

NWX- US FISH & WILDLIFE

Moderator: Robbin Lavine

April 13, 2022

11:41 am CT

Coordinator: Good afternoon, and thank you for standing by. I'd like to inform all participants that your lines have been placed on a listen-only mode until the question-and-answer session of today's call. Today's call is also being recorded. If anyone has any objections you may disconnect at this time. I would not like to turn the call over to Miss Sue Detwiler. Thank you. You may begin.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you operator and thank you everybody for joining us today. My name is Sue Detwiler. I'm the Assistant Regional Director for the Office of Subsistence Management within Fish and Wildlife Service. And I wanted to confirm Court Reporter (Tina), are you - have you started recording this meeting?

(Tina): I am recording Sue.

Sue Detwiler: Okay, thank you. Having confirmed that I will start going through our roll call to see who we have on starting with the board members. Do we have National Park Service?

Sarah Creachbaum: Good morning Sue, this is Sarah. Good morning everyone.

Sue Detwiler: Good morning Sarah Creachbaum. BLM, Thomas Heinlein?

Tom Heinlein: Good morning.

Sue Detwiler: Good morning. Fish and Wildlife Service, Sara Boario?

Sara Boario: Good morning, Sara Boario is here.

Sue Detwiler: Good morning Sara. Forest Service Dave Schmid?

Dave Schmid: Good morning Sue. Dave's on.

Sue Detwiler: Good morning Dave. BIA, Gene Peltola?

Gene Peltola: (Unintelligible) is on. Thank you Sue.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Public member Rhonda Pitka? Public member Charlie Brower?

Charlie Brower: ((Foreign Language Spoke 0:01:35))

Sue Detwiler: Good morning Charlie. Chairman Anthony Christianson? The chair may still be trying to get on. Moving forward to Legal Counsel from Department of Interior Regional Solicitor's office do we have Ken Lord?

Ken Lord: Yes ma'am I'm here. Good morning.

Sue Detwiler: Good morning Ken. USDA Office of General Counsel, (Jim Killifishes)? Liaison to the board Alaska Department of Fish and Game Ben Mulligan and/or Mark Burch?

Ben Mulligan: Good morning Sue. This is Ben.

Sue Detwiler: Great, good morning Ben.

Anthony Christianson: I'm on as well Sue. Sorry to interrupt this is Anthony Christianson.

Sue Detwiler: Oh, okay, thank you Tony. I'm just going through the liaisons to the board. Regional Advisory Council Chairs, I'll start with Region 1 Southeast, Don Hernandez?

Don Hernandez: I'm here.

Sue Detwiler: Okay, thank you. Region 2 Southcentral, Greg Siekaniec is I understand not available but Gloria Stickwan, Vice Chair, are you on?

Gloria Stickwan: I am. Good morning.

Sue Detwiler: Good morning Gloria. Kodiak Aleutians, Della Trumble? Bristol Bay, Nancy Morris Lyon?

Nancy Morris Lyon: Good morning, present and accounted for.

Sue Detwiler: Great, thank you. YK Delta Ray Oney?

Eva Patton: Good morning Sue. This is Eva there's still no connectivity in Allalaket right now. We'll keep you posted when we're able to connect with our YK Delta chair, thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Okay, thank you Eva. Western Interior, Jack Reakoff?

Jack Reakoff: Jack Reakoff here. Good morning.

Sue Detwiler: Good morning. Seward Peninsula, Louis Green? He wasn't able to join yesterday, Nissa Pilcher may be able to speak on his behalf when she comes on. Northwest Arctic, Thomas Baker? Eastern Interior, Sue Entsminger?

Sue Entsminger: Good morning. Yes, I'm here.

Sue Detwiler: North slope, Gordon Brower? Okay, Mr. Chair let's see the only number that is has not signed on yet is Rhonda Pitka. Rhonda, are you on?

Rhonda Pitka: Yes, I'm here.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Mr. Chair it looks like we have all eight board members on the line so turn it over to you.

Anthony Christianson: All right, thank you Sue. Thank you everybody this morning and welcome to day two of the meeting Federal Subsistence Board meeting.

Just welcome everybody again. And I look forward to another productive day of uh - I lost my agenda here. Another productive day of going through the agenda here.

And as of every morning we'll provide an opportunity this morning to the public to go ahead and speak on non-agenda items. And again, this is an opportunity to speak on non-agenda items, something that might be of importance for the board to hear that isn't on our agenda to deal with in the next couple of days.

And so operator with that I'll open it up uh this morning for the public. And after we go through that I'll go ahead and see if any other board has anything to share, and then we'll move on with the order of business. Thank you.

Coordinator: Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: So public - any public wants to they have the floor.

Coordinator: Thank you. To ask a question please press Star 1. Please ensure that your phone is unmuted and record your name clearly when prompted.

