he is uniquely qualified to understand this
process better than most of the general public as he
was a subsistence law enforcement officer. We figured
once the door was open and the proposal was on the
agenda, then the public comments would start and that
process would clearly show that the Moose Pass rural
area doesn't end at Falls Creek like in the initial
proposal. Those of us living south of Jeff Bryden's
proposed arbitrary Moose Pass boundary thought the
folly in defining Moose Pass in such a limited manner
would be corrected once public testimony was received
and it was brought up as a possibility at the local
meeting. Imagine if the tables were turn, if Crown
Point had submitted a proposal before a Moose Pass
resident, you bet Moose Pass folks would rightfully say
that they should be included since we all live in the
same area surrounded by National Forest. What
precedent would it set if the Council or Federal
Subsistence Board did not allow proposals to be
modified after scoping/research clearly shows the
proposed boundary was not aligned with reality.

By not allowing modification of the
proposal's boundary, because it isn't how the author
wrote it or intended it, and leaving out people who are
clearly members of the same community is a dangerous
precedent and could give an author of any proposal
unjustified and arbitrary control over the entire
definition of a community.

I don't believe Bryden had ill-intent,
but it certainly could open the door for one person to
take advantage of this system.

Side note. Today I got mail from Moose
Pass post office and put my Moose Pass fire department
dues in the mail so my home in the Crown Point
neighborhood is protected. I am sad Trail Lake Lodge is
closed, that is the hub for mingling for everybody no
matter what side of Falls Creek you live on, but at
least we got to celebrate New Years with our Moose Pass
community, including Crown Point and Primrose folks, of
course, watching fireworks funded by the Moose Pass
Sportsmen's Club, a club funded by and open to persons
residing within the area of Mile 16 Seward Highway to
Mile 50 Seward Highway. Where, in any of my day as a
resident just south of Falls Creek does it seem like
Crown Point is its own stand-alone entity from Moose
Pass. Why would any of us have thought we needed our
own nonrural proposal when we are a part of Moose Pass
in every other way. The only thing differentiating our
community is literally the verbiage in Proposal 19-01.
Verbiage we did not see until the proposal was out for
public comment and we sure did comment.

I understand public comments are closed
but we have already given comments and it seems like
the Southcentral RAC disregarded our comments about the
true boundaries of our community and only used Crown
Point and Primrose for the intent of showing that Moose
Pass is surrounded by rural communities that engage in
subsistence activities. How can rural and subsistence
use/character of Crown Point and Primrose be used to
support Moose Pass' limited boundary bid for the
determination but not also show that Crown Point and
Primrose should also be classified as nonrural and part
of the same community.

My husband and I have been taking the
time to read through documents and try to figure out
how to navigate these two different positions between
the OSM and the Southcentral RAC, what it all means and
what can still be done before the next conference. I
simply don't even know what to do, to submit a stand-
alone proposal for Crown Point after thinking we would
be included in a corrected boundary of the original
proposal puts us years behind the rest of our community
north of Falls Creek. On top of that does Line (ph),
Victor Creek and Primrose need to submit their own
proposals, that just seems unnecessary as the research
has already been done for this entire area.

I am not as well spoken or well written
as the original proposals author and apologize for
being long-winded and redundant. I hope this letter
makes sense, why I am confused and looking for
guidance. When Proposal 29-01 is officially voted on,
will it consider the expanded boundaries or not? Can I
request it officially be amended, aligned with OSM's
findings and suggestion? The long and the short is, is

Computer Matrix, LLC  Phone: 907-243-0668
135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501  Fax: 907-243-1473
there anything left we can do to ensure Crown Point and
Primrose are still being considered for a rural
determination at the same time as Moose Pass before the
meeting at the end of January. Knowing that
Southcentral RAC already heard our comments and still
dismissed them during their October meeting is why I
feel like I need to reach out and ensure the OSM and
Southcentral RAC that Crown Point and Primrose are
still paying attention, are very concerned, and
disagree with dividing our community. Any advice,
guidance or help, please let me know.

Again, that's from Lisa Lipetzky, who I
believe had intended reading this into the record
yesterday afternoon.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, appreci ate that written comment. Any questions from
the Board.

MS. PITKA: This is Rhonda.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Rhonda, you
have the floor.

MS. PITKA: Yeah, so is her comment
addressed by the OSM conclusion? That was my only
question. Thank you.

MS. LAVINE: Mr. Chair, this is Robbin.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have
the floor Robbin.

MS. LAVINE: Yes, thank you, Rhonda and
Mr. Chair. If -- if -- well, the OSM conclusion is
recommended to define the community of Moose Pass as
inclusive of all three CDPs and so that would include
Lisa’s CDP of Crown Point. And I think that the
comment was generated out of concern after the
Southcentral Regional Advisory Council gave its
recommendation on supporting the proposal as written.
And so from what I understand the Southcentral Regional
Advisory Council and I’m sure you’ll hear their
recommendation shortly did recognize the community of
Moose Pass as rural, but was concerned about expanding
the definition of the community and decided to support
the proposal as written.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Robbin. Any other questions from the Board.

MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, this is DeAnna Perry again. I just wanted to let everyone know that I just received a text from Ms. Lipetzky and she advises she is on the line so if the Board does have further questions she should be available.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, DeAnna, appreciate that. If I hear no more questions from the Board I will open up the floor for public testimony and entertain her at this time if she wishes to speak to it or any questions fielded from the Board to her. So, Operator, can you make her line available, please.

OPERATOR: Yes, Lisa, your line is now open. And as a public comment, if you would like to make any comment you can dial star one to make a comment and star two to remove a comment. Again, star one.

(Pause)

OPERATOR: And we do have a comment here from Christine Brummer, your line is now open Christine.

MS. BRUMMER: Hi. I just wanted to remind the Board that I gave public testimony yesterday morning thinking that you guys were going to actually get to the Moose Pass proposal yesterday. But I have today off so I am online and if you have any questions I'm here and I just wanted to remind you about that the speech that I gave you so that you guys could take what I had to say into consideration.

Thank you so much.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. And appreciate you being able to call in today to follow your testimony. Any questions from the Board.
(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right. Hearing no further questions from the Board, I'll ask if there is any other people on the line, Operator, that would like to be recognized at this time.

OPERATOR: Yes, thank you. The next comment here will come from Rick Smeriglio, your line is now open.

MR. SMERIGLIO: Good morning, Mr. Christianson -- Mr. Chair that is, and members of the Board. My name is Rick Smeriglio, I live in Moose Pass and I live in that Crown Point area about one-half mile south of the boundary that's outlined in RP19-01.

And before I go any farther I would just like to acknowledge that we're talking about Kenaitze territory here. I am not a member of the Kenaitze Tribe and I do not speak for the Kenaitze but I would like to respectfully acknowledge that the lands where I hunt are Kenaitze territory.

So the reason I'm calling in is to support rural determination for Moose Pass and I guess that's properly rescinding the nonrural determination. But I also favor that OSM modification of RP19-01, which would then include my neighborhood and well beyond. I think the description of Moose Pass and the analysis that you got in your packet are very accurate and they're very fair, extremely detailed. I enjoyed reading it. I've lived here for 34 years and I certainly learn things by reading the analysis of OSM.

I do have to disagree, though, with ADF&G's conclusion to not find us rural just because we're similar to Seward. We're also similar to Hope and Cooper Landing and both those small communities have been found rural and I think we're probably more similar to Hope and Cooper Landing in terms of population, in terms of our rural lifestyle and the general traditions.

But all that demographic stuff aside, I'd just like to say that Moose Pass is more than a place name, it's more than a census district, we are a distinct community and we have a great reliance on the subsistence resources. And for that reason I urge you
to vote in favor of RP19-01 and especially the OSM modification of it, which would then include the whole population of what I call Moose Pass.

Thank you very much for your time. I know you've put in a lot of it today and I know it's been a long three days, and that's the end of my comment.

Thank you, again.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for calling in. Appreciate you calling in and adding your support for your proposal for us to consider here. Any questions from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing none. We'll ask the Operator, is there anybody else online who would like to be recognized at this time.

OPERATOR: Yes, thank you. We do have Bruce Jaffa, Bruce your line is now open.

MR. JAFFA: Thank you. Through the Chair and the Board. I appreciate the opportunity to speak in favor of RP19-01, the correction and reclassification of rural status of the Moose Pass community and the OSM conclusion of broader interpretation of three CDP area boundaries.

For an initial submission to a very complex Federal process, a small area may have been selected, but should now be expanded to include the full Moose Pass community. As a long time resident we have typically considered the area from Mile 18 to the Y at Mile 37 to be the Moose Pass area. Our issue is much less complex than many of those that you've reviewed over the last few days and I am impressed by the knowledge and effort of so many speakers who have presented to your Board. I have listened over the last few days and I'm impressed by the time and effort involved.

I am a member of the Kenai Mountain Turnagain Arm Heritage Area and I'm aware of the stark activities that include the indigenous population in
this area. They participated with the early western
explorers, hunters and miners. This area just didn't
spring out of nowhere, there was a historical presence
here of many, many people for generations, centuries.

I spoke to your Board in 2019 and
several years before, both times in favor of the
reclassification, not much has changed over the years
except we are all getting older. My wife and I have
lived for 45 years at Milepost 36 of the Seward Highway
after moving from a dry cabin in Cooper Landing. We
settled here only 10 years after the 1964 Earthquake.
The State Highway has been improved but not enough to
shrink the distance to any town, commercial store or
gas station. We truly are remote in every sense of the
word rural.

The opportunity to use local fish and
game resources has always been important, never more so
than during the current times. The report before you
compares resource consumption in Moose Pass to the
remote communities of Nanwalek and Port Graham. Due to
geographic realities this is not a fair comparison.
Other examples of rural communities such as Cooper
Landing support our status as rural, substantial,
practical and regular access to supplies and stores may
be a truer test. As an example, incorrectly using data
I point to the current Chugachmiut Health Clinic in
Seward that provides services to many people on the
Kenai Peninsula and Prince William Sound communities
and is seriously considering an expansion in Seward.
Certainly the use of this care facility does not and
would not diminish the accuracy of rural residency of
anyone who may live in Port Graham or Chenega or
elsewhere across Alaska. Likewise, the mere proximity
of Moose Pass to Seward should not be overly used as a
criteria to evaluate our rural status. There is no
central water system here, no police, only a local
volunteer fire company, local neighbor to neighbor
boards provide community guidance and support.

As a striking separation of
communities, the Covid pandemic has put a light on
things as never before. When Seward initially
considered closing the town along the highway, airport
and harbor to nonresident travel, Moose Pass was
excluded -- was on the excluded side of the issue. At
that time my freezer with stored food, including fish,
game and berries looked even more important. Rarely
have we been more clearly presented as independent of Seward, on our own and rural. In every sense Moose Pass is rural, deserves subsistence recognition as that.