And to withdraw your request please press Star 2. A question from Heather. Your line is open.

Heather Bauscher: Good morning everyone. Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you members of the board. My name is Heather Bauscher. I'm here in Sitka, Alaska. I'm representing the Sitka Conservation Society and the University of Alaska, Southeast.

I wanted to let everybody know that we've continued doing the dual enrollment classes around the Federal Subsistence Board process. And I have four students from various schools in Sitka here participating.

Two are from Mount Edgecumbe, one is a Sitka High student and one is a homeschooled student. And in other years when we were able to attend in person we usually would introduce ourselves at the beginning of the meeting and I just wanted to know if this is an appropriate time to let the kids say hello?

Anthony Christianson: Yes, hey welcome back Heather. This is Anthony Christianson Board Chair. And we welcome anybody working in the field of recruitment and educating on our board process, so yes this would be an appropriate time. Welcome and uh thank you for your good work. You have the floor.

Heather Bauscher: Thank you Mr. Christianson. I also want to say thanks to the Forest Service and Mr. Schmid for the help supporting this class.

Thanks to (Perry Semenski) over the years for his support and a big thank you to Rob Cross for helping doing the agency presentations with the students this year. We've also had presentations from Don Hernandez, (Cathy Leidham) and a local Advisory Committee to the state members Tad Fujioka here.

So I'm going to - now I'm going to turn this over to each student and let them introduce themselves. Do you want to go first (Claire)? Okay.

(Claire Jungers): Is this on?

Heather Bauscher: Yes, it's on.

(Claire Jungers): Good morning. ((Foreign Language Spoken 0:07:38)). My name is (Claire Jungers). I am a senior in Mount Edgecumbe High School. And I'm from Shishmaref, Alaska.

I decided to take this class because I thought this was a great opportunity to learn more about the process of going through a proposal. I personally hunt myself and maybe one day I'll write a proposal. And thank you Mr. Chair and the board.

(Nahama Volek): Hi, my name is (Nahama Volek). I'm a senior at Sitka High. I took this class to learn more about the subsistence process. And I'm very excited. Thank you for this opportunity to speak.

(Arta Wilkinson): Hello. My name is (Arta Wilkinson). I'm a sophomore homeschool student residing in Sitka, Alaska. I would like to take this class because I want to learn more about the process of policymaking. And I am very glad for this opportunity. Thank you.

(Nathan Cleveland): Good morning. My name is (Nathan Cleveland). I'm a senior at Mount Edgecumbe. And I'm from Quinhagak, Alaska.

Heather Bauscher: Okay, that's the four students that we have participating. And they prepared subsistence reflections and introducing themselves. So if there's any questions for them let us know.

Anthony Christianson: Well thank you Heather. And appreciate you guys and your continued education and outreach and look forward some proposals and I hear a policy writer there too. Always looking for people to fill jobs at OSM.

So good luck to young emerging leaders and keep it up. Heather, thank you very much. Any questions from the board for the students?

Dave Schmid: Yes, Mr. Chair, Forest Service.

Anthony Christianson: Yes, you have the floor Dave.

Dave Schmid: Yes, thank you Tony. And thank you so much Heather and the students. I sure wish we could meet together here in person and hopefully in our next meeting we'll be able to do that.

But I just want to extend my gratitude as well for this program. It is - it's a powerful program. And I - we learn more as much from the students I think as they learn from the board. So thank you so much for continuing, and I know our agency will continue to support you as well. Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: All right, thank you. Any other board. Well thank you students, thank you Heather. Operator, is there anybody else online who would like to speak to a non-agenda item on the phone?

Coordinator: Yes. Next question comes from (Bill). Your line is open.

(Bill): Hi, is this - is that me? Hello?

Coordinator: Sir, that's you.

(Bill): I'm not sure if I'm speaking (unintelligible) I guess I at least have a question. And I'm not real familiar with the Federal Subsistence Board and so - but I'm - anyway I've been (unintelligible) some proposals that are tied to grizzly bear harvest and Gates of the Arctic National Park.

And I guess I just want to confirm the proposals of 22, 46, and 2256. And I guess my understanding is that I shouldn't comment on those.

But my question is, and I believe this is so but if it can be confirmed, that those two proposals were moved to the non-consent or nonconsensual agenda? And if that can be confirmed. And then also are you taking any public comments on those at the meeting or not?

Anthony Christianson: Yes, this is the Board Chair. Thanks for those questions. As far as the two proposals I'd have to ask staff if they're on the non-consensus agenda item we will provide public testimony. Lisa, did you want to answer that?

Lisa (Gredigan): Thank you Mr. Chair. This is Lisa (Gredigan). And yes both WP 2246 and 56 were removed by the Park Service Board member yesterday.