I appreciate your time and consideration and I'm available for questions as needed.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for your articulated point of view and if there's any questions from the Board now is your time to ask them.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing no questions, again, thank you for calling in and sharing your life and experience down there in Moose Pass and hopefully things continue to improve out of this pandemic.

Operator, is there anyone else online who would like to be recognized at this time.

OPERATOR: Yes, thank you. Next up we will have Hope Roberts, Hope, your line is now open.

MS. ROBERTS: Good morning Federal Board and Staff. Thank you, again, for letting me speak this morning. I'm Hope Roberts. I live in Valdez. I am an employee at Chugach Regional Resources Commission as their intertribal liaison for Federal subsistence outreach. We represent seven Chugach communities -- Native communities, which are, Chenega, Eyak, Port Graham, Nanwalek, Qutekcak, Tatitlek and Valdez.

We -- oh, first (In Native) Rhonda Pitka, Happy Birthday.

And, with that, we ask you to support FP19-01 designating Moose Pass as a rural community independent from the greater Seward area. There are registered members of the Qutekcak Native Tribes who reside in areas that would be considered rural under this new determination. Supporting this rural determination would allow these citizens to practice their customary and traditional harvest near their home, a right denied them under current regulations.
Staff consulted with Qutekcak about this proposal and received their Councils full backing to provide official Alliance testimony in support of this proposal. Unit 7, where Moose Pass is located is surrounded by Federal lands with 78 percent of land in the unit being Federal and over 50 percent of that land eligible for subsistence by Federally-qualified users. A favorable rural determination would open new opportunities for tribal citizens and other residents of this area to hunt and fish near where they live. Currently Federally-qualified subsistence users from elsewhere on the Peninsula and the state can harvest on Federal lands surrounding Moose Pass but Moose Pass' nonrural determination denies residents the ability to hunt, fish and gather food in their own backyard.

Originally Moose Pass and the nearby areas of Primrose and Crown Point were combined with Seward's population to create the Seward nonrural area. Moose Pass is sufficiently separate from Seward and should be considered as its own community upon being considered for rural determination. This is supported by the fact that Moose Pass has its own utilities, school, post office, store and other services separate from Seward and relies on the Alaska State Troopers for law enforcement like other rural areas around the state. The population and use of wild foods also makes it more similar to other Kenai Peninsula communities with a rural determination such as Cooper Landing and Ninilchik than larger populations such as Homer providing further evidence to support a rural designation is the Alaska Department of Fish and Game's 2003 subsistence survey that estimated 99 percent of households in Moose Pass, Crown Point and Primrose used wild foods and 92 percent of households participated in harvest. This high percentage of users of wild food is like other rural communities in Alaska.

From the Chugach regional villages that I am representing today.

Quyana, Federal Subsistence Board and Staff for your time.

Questions are welcome, thanks.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Thank you for taking the time to call in and provide your point of view, any questions for Hope.
MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, this is Greg.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg, you have the floor.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you. Yeah, thanks for that testimony. I just wanted to confirm that when you refer to the Moose Pass area you are also including Primrose and Crown Point within that?

MS. ROBERTS: I believe I did, yes, sir.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Okay, thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any additional questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, thank you, Hope. Operator, was there anybody else online who would like to be recognized at this time.

OPERATOR: Yes, thank you. The next comment here will come from Willow Hetrick, Willow your line is now open.

MS. HETRICK: Hi, Mr. Chair, members of the Council. Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You got the floor loud and clear.

MS. HETRICK: All right, thank you. For the record my name is Willow Hetrick. Thanks for allowing me to testify before you today. I am a working professional in the natural resource management arena, a Board member of the Kenai Mountain Turnagain Arm National Heritage Area, which is always a mouthful, and an avid participant in managing (indiscernible) grant applications on behalf of Moose Pass Chamber of Commerce and the Moose Pass public library.

My family moved to Moose Pass from Prince William Sound so that myself and my siblings could go to an actual school. My parents chose Moose
Pass because of its small town feel, where people take
care of their neighbors, where their kids can grow up
living off the land and where they can provide for
their family. Now my entire family are proud
homeowners in Moose Pass. I harvested my first moose in
Abernathy Creek drainage along the Resurrection Pass
trail and several years later I harvested my first
caribou in that very same drainage with my husband. I
was able to harvest all of those animals through luck
of the draw in the State system. My family catches
fish on the Russian River. We pick berries and harvest
plants all over the Chugach National Forest. And Moose
Pass is just surrounded by a majority of Federal lands
and it's a special place that I now share with my two
children.

In 1990 after my family moved to Moose
Pass, this very Board used an arbitrary aggregation to
exceed the population thresholds of Seward. I was five
years old. 10 years later, the Alaska Department of
Fish and Game visited Moose Pass to conduct their very
first comprehensive harvest assessment of wild
resources in the area. What are the most important
resources according to this study, while similar to
other communities that are considered rural, salmon,
wild plants and land mammals. These are the same
resources that are neighboring rural communities are
harvesting under the Federal system. The residents
that live in Moose Pass today are largely not the ones
from 19 years ago that the Alaska Department of Fish
and Game surveyed. My generation has aged. We're
living, recreating and subsisting off the land. New
families have moved in that value that same subsistence
lifestyle.

In 2017 this Board was given the
authority to make nonrural determinations using a
comprehensive approach, and I'm just going to go
through some of those factors.

Population size was one of those
factors, and, indeed, Moose Pass we are small averaging
around 250 people.

Density is another one of those
factors, our town encompasses a large area that spans
over 30 miles along the road system surrounded by the
Chugach National Forest.
Economic indicators are another factor for you to consider. My explanation of our town and its amenities indicate that economic opportunities are few.

Military presence is another factor, of which we have none.

Industrial facilities is another factor for this Board to consider, of which we have none.

Use of fish and wildlife. My previous statistics indicate, you know, and from other folks who have also provided public testimony today indicate that our community, we are subsistence users.

Another factor for the Board to consider, degree of remoteness. As Mr. Jaffa pointed out, whereas we're not really considered technically remote we are often isolated. And that isolation has happened in my lifetime through avalanches that have shut off the community going both directions for multiple days. Most recently Covid pandemic travel restrictions.

And one other point I want to make to the Board is about the integration between our community of Moose Pass and other rural communities of Hope and Cooper Landing. I want it to be known that our kids share schools. We share sports. We share sport equipment. We travel between communities to harvest firewood, pick berries, hunt and fish. Community members that live -- there are community members that live and work between all three of the communities. For example, the postmistress in Cooper Landing lives in Moose Pass and a teacher from Moose Pass lives in Hope.

Our community is in the heart of the Kenai Peninsula. We're surrounded by the Chugach National Forest. I'm sure you're aware that 80 percent of Unit 7, which is considered our hunting area is comprised of Federal land. To get out of Unit 7 we must travel for over 100 miles.

And, Mr. Chair, thanks for offering me the opportunity to testify today. I urge the Board to pass this rural designation as proposed, however, I would also ask the Board to heavily consider the
expansion of the boundaries as well. Of course if there are any questions on the expansion of the area, the best thing to do today would be to take the original proposal over nothing. Make no mistake, the lands surrounding the community are essential to our community’s physical, economic, traditional and cultural existence. Moose Pass was the original town on the Kenai Peninsula, has kept a consistently small number of residents with limited services and amenities and we deserve a seat at this very table to be able to manage our natural resources along with all of you.

Thank you.

I'll take any questions.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Appreciate you calling in today and giving us your perspective on everything. Any questions from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing none, thank you for calling in today. Operator, is there anybody else online who would like to be recognized at this time.

OPERATOR: Yes, next up we will have Dan Migow (ph), Dan, your line is now open.

MR. MIGOW: Hello, can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Dan, you have the floor.

DAN: Okay, thank you. I'm calling in support of modifying this proposal to include the Crown Point and Primrose CDP. I've lived in the Crown Point area for 14 years and I've never had to explain why I'm a part of Moose Pass. Anyone who lives in any of these three CDPs will tell you the community extends to include Crown Point and Primrose.

Contrary to the submitted proposal, I do have a Moose Pass address. I pay my dues to the Moose Pass Volunteer Fire Department. My P.O. Box is in Moose Pass. Moose Pass dump is even south of my house but here I am defending being part of my
community. Why Crown Point and Primrose remain separate CDPs is a mystery to me. They're not communities, they are just small subdivisions of Moose Pass, the same as (indiscernible) and Goat Haven Estates to the north. Everything stated in Mr. Bryden's proposal to define Moose Pass as a rural community applies to us because we are the same. The churches, community club, fire department, post office, businesses and schools cited in the proposal that make Moose Pass unique are the same ones that we use and support. We are surrounded by the same Federal land that we depend on for a wide variety of natural resources.

It's frustrating to have to justify something so inherently known by residents, something that wasn't an issue until this proposal.

The southern boundary stated in this proposal is arbitrary as it pertains to our community. It doesn't stop at a small creek, there's not even a break in residences there. Further up, the proposed boundary of Falls Creek itself are adopted. At Mile 25 it would include some households already within the Crown Point CDP. The proposal also tries to use utility coverage as a defining characteristic of community. Yes, those of us in Crown Point and Primrose are stuck paying Seward for our electricity but everyone else pays Chugach Electric based in Anchorage. It would be ridiculous to say they are part of the Anchorage municipality based on where their bills get paid.

The proposal as written draws a line through our community. It would create haves and have-nots, a neighborhood gained the privileges of subsistence rights and I wouldn't be able to share the same right just outside my door. There is more than enough testimony, research stating that Moose Pass, Crown Point and Primrose CDPs are all one community to see that it is the case. Please modify this proposal to include our entire community and be a true depiction of Moose Pass.

And, you know, just to add on to that, you know, I say frustrating but it's kind of a light word. You know it's awkward to have to justify the community you live in. I'd rather be telling the Board about our, you know, the resources we collect and how
we depend on hunting and fishing but, you know, I'm just trying to be a part of the community right now, you know, without -- Moose Pass is our town center, Crown Point and Primrose is just a handful of houses with really nowhere to call home, you know. So if the discussion is really about the community of Moose Pass, the proposal as submitted it just isn't it, you know, it's dividing our community instead of bringing it together.

So, again, I urge you to really look at all those materials. Christine Brummer's well done thesis. Public comments. You know everything says we're part of the community and we should be included. So please support and modify this proposal to include Crown Point and Primrose.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Can you hear me?

MS. PITKA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for calling in and testifying, I appreciate that and hopefully we could be inclusive here today as the Board deliberates on this. Operator, is there -- or I mean Board any questions, or Operator who's next online.

(No comments)

OPERATOR: All right, the next comment here comes from Jeffery Biden -- or excuse me, Bryden, your line is now open.

MR. BRYDEN: Can you hear me, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Mr. Bryden, you have the floor.

MR. BRYDEN: Thank you very much. Thank you, Board, for taking the time in considering this proposal. As you can see there's a lot of different feelings and concerns.