So now both of those proposals are on the non-consensus agenda. And so the time for public testimony on those proposals will be when the board takes them up in - it's hard to say exactly when that'll be, but they are towards the end of the proposals.

So if you're able to call back in and provide testimony when the board individually considers those proposals that would be great. And we do have updates on our Web site and Facebook page on where the boards at in the meeting that you're able to just quickly check those to see what proposal they're on if you're not able to stay on the phone the whole time. Thank you.

(Bill): Okay, I appreciate the answers. And am I correct in that the meeting goes through the 15th?

Anthony Christianson: Yes, we're we're scheduled to go through the 15th. Probably these proposals more towards the end we'll be looking at probably tomorrow afternoon-ish.

(Bill): Okay, great. Thank you. I don't know that I'll be able to closely monitor what's happening, but I appreciate the work that you're doing, and I appreciate the answers to my questions.

And I also appreciate, from a personal perspective, that those two proposals were moved to non-consent agenda. I think they do merit discussion. So thank you very much for your time and I appreciate it.

Anthony Christianson: You have a nice day. Thank you for calling it.

(Bill): Okay, thanks. Bye.

Anthony Christianson: Operator, is there another public that would like to speak on non-consensus this morning?

Coordinator: Yes sir. Next question comes from Mark. Your line is open.

Mark Richards: Yes, thank you. Can you hear me Mr. Chairman?

Anthony Christianson: Yes Mark. You have the floor.

Mark Richards: Thank you. For the record my name is Mark Richards. I'm the Executive Director of Resident Hunters of Alaska. And I'm representative over 3000 members from across the state today.

I wanted to comment on some Federal Subsistence Board issues in general. And the recent passage of Wildlife Special Action Request 21-01A the closure of caribou hunting in Unit 23 and 26A.

We're looking forward to, you know, you guys getting back to in person meetings but with the Special Action Requests it looks like you're not required to hold public meetings. And it's just - it's very frustrating that the board insulates itself from the public and you don't really get to hear the public you just see the summaries from the Office of Suspicious Management.

And typically these Special Action Requests are controversial. And as this latest one WSA 21-01 proved, you know, there's hundreds of people that want to comment and it's just we'd really like to see some changes in the future where you could actually allow the public to comment in front of the board so you actually hear the public.

Another issue we had, and I believe after the updated population estimate of the Western Arctic caribou herd was released, we were the only organization to change our opposition to the proposal. We have always supported the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group management plan.

And with the caribou under 200,000 animals it puts them in a preservative management under that plan which does call for restrictions. But what we have said in our letter, which also we were not allowed to send to you, was that there should be a shared sacrifice among all users when the population is in decline and in preservative management.

And the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Management Plan did call for the restriction on the taking of cows and calves yet the Northwest Arctic RAC that supported the closure voted to continue to taking the taking of cows.

And nothing happened at your recent meeting when you voted to accept the closure about that. And so we're frustrated I mean we do support subsistence and we do believe, you know, with the herd as it is now that there does need to be some restrictions.

But especially there needs to be restrictions on local federally qualified users on the taking of cows. And so I know you're not going to revisit this right now and we're not going to turn in another Special Action Request about that, but it

just does seem wrong that you restrict other users and at the same time with the herd and such decline there was nothing about restrictions on the taking of cows and calves by locals.

In closing Mr. Christianson, and members of the board, and all the RAC chairs I just wanted to say thank you for your service. I know it's very time consuming, and we really appreciate your service and respect what you do.

And again we do respect subsistence and we do represent all Alaskans. So with that I just wanted to say thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Well thank you Mark for calling in. And, you know, you bring up some good points there some of the harder things we struggle with is trying to find a balance between the public, you know, process and, you know, the rural users priority preference that the board has to take up as we look at conservation measures as they come on us with these resources and they get in a certain status.

And so I just appreciate all the support you guys are giving the Western Arctic herd there too we lean a lot towards the information they provide to the board and just look forward to trying to make the process here as user-friendly as we can.

And we know sometimes it doesn't always go and work out the way that we want it to, you know, with the various conditions in this working world we just do the best we can. So I appreciate you Mark and your work you continue to do out there and we'll try to continue to work towards a best system for all users. And - so thank you for calling in today Mark.

Mark Richards: Thanks Tony.

Anthony Christianson: And next operator, was there another one on the board?

Coordinator: As a reminder to ask a question please press Star 1. But at this time there are no further questions over the phone.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you, appreciate that. That concludes the non-consensus public process in the morning. At this time I'll just go ahead and open up the floor before we move on to the agenda. If there's any board members would like to share anything information for the day this is your time, staff as well?

It sounds like nobody drank coffee this morning so we'll go ahead and move on. I believe we are starting to on - I will ask Sue to take over the agenda for a moment because I'm not - I know we left off on census so I think we're starting with the non-consensus agenda items?