I have been involved in this process
for a very long time. As a Moose Pass resident for over 25 years. I started going to my first Federal Subsistence Board meetings in 1992. So I've seen how the Board's have worked and how it reacts on different things. In looking at these proposals and putting this together, I specifically wrote the proposal strictly to eliminate possibilities to have it being not considered.

At this time there are three different CDPs. Moose Pass, the Crown Point and the Primrose. I used the criteria that the Board put together and part of what they used to look at was where is your Post Office Box, where is your electric service coming from, where is the defined boundaries. As I'm trying to show Moose Pass as a community that became a problem, but the CDPs clearly showed a defined boundary for Moose Pass so that's what I used in putting the proposal because I thought it was the cleanest way of doing it. In the past the Southcentral RAC has always said if members are not in that member and they want to be included that they should put a proposal in also, to put it in.

I have no problem with including Crown Point and Primrose into the mix, the problem I have is if putting them into the mix weakens the case. And if you decide to do that I'd like to see that the vote first go through with Moose Pass by itself, as I proposed it, and if that passes then bring up adding on the additional communities to see how that would go through.

Having been at the meeting in 2000 when the entire Kenai Peninsula got included, part of the reason that vote was put in was the information that was provided from the Moose Pass residents. Part of what got us moving into this whole thing was the Forest Plan. As I've lived here we've had two different Forest Plans and both of those plans have taken away accessibility to people that live in our area. We used to be able to take ATVs up the Mills Creek Road system in Manitoba, up the Stetson Creek area out in the Resurrection and Snow Rivers. The Forest Plan's taken that away. We used to be able to go up Ress Pass every year on snowmachines in the wintertime, that's taken away. We use those areas to be able to get away from other folks and to harvest resources. A lot of the resources we harvest aren't just fish and game, but
they're berries, they're mushrooms and they're firewood. Right now as you can see on the maps, the Moose Pass community as well as the Crown Point and the Primrose are surrounded by National Forest. Community members from Hope and Cooper Landing can come over to our areas take motorized vehicles go up our closed areas and harvest any of those game they like and the berries, mushrooms and type stuff, bring out the firewood when we're not allowed. That's what I was trying to get us into was to have better access for resources to be able to come in.

We talked a little bit -- Willow brought up about our coordinations of our schools, we do have Cooper Landing students that go to Moose Pass school. Obviously our history with the school system has members of our students meeting up with the Hope kids and the Cooper Landing kids and going to Alyeska to make a large enough group to be able to get discounts on groups, rates and type, so we have a really good feeling with the other communities.

I'm just trying to get this proposal to go forward and have it pass and that's my concern.

Any questions.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for taking the time to call. Any questions from the Board.

MR. SCHMID: Dave Schmid, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Dave, yep, you have the floor.

MR. SCHMID: Yeah, thanks, Jeff. I appreciate your opening the proposal here. I guess looking forward here, if we were to modify, I think we could go either way as a Board, and I'm getting ahead of things a little bit, but if we were to modify the proposal to include the other communities, and should that fail I would certainly be more than willing to offer another motion to go back and just consider your original. And so that's at least just kind of sharing what I'm thinking and would just like to hear your reaction to that.

MR. BRYDEN: That would be find with me. Again, we have no concern with adding the other
residents other than it weakens my original case for trying to put it forward and be appealed.

MR. SCHMID: Yeah, through the Chair there. Back to Jeff, thank you for that, and I appreciate your openness to the other communities as well.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any other questions from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, thank you for taking your time to call in today, appreciate that. Operator, is there anybody else online who would like to be recognized at this time.

OPERATOR: Yes, our next comment comes from Jim Simon, your line is now open.

MR. SIMON: Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. My name is Jim Simon. I'm a consultant with the Chugach Regional Resource Commission but today I'm just giving you my personal testimony as a 50-some year old guy who's from the roaded rural areas of Alaska.

My family grew up in -- I grew up in the Nelchina area and yet we did not live between the road signs identifying Nelchina. My grandparents, my uncle and my aunt's property which was 20 miles from our house, you know, was in a different census designated place and I think that that -- just because a census designated place exists does not make that a community, those census designated place boundaries have changed through time as a way of collecting census information and reporting socio-economic data but they do not define specific communities, in my opinion and experience, having worked for the Division of Subsistence for 14 years where we conducted community surveys largely using census designated places because of the utility in being able to make statistical expansions, sampling design, et cetera. However, I don't believe that there is anything in Federal regulation that requires you to define communities based on census designated places and the issue of the
post office in this geographic definition of community is problematic. At my family's place in Nelchina, our post office was either Palmer or Glennallen, it shifted through time as the highway corridor postal address. And so I think there is ample testimony that's been provided from the residents of these three census designated places that speak to the community aspects there.

And I encourage the Federal Subsistence Board to work with the Office of Subsistence Management to really evaluate alternative approaches to looking at community definitions beyond census designated places. This has also been an issue in my home region, in the Copper River Basin in defining communities. And it's very difficult for local people to explain what a community really is when you talk about the social relationships and the sharing and the interactions that occur with people on a distant road system. And there tends to be conflict in how local people define their community and the census designated place determinations made by the U.S. Census Bureau.

And as one of the previous speakers, Willow, mentioned, there are ample criteria for you to utilize beyond -- in making rural/nonrural determinations and it is much more complicated than just lines on a map and geography.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, appreciate you taking the time to call in today. Any questions from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, appreciate that. Operator is there anybody else who would like to be recognized at this time.