Sue Detwiler: Yes, correct. We're - Agenda Item 7, and the main agenda, and at Lisa mentioned earlier the consensus and non-consensus agendas have been updated to reflect the board's actions yesterday. And those revised agendas are on our Web site and also on our Facebook page.

And yesterday we just started the non-consensus agenda. We finished with Wildlife Proposal WP 22-01. So this morning the first one we'll start out with is WP 22-02. And that will be led by Pippa Kenner.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Sue. Pippa, you have the floor. Was Pippa available?

Sue Detwiler: I think she may be muted unless she dropped off.

Anthony Christianson: Okay, we'll give Pippa a minute here to get ready, and then we'll get started. So we'll just wait on Pippa.

Sue Detwiler: Pippa is working on it. It should be - Pippa should be online here shortly. She ran into a technical difficulty.

Coordinator: Pippa if you're on the line ma'am please press Star Zero. Again, Pippa if you're on the line please press Star Zero. Again, Pippa if you're on the line please press Star Zero.

Lisa (Gredigan): Yes, Mr. Chair this Lisa. And it looks like Pippa dropped the line and needs to call back in. We can either wait a few minutes for Pippa to rejoin or I do have talking points that she provided that, you know, I could read for her until she's able to rejoin?

Anthony Christianson: We'll just give her a minute Lisa. We're - yes we'll get rolling here when she gets on. It takes a minute so thank you. If she takes longer than a few minutes we'll get started.

Coordinator: This is the operator does not show where Pippa has dialed back in. This is the operator it looks like Pippa has joined back in. She's coming into the call now. Pippa, your line is open.

Pippa Kenner: Hello. Can people hear me?

Anthony Christianson: I got you loud and clear Pippa. You have the floor.

Pippa Kenner: Well that was unfortunate. I apologize. I'm not quite sure what happened but I'm here now. Good morning Mr. Chair and members of the Federal Subsistence Board and Regional Advisory Council chairs.

The analysis for Wildlife Proposal WP 22-02 begins on Page 519, of Volume 2A of the board meeting materials. My name is Pippa Kenner, and I'm an Anthropologist at the Office of Subsistence Management in Anchorage.

Proposal WP22-02 was submitted by the Office of Subsistence Management and requests to remove language from designated hunting regulations that prohibit the use of a designated hunter by a member of the community operating under a community harvest system.

So yesterday afternoon we were talking about community harvest systems. And now we're going to talk about the designated hunter system.

Current designated hunter regulations begin on Page 521 of your meeting materials. And it begins by saying. "If you are a federally qualified subsistence user you may designate another federally qualified subsistence user to take deer, moose and caribou on your behalf unless you are a member of the community operating under a community harvest system.

What we propose is to remove from the language that says you may designate - okay sorry about that. What we are proposing is to remove from the language that says you may designate another federally qualified subsistence user unless you are a member of the community operating under a community harvest system.

This is because if a person does not register to participate in the community harvest system that person retains, or still has an individual harvest limit one moose for example, and should be able to designate that harvest limit to someone else to harvest for them under designated harvester regulations.

Now I want to add that recommending that the board adopt the proposal as modified by the Eastern Interior Alaska Council was considered and rejected because the council's recommended modification is already in regulations and therefore is not necessary to incorporate here.

The OSM conclusion is to support proposal. WP 22-02. Thank you for your time. And this is the end of my presentation. I'm available to try answering your questions.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Pippa. Any questions for Pippa from the board? Thank you hearing none we'll go ahead and move on to the summary of written comments.

Pippa Kenner: Thank you Mr. Chair. Again, this is Pippa Kenner with OSM. No public written comments were submitted during the public comment period. Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: At this time operator we'll open up the floor if there's any public testimony for this proposal.

Coordinator: As a reminder to ask a question or comment please press Star 1. Just a moment. I have a question over the phone. Just a moment.

Anthony Christianson: Okay, all right hearing no public testimony on this one we'll go ahead and call on the Regional Advisory Council recommendations. And...

Lisa (Gredigan): Hey Tony, this is Lisa. There is someone in the queue for public testimony. It's just taking them a moment to get their information through the operator.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Lisa for that.

Coordinator: We do have a question over the phone. It comes from Karen. Your line is open.

Karen Linnell: Thank you. This is Karen Linnell, Intertribal Resource Commission. Again, we want to thank OSM for their work on this proposal to rectify a situation that was discovered during the creation of the community harvest system.

While we attended several regions meetings in - to discuss this and clarify information on it this proposal will do what we've told folks all along throughout the development of our community harvest system in which we talked with staff about, and the interagency staff committee about, over the last couple of years.

And so we do appreciate this. This will straighten it out to where while we have some hunters that will participate in the community harvest system they will still be able to be a designated hunter if they register at the federal agency for federally qualified users that are not qualified for the community harvest system, and we appreciate that. I just want to say again thank you to the OSM staff for this and, and thank you board for your time.

Coordinator: No further questions on the phone at this time.

Anthony Christianson: Well thank you Karen. Thank you for calling it. Appreciate no other comments on the public. We'll go ahead and move on to Regional Advisory Council recommendations. And I'll call on Sue. You can uh call on them. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you Mr. Chair. All ten Regional Council - this is a statewide proposal so potentially all ten regional councils may have comments. So I'll just start with Region 1 Southeast, Don Hernandez.

Don Hernandez: Thank you. Southeast took no action on this proposal. We don't have any community harvest systems in place.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Region 2 Southcentral, Gloria Stickwan?

Gloria Stickwan: The council supports this proposal that will allow members of a community with a community harvest system to designate another person to harvest on their behalf to meet either individual harvest limit or count towards the community harvest limits.

This provides more opportunity for hunting and increases the chances that subsistence users can get meat in their freezer. The ability to meet subsistence needs benefits subsistence users. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you Gloria. Region 3 Kodiak Aleutians, Della Trumble?

Della Trumble: Good morning, thank you. Our council supports the regulatory changes as it provides more equitable harvest options and opportunities. And this is one that we do make good use of it and appreciate that we have it. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Bristol Bay Nancy Morris Lyon?

Nancy Morris Lyon: Yes, good morning. Bristol Bay Subsistence Regional Advisory Council also supported this with Eastern Interiors modification with the understanding that the modification is already in place.

I'm sure we would have no hard feelings on the boards part. They just wanted the clarification in there. They felt like the regulation would protect the rights and opportunities of the individual who cares to hunt separately and knowing that those are protected we would be pleased with that. These hunting regulations would be simpler, provide clarity and protect the hunting opportunity of individual federally qualified subsistence users (unintelligible).

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. YK Delta, Eva Patton?

Eva Patton: Yes, good afternoon. Eva Patton, Council Coordinator for the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta Subsistence Regional Advisory Council.

And the YK Delta RAC voted to support WP 2202. And the council supports the Ahtna People in their community harvest system. And while there isn't a harvest system currently in place in the YK Delta Region this proposal would be a benefit if one were adopted there. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Western Interior Jack Reakoff?

Jack Reakoff: Western Interior Regional Advisory Council supported the proposal basically in support of our Ahtna neighbors. But in the future this would be a fair and equitable way to administer the community hunts. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Seward Peninsula, Nissa Pilcher, Louis Green, did anybody sign on this morning?

Nissa Pilcher: Yes, this is Nissa Pilcher. Mr. Chairman, members of the board, for the record my name is Nissa Pilcher, the council Coordinator for the Seward Peninsula Council.

I don't believe that Louis Green was able to call in yet today. So for the Seward Peninsula Council voted unanimously to defer.

The council was presented with the proposal and discussed it but deferred the decision to the home regions as there are no community harvest systems in the Seward Peninsula region. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Northwest Arctic Brooke?

Brooke McDavid: Thank you. Brooke McDavid, Northwest Arctic Council Coordinator standing in for Chairman Baker. The Northwest Arctic Council supported WP 22-02. The proposal clarifies how these systems work and concurs with the recommendations of other councils. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Eastern Interiors Sue Entsminger have you joined?

Sue Entsminger: Yes, I have. I had to find my mute button. Okay, the Eastern Interior supports WP 2202 with the modification to clarify participants and a community harvest system cannot designate another federally qualified subsistence users to take wildlife on their behalf.

The modification was recommended by a representative of AITRC, Interchangeable Resource Commission and also by the Wrangell-St. Elias Resource Commission. This modification will allow people outside of a community harvest system to have a designated hunter to meet their subsistence needs. This will be beneficial to those users.

And then the language is different. So what Pippa said and what we were talking about doing I feel is a little bit different. So I'm confused to what

Pippa said because if you look at the modified regulation it should read on all of the things in the Pages 34 or 534 and 535.

If you are a federally qualified subsistence user you may designate another federally qualified subsistence user to take these species on your behalf unless you are a participant in a community harvest system. So I'm a little bit confused because I thought we were taking that out. I don't - I might need some help from staff.

Lisa (Gredigan): Okay, yes Mr. Chair this is Lisa. I can address Sue's question unless Pippa would like to address it.

Anthony Christianson: You have the floor.

Lisa (Gredigan): Okay, yes Pippa says she can fill in if I miss something here. But I think that what Pippa was trying to say is that WP 2202 is a statewide regulation that would affect community harvest systems across the entire state or I mean designated harvest permit systems across the entire state including, you know, the general regulations and Section 25E of the federal regulations.