OPERATOR: We have no further comments at this time.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. And I appreciate everybody who took the time to call in and share and express the wishes of the area and hopefully we can deliberate here and come out with a positive outcome.
Moving on, we'll call on the Regional Advisory Council recommendation, RAC Chairs.

MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair and members of the Board. This is DeAnna Perry, Council Coordinator for the Southcentral Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. Our Chair, Mr. Greg Encelewski is unavailable today and it's my pleasure to speak on his behalf on this matter.

Robbin did a fantastic job of outlining the process this proposal has taken. Just a few details to reiterate.

There was a public meeting for input on the rural determination of Moose Pass during the time that the Southcentral RAC was in Seward for its meeting in October of 2019. Several Council members did attend that public hearing. The next day the Council's deliberations on the record when it discussed rural characteristics of the Moose Pass area clearly showed that they appreciated and recognized that many people living in the areas just outside the proponent's proposed boundaries felt that they were a part of Moose Pass and as shown in the record of that meeting it was not the intent of the Southcentral RAC to be exclusive. The Council heard from the proponent later in that meeting and again at its most recent meeting where the Southcentral RAC drafted its recommendation on the proposal. I believe the Council's recommendation was honoring Mr. Bryden's initial proposal and supporting testimony for a few reasons, which you just heard from Mr. Bryden. The Council understood that Mr. Bryden did not want to speak on behalf of any other community and that Mr. Bryden's concern that if the area he proposed for the determination was expanded, that this might increase the odds of the proposal being unsuccessful. So, therefore, the Council supported this proposal as written.

And the formal justification.

The Council supports the proposal as written by the proponent based on testimony heard at its meetings as well as the public hearing held in Moose Pass in the fall of 2019. The Council toured Moose Pass in fall of 2019 and recognized it as a rural community. Also discussing the rural characteristics of Moose Pass during that fall meeting, including rural
culture, economy, uses of fish and wildlife resources for sustenance, art and firewood, the sparse population of the area and lack of community services such as schools, air field and police. The Council felt the discussion on this proposal was adequately stated in the final analysis as well as in the transcripts of their past meetings since this proposal was originally submitted.

That's the recommendation of the Southcentral Subsistence Regional Advisory Council.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, appreciate that. Any questions for the Regional Advisory Council position.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I would also offer up at this time if there is any other Regional Advisory Councils who would like to speak to this issue now is your time.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll call on the tribal, Alaska Native Corp comments, Native Liaison.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Donald Mike. I'm covering for Mr. Orville Lind, he's got some prior commitments today.

Back in October 2018, the Tribal Liaison, Mr. Orville Lind, sent a notice of tribal consultation on FP -- excuse me, Rural Proposal 19-01. And on this particular proposal there were no questions or comments on this proposal.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Donald, appreciate that. We'll move on to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Mr. Ben Mulligan.

MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. For the record this is Ben
Mulligan at the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

We provided extensive comment for the record so I'll just summarize our position. The Department opposes the proposal, given after looking at the data the strong similarities we see between the community of Moose Pass and Seward and the bigger differences we see between Moose Pass and the other rural communities on the Kenai Peninsula. We also encourage the Federal Subsistence Board to consider the characteristics that we described in our written comments and in the reference study when considering this rural designation.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Ben, appreciate that. Thank you for the quick summary. Any questions from the Board for the State.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll move on to the InterAgency Staff Committee comments. Katya.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the Board. This is Katya Wessels, the InterAgency Staff Committee provided the standard comment on RP19-01.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Katya. We'll open up the floor for Board discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, Board action.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chair, Dave Schmid.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor Dave.

MR. SCHMID: Thank you. And appreciate all the conversation here. I move to adopt Proposal RP19-01 with the recommended OSM modification to define
the community of Moose Pass as encompassing the Moose Pass, Crown Point and Primrose census designated places. Following a second I will explain my reasoning for broadening the extent of the rural area proposal.

MR. PADGETT: Chad Padgett, BLM, second.

MR. SCHMID: Thank you, Mr. Padgett. My justification for supporting the adoption of RP19-01 with the described modification includes the following key points.

Moose Pass, Crown Point and Primrose, as you've heard share a rural experience with other Southcentral rural communities that includes reliance on wild foods, reduced amenities and services, geographic isolation and a shared sense of identity as a cohesive rural community.

Public testimony, discussions within these communities, harvest surveys and harvest reports demonstrate consistent participation in hunting and fishing opportunities in Moose Pass, Crown Point and Primrose designated places.

All residents providing testimony described the importance of wild foods in their diet and home.

It would, and will be difficult to justify separating Primrose and Crown Point from Moose Pass when determining rural status, given their very close juxtaposition and common subsistence-based lifestyles. Opportunities for Primrose and Crown Point to gain rural status determination should be the same as Moose Pass.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Dave, appreciate that. Did we receive a second on that?

REPORTER: Yes.

MS. PITKA: I heard Chad Padgett second.
REPORTER: Thank you, Rhonda.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, yeah, Chad, thank you for that. So the floor is open for discussion, thank you, Rhonda.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the question.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Question.

MR. STRIKER: Question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Roll call, Sue, please.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, the motion on the floor is to adopt Rural Proposal 19-01 with the OSM modification to define the community of Moose Pass as encompassing the Moose Pass, Crown Point and Primrose census designated places.

We'll start with the maker of the motion, Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

MR. SCHMID: Yeah, thank you. I support the motion for the justification I just provided.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Chad Padgett, BLM.

MR. PADGETT: I support for the Forest Service motion. Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Gene Peltola, BIA.