And for example what happened with the AITRC administered community harvest system is that there's a framework associated with that harvest system. And so within that framework and the specific regulations we kind of make that clarification that the Eastern Interior Council has in their modification.

And so it just seemed a little simpler to OSM, since it again affects the designated harvest permits across the entire state, to just take out completely the language of unless you are a member of a community operating on a community harvest system.

And then make that distinction that the Eastern Interior made in their modification about participants in the community harvest system versus non-community harvest systems in more on a case by case basis through either the framework or unit specific regulations about that community harvest system. So hopefully that makes sense and Pippa please fill in if I missed something. Thank you.

Pippa Kenner: Mr. Chair, this is Pippa Kenner with OSM.

Anthony Christianson: Yes Pippa. You have the floor.

Pippa Kenner: Yes, I'd like to - Lisa I agree with Lisa, Lisa was correct. The way the regulations read is that members of the community - members of participants in the community harvest assisting can harvest only as part of the community harvest system.

It has to do with accumulating harvest limits one cannot accumulate an individuals harvest with the community harvest limit. Also there are several reasons why a federally qualified subsistence user may not be able to designate a center when they may not have the required permit.

So there's a lot of reasons why a person might not be able to designate someone. This is only one of the reasons, and therefore it could create confusion and conflict in the regulations. Thank you.

Lisa (Gredigan): And I think it has created confusion.

Sue Entsminger: Yes.

Pippa Kenner: Maybe - this is Pippa again. Maybe I'll just add one more clarification that at the time the Eastern Interior Council deliberated and was responding to representative AITRC we did not, you know, we did not object or say this is in conflict.

But later on when we were considering it and in conversation with the Solicitor's Office it was determined it would be better to not add the language because it already exists in regulation. Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. And Sue I think we were still going around the table?

Sue Detwiler: Yes.

Sue Entsminger: Okay.

Sue Detwiler: Two Sue's. Yes, we were just getting to North Slope, Gordon Brower? Yes.

Eva Patten: Yes, good afternoon. This is Eva Patten, Council Coordinator for the North Slope. I'll be presenting for our Chair, Gordon Brower. He wasn't able to connect at the moment.

And the North Slope Subsistence Regional Advisory Council supports WP 2202. The community of Anaktuvuk Pass, within the North Slope Region, does have a community harvest system for sheep.

And this proposal is beneficial to meeting subsistence needs because that need sometimes is not met by elders and those who are disabled. And this would allow for designated hunters to assist even if there is a community harvest system in place. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Sue, do have who is next?

Sue Detwiler: Excuse me Mr. Chair. That would be Tribal and Alaska Native Corporation comments, Orville?

Orville Lind: Good morning, Mr. Chair, Federal Subsistence Board members, this is Orville Lind, Native Liaison for Office of Subsistence Management. And during consultation sessions there were no comments or recommendation. Thank you. Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Orville. Then next we'll call on the Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments state liaison.

Ben Mulligan: Good morning Mr. Chairman. For the record this is Ben Mulligan from Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

The department supported the action being taken in this proposal. We viewed it as a clarification and a fairness issue whereas it pertained to the designated hunter rule.

And then just given that it's up I will just one last time stress that when you guys look at these community harvest systems that the same diligence and say regularity of making sure that harvest data is reported maintains that same level. So when necessary to make in season management decisions that information is there. Thank you sir.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Mr. Mulligan. We'll move on Interagency Staff Committee comments, IFC Chair?

Robbin LaVine: Thank you. Good morning Mr. Chair. This is Robbin LaVine, Policy Coordinator and IFS Chair. For Wildlife Proposal 2002 the Interagency Staff Committee provided the standard comment. That was the comment that I read to you last evening. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Now we'll open up the floor for board discussion with council chairs and state liaison. Any question from the board? All right, hearing no questions from the board we'll open up the floor a board action.

Tom Heinlein: Mr. Chair, Tom Heinlein, Bureau of Land Management.

Anthony Christianson: Yes Tom, you have the floor.

Tom Heinlein: Mr. Chair, I move to adopt proposal WP 2202. And if I get a second, I'll explain why I intend to vote and support my motion?

Charlie Brower: Second, Public member, Brower.

Tom Heinlein: Thank you. Adoption of this proposal will allow those living in communities with a community harvest system to designate someone to harvest on their behalf in order to meet their individual harvest limit or to count toward the community harvest limit depending on whether or not they choose to participate in the community harvest system.

It will also help provide more harvest options and opportunities for federally qualified subsistence users. Adoption of this proposal is also consistent with the recommendations of seven of the ten assistant Regional Advisory Councils. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any questions, comments, discussion?

Coordinator: And a reminder to ask a question please press Star 1.