MR. PELTOLA: BIA supports based on the justification provided by the Forest Service, in addition to the testimony received by this body earlier today.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Gene.
Fish and Wildlife Service, Greg Siekaniecz.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Sue. For the reasons noted by our colleague at the U.S. Forest Service I support the motion as modified to define the community of Moose Pass encompassing Moose Pass, Crown Point and Primrose CDPs.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Greg.

Don Striker, National Park Service.

MR. STRIKER: Thank you, Sue. Park Service supports for the reasons outlined by Mr. Schmid. And I'd also like to add that I was really impressed with all the testimony we received. I disagree with Ms. Lipetzky, I think she was very articulate and Ms. Brummer's Master's work was excellent. Thank you so much.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Don.

Moving to Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: I support as outlined. And I would also like to recognize all the excellent testimony today and the testimony that was put on the record.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Public Member Charlie Brower.

MR. BROWER: I support as stated by Forest Service. Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Chair Tony Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Motion passes unanimously, the proposal is adopted as modified.
by OSM.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. And that was a good job, diligent, and, again, I'd like to thank everyone who called in to give us a clear perspective of the wishes of the area and congratulations to the Moose Pass residents and I hope, you know, looking forward we can continue to strive to serve your rural residents.

Sue, on my agenda, I thought that we placed another item on the agenda for consideration today.

MS. DETWILER: Yes, we did. We actually have two more items before you adjourn. One is an information item which is an update on the subsistence budget review and the second item is to schedule upcoming Board meetings.

The -- and I understand Don Striker will be leading the discussion on the update on the subsistence budget.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, thank you, and so we'll call on Staff to do the budgets.

MR. STRIKER: So just a point of order, in the past we had done the budget conversation, I believe, at an executive session, just an open question. (Indiscernible - cuts in and out) I don't know how the other Board members feel about that, whether we should finish our public facing discussion first and then move into executive session (indiscernible - cuts in and out)

REPORTER: Okay, sorry, this is Tina, if I could just interrupt. So, Don, I don't know what kind of device you're talking on but you're coming in very choppy every other word or two.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA. (Indiscernible - cuts in and out) how progress has proceeded generically because some of us were involved in that and some of us were not.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. STRIKER: With that then, Mr.
Chair, with your indulgence I'll just give people the
update. Park Service worked with Fish and Wildlife
Service and Staff to develop a draft template for how
we could all articulate our budgets. I'll give you the
short answer first. We did a lot of work and then I
dropped the ball.

The way we tried to approach this was
to have one bureau and that was the Park Service take
point on developing what would be a really
comprehensive template that looked, not only on sort of
the central office costs currently incurred and that we
think we should be incurring, but also to look into the
field offices. And so as part of that process it took
us until about the end of September to poll all of the
Parks in the Alaska region for the National Park
Service and to put together a template.

We then had a meeting with the
InterAgency folks and sort of blessed and endorsed that
draft and I thought, at the time, that what we decided
was that that was a good template and that we would
then be sharing that template with all of the rest of
you, but I see now in looking through my email right
before I went hunting, the actual aspect came back to
me, was for me to bless this before the Staff sent it
to the rest of you, so I'm the hold up and you can
expect that coming your way next week.

That's the long and the short of it.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Don.
I don't fault you for dropping the ball during hunting
season because I drop the ball too during hunting
season.

(Laughter)

MR. STRIKER: Thanks for your
understanding.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Everything
stops when it's time to go hunting brother, sorry about
that.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Was there any
other Board members, I think that's the short answer,
and I appreciate that update. I think it's still, again, Gene, something we need to focus on and probably just direct Staff to continue to look towards that budget and maybe at our work session that we have coming up this summer, it could be something we could hash out in a more diligent way within the framework of the program and the agencies that represent the OSM.

MR. STRIKER: Mr. Chair, Park Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Don.

MR. STRIKER: Yeah, I might also say that with the change in Administration, I think we actually are going to have an awesome opportunity to present a consolidated budget ask, at least within Interior, sorry Dave, that sort of represents all the bureaus, and it may well be that if we include the Forest Service it would provide sort of a good justification across agencies for an initiative that's so important up here in Alaska.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Well, I think that sounds good. As you know, you know, how under-funded this program has gotten in the last decade, you know, we went from almost $13 million down to 5 and that really drastically (indiscernible - cuts out) especially the information needs program that got the ax, which is where we need to go with the issues that you continue to hear from rural Alaska and needing to engage and uplift and involve in a meaningful role through those partnerships that seem to be growing in numbers across the region due to resource issues. And so appreciate that effort and I think a consolidated voice would be a lot better approach to coming at this new Administration and it looks like they're stacking Farm Bills and USDAs up there so appreciate the effort from the agency.

MR. SCHMID: Yeah, Mr. Chair, Dave Schmid.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Dave.

MR. SCHMID: Yeah, just wanted to share on behalf of the Department of AG and representing the Secretary here, there will be a much better appetite, I
think, for a combined effort here with Interior and
just all in on that and hopefully we can maybe move
that needle where it needs to be. So I appreciate
Don's outreach there as well. We're all in with you on
this.

And then, finally, I have to jump off,
Wayne will cover here. But as to a side note, Anthony,
just wanted to extend, certainly my condolences and
sympathies to you, your family, the community of
Hydaburg during this time and we'll be thinking about
you and I'll say a prayer for you, so you all take
care.

Wayne will cover for me here.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Dave. And appreciate all your work this week and
definitely enjoy sitting on the Board with you guys, so
best to you as you depart and God Bless.