Anthony Christianson: All right, hearing none we'll call for the question?

Man: Question.

Sue Detwiler: Question has been called. I guess we'll go ahead and all in favor of this one signify by saying aye?

Group: Aye.

Sue Detwiler: Opposed same sign? Motion carries unanimously. And thank you for that. That was a quick one to get it started for the day. I will go ahead and move on to the next proposal. Sue?

Sue Detwiler: Yes, that would be WP22-03. And Tom Plank will be kicking that one off.

Tom Plank: Good morning Mr. Chair, members of the board. My name is Tom Plank. And I am a Wildlife Biologist in the Office Subsistence Management. And I will be presenting a summary of the analysis for Wildlife Proposal WP2203 submitted by ADF&G which begins on Page 542 of your meeting books.

The proponent states current federal sealing regulations no longer align with new state sealing regulations designed to gather more precise information from harvested wolves for use in ADF&G's annual population estimates. It was not understood in 2019 to what extent the change in the sealing requirements from within 14 days of harvest to within 30 days after the season closed would have on data used for population estimates.

The purpose of this proposal is to correct that error. Of note Unit 2 wolves are part of the Alexander Archipelago subspecies which occupies Southeastern Alaska and Coastal British Columbia.

In 1993, 2011 and 2020 the Alexander Archipelago wolf was petitioned to be listed under the Endangered Species Act. The US Fish and Wildlife Service found the listings not to be warranted on both 1993 and the 2016 petitions as the rangewide population appears stable.

On July 27, 2021 Fish and Wildlife Service announced a 90 day finding that the petition to list the Alexander Archipelago wolves presented substantial information indicating that the petition action may be warranted. Therefore, the US Fish and Wildlife Service will initiate a status review to determine whether the petition action is warranted.

In 1997 the Board of Game and Federal Subsistence Board adopted harvest guideline levels to manage the Unit 2 wolf population which established annual harvest quotas based on wolf population estimates. Seasons would close early if quotas were expected to be met.

Between 2013 and 2018 seasons closed early with reported harvest well exceeding quotas in some years. In 2018 ADF&G submitted Proposal 43 to the Board of Game to change the harvest management strategy from using the harvest management guidelines to meet population objectives.

The Board of Game adopted the proposal in January 2019 establishing the Unit 2 population objective range as 150 to 200 wolves. The Board of Game also extended the season - the state's trapping season aligning federal and state seasons.

In 2020 the board approved a proposal extending the sealing permit from within 14 days of harvest to within 30 days of the end of the season. This proposal also removed the harvest quota and increased harvest limits to no limit with wolf hunting and Unit 2.

In March of 2021 the Board of Game adopted Proposal 194 as amended requiring all wolves taken in Unit 2 to be sequentially marked, numbered by the hunter or trapper and required hunters and trappers to call the A DF&G within seven days of take to report the date and location of take for each wolf and that all hides must be sealed within 15 days of take.

Before 2013 Unit 2 wolf abundance was uncertain but since 2013 a method using DNA from fur samples has been used to generate population estimates. Between 2013 to 2020 wolf population estimates have ranged from a low of 89 wolves in 2014 to a high of 386 wolves in the fall of 2020.

Human harvest accounts for the vast majority of wolf mortality in Unit 2. However, wolves are very resilient to high harvest levels due to their high reproductive potential and ability disperse long distance.

Past research indicates greater than 38% total annual mortality is likely unsustainable. In Unit 2 wolf abundance is closely linked with deer abundance, their primary prey.

Deer are primarily limited to habitat which is being negatively affected by logging of old growth forests and Unit 2. Logging operations also construct roads, provide an easy hunter and trapper access in the previously remote areas.

The new harvest management strategy consists of four zones as you can see on Figure 2 of Page 557. Different zones correspond to different population levels and seasons.

Zone 3 is a desirable zone where the wolf populations within the objective range of 150 to 200 wolves and the season of up to two months would be announced. The fall 2020 wolf population estimated is 386 wolves placing it in Zone 4 however for the 2021 season citing recent uncertainty about early population estimates, and their influence on population objectives, the conservation approach was taken and the state and federal trapping season was open from November 15 to December 15 and the hunting season also closed on December 15.

Harvest primarily occurs on non-federal lands under a combination hunting trapping license. And typically little harvest occurs before mid-November when only the federal hunting season is open.

From 1997 to 2018 when the harvest guideline level was initiated annual reported harvest has ranged from seven to 76 wolves averaging 50 wolves. And the annual harvest quota has been exceeded five times.

High unreported harvest rates of 38% to 47% have likely resulted in an unsustainable harvest in some years. Between 1997 and 2018 total trapper numbers in Unit 2 averaged 14.5 trappers per year, with Unit 2 residence primarily from Klawock harvesting 89% of the wolves on average.

Over this time catch per trapper average is 3.4 wolves. However, usually just two to three skilled trappers harvest more of the wolves.

In 2019, the first year under the new harvest management strategy without quotas, 165 wolves were reported harvested which is the highest number ever recorded in Unit 2. This is possibly a result from a doubling of the normal trapping efforts, but in 2021 reported harvest was 64.

Adopting WP2203 would align federal and state regulations by requiring federally qualified subsistence users to sequentially mark and number hides, call ADF&G within seven days of take to report the date and location of take for each wolf and seal all hides within 15 days of take.

Effective wolf management in Unit 2 depends upon coordination between state and federal regulations, managers and users. The requirement sequentially marking and numbering the hides along with a seven day call in requirement will aid in minimizing loss for incorrect data.

Having the highest sequentially numbered marked will allow data acquired during the seven day call in to be correctly correlated and each individual harvested wolf's hair sample taken during the sealing process. The sealing requirement is shorter than the current regulation, but is one day longer than the sealing requirement prior to regulation change in 2020.

Sequentially numbering and marking hides and reporting in seven days will also help increase the accuracy of hunters and trappers reports records when the hides are sealed, especially if there is a delay due to weather or access to the sealer. While these reporting and sealing requirements will be more burdensome hunters and trappers it is essential to allow the management agencies to acquire the most precise data possible to aid in estimating the wolf populations with more precision defensibility in Unit 2.

However, reporting harvest at seven days and again at 15 days after harvest could result a regulatory fatigue for subsistence assistance users and confusion relating to reporting requirements. In response to the 2020 petition US Fish and Wildlife Service announced a 90 day finding that the petition to list the Alexandra Archipelago wolf presented substantial information indicating that the petition action may be warranted.

One reason that a species can be listed under the ESA is inadequate or of existing regulatory mechanisms. The OSM's conclusion is support WP2203 with modification to remove the seven day report requirement. Thank you Mr. Chair and members of board. I'd be happy to field any questions.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any questions for staff? All right, hearing none we'll move on to a summary of written public comment.

Tom Plank: Again for the record this is Tom Plank with OSM. And there were no written public comments.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Tom. We'll go ahead operate open up the floor to any public online that may want to comment on it.

Coordinator: And as a reminder to ask a question please press Star 1. No questions over the phone at this time.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. We'll go ahead and move on to Regional Advisory Council recommendations. I'll have Sue call on them.

Don Hernandez: Yes, this is Don Hernandez with the Southeast Council. Are you ready for my...

Anthony Christianson: Yes, you have the floor.

Don Hernandez: ...comment? Yes, okay the Southeast Council did support this proposal with the modification to remove the seven day phone reporting requirement.

The council was concerned that numerous changes in regulations applied to hunters and trappers may result in regulatory fatigue and confusion. Double reporting of data is an unnecessary burden on the subsistence users and may produce inaccurate information.

Council recommends to removing the seven day phone reporting requirement recognizing that hunters and trappers will still be required to provide date and location of wolves within 15 days to help address the need for collecting this information.

This reporting helps successfully manage wolf populations within Unit 2 to prevent the need to list the Alexander Archipelago wolf as an endangered species. Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Don. Any questions for Don? Moving on Tribal Alaska Native Corporate comments Native Liaison?

Orville Lind: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Orville Lind, OSM. There were no recommendations or no comments during the consultation. Thank you. Mr. Chai.

Anthony Christianson: Alaska Department of fishing Fish and Game comments state liaison?

Tom Plank: Thank you Mr. Chair. For the record ADF&G supports the proposal as submitted to align federal regulations with the changes the Board of Game made to the state sealing requirements for wolves harvested in GMU 2.

More precise information on when and where each wolf is harvested should contribute toward a more accurate and precise Unit 2 wolf population estimate. More accurate population estimates will enable state and federal managers to better regulate the wolf population through harvest to meet the follow population objective of 150 to 200 wolves.

Maintaining the population within that range is intended to balance the need for a sustainable wolf population with the effect of wolf predation on deer. This regulatory change will - would reduce regulatory confusion, ease enforcement burden and promote sound management practices within the game management unit. Thank you sir.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Appreciate - go on to the Interagency Staff Committee SC Chair?

Robbin LaVine: Good morning Mr. Chair, this is Robbin LaVine. For Wildlife Proposal 2203 the Interagency Staff Committee provided the standard comment. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. And we'll go onto board discussion with chairs. State liaison any questions, comments? All right, that opens up the floor for federal board action on this proposal.

Dave Schmid: Mr. Chair, this is Forest Service.

Anthony Christianson: Yes, go ahead Dave.

Dave Schmid: Thank you. I move to adopt Wildlife Proposal 22-03 as submitted by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Following a second I will explain why I intend to support my motion