MR. SCHMID: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other
questions on the budget.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
we'll just expect this to just be a continuing effort
to continue to elevate our concerns (indiscernible -
cuts out) with the intent of this. But if
(indiscernible - cuts out) and elevate that up to
showcase the shortfalls we have, I think we'll be in a
position to improve our position with the Program. So
any other input.

MS. PITKA: This is Rhonda. I'd just
like to thank Don Striker for taking on that work and
making sure, you know, and with the Staff, I really
appreciate that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, I
think that concludes the budget update. Sue, we'll
call on the next meetings.

MS. DETWILER: Yes, Katya Wessels will
be leading that -- kicking that agenda item off,
schedule of upcoming Board meetings.
MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Board. This is Katya Wessels. We now need to schedule next two Board meetings.

First of all the summer 2021 work session. I sent an email to all of you with the proposed dates, but I'll repeat it here now. So the summer work sessions are usually held like early August, and the Board, two of the items on that agenda are the Board RAC appointment packets to be recommended and also discussion of the annual report replies and any postponed special actions. So the OSM proposes two weeks in early August, August 2nd through 6th, or August 9th through 13th, and that's a two day meeting.

So I received a couple of replies from you, one of the vote was for the second week and the other one was for the first week. So I just would like to hear which week do you prefer to schedule the meeting and then we can pinpoint the dates.

MS. PITKA: This is Rhonda. I would prefer the first week.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Rhonda.

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair, Charlie.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Charlie, you have the floor.

MR. BROWER: For summer, first week is fine with me.

MS. WESSELS: You said the first week, Charlie.

MR. BROWER: Yes.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Katya, this is Anthony here. You were talking about June, right?

MS. WESSELS: No, we're talking about August.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, August.
MS. WESSELS: August 2nd week or August 9th week.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. Early works good for me.

MS. WESSELS: The first week.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, this is Greg.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Greg.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Yeah, I would just voice an interest in the second week, it just fits my schedule much better at this point in time.

Thank you.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Greg.

MR. STRIKER: Mr. Chair, Park Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Don.

MR. STRIKER: I would -- I'll make it a priority either week. I would suggest we defer to our public members.

MR. PELTOLA: And, Mr. Chair, BIA.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you.

MR. PELTOLA: We would concur with the Park Service, because agency representatives on the Board we have alternates that could sit in for us but the Public Members do not. In addition to the second week of August is the start of sheep season.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you.

MR. PADGETT: Mr. Chair, Chad Padgett, BLM. I agree with both Parks and BIA.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, this is Greg.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Yeah, I can agree with that because you're right we do have alternates Gene.

Thank you.

MR. OWEN: And, Mr. Chair, the Forest Service concurs with the group.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Sounds good.

We'll figure it the first week of August then.

MS. WESSELS: Okay. So since it's the first week of August I propose Wednesday and Thursday, August 4th and 5th. And we can move it around that week if we need to, if we need to start a little bit earlier or a little bit later when we get close to the meeting but at this point it's Wednesday and Thursday, August 4th and 5th.

Okay, thank you.

So now on to scheduling the April 2022 Wildlife Regulatory Meeting, and we can do it in almost any week during April. So we can't schedule it any later because we need to allow the adequate time to publish the wildlife regulations. So the four proposed weeks, the week of April 4th, 11th, 18th or 25th and that's 2022.

And I received a couple of ideas for that and April 11th week was proposed or April 4th but I would like to hear from all the Board members.

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair, Charlie. I would take the week of April 11th to the 15th, it would work with me, or the week of April 4th to 8th.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Charlie.

MS. PITKA: This is Rhonda. That April 11th works for me.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA. I'd recommend we defer to the Public Members for the same reasoning we utilized the schedule for the summer work session. We could make it work on this end.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Sounds good.
Concurrence from the rest of the Board.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Fish and Wildlife concurs.

MR. PADGETT: BLM concurs.

MR. OWEN: Forest Service concurs.

MS. WESSELS: Okay, so the week of April 11th through the 15th, correct?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Sounds good, yep, that's what I recollect there, Katya.

MS. WESSELS: Okay. So the actual meeting will be April 12th through 15th, four day meeting.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And if we all got our vaccines, I'm hoping to see you all in person by then.

MR. OWEN: Woo-hoo.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Fish and Wildlife concurs.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, very much.

MR. BROWER: Public Member concurs.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Sounds good.
Well, I think that concludes the business guys. I want to just say thank all of you for your hard work and patience and listening and truly appreciate the work by the Staff to get us through a week of this teleconferencing, you know, it was challenging with the drops and the on's and thank you Rhonda for being diligent and picking up the Chairmanship when I lose my calls. Sue, staying on point on the agenda. All the Staff for their analysis and thoughtful input. All the testifiers who called in with their meaningful, educational information for us to help us make the best decision we can for rural users and the resources. I just want to reach out to all of you and Bless you and
hope we continue to strengthen the relationship between the rural public and the Federal Board in managing Alaska's resources for priority use, consumptive purposes. And just want to say thank you.

And at this time if there isn't any other comments to entertain at this time, a motion will do to adjourn.

MR. PELTOLA: So moved.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, I move to adjourn.

MR. BROWER: So moved -- second. Happy Birthday Rhonda.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Adjourned, Happy Birthday Rhonda.

MS. PITKA: Thank you all.

(Off record)

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)
CERTIFICATE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )

)ss.

STATE OF ALASKA )

I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter of Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing, contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE BOARD MEETING, VOLUME IV taken electronically by our firm on the 29th day of January 2021 via teleconference;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 6th day of February 2021.

Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 09/16/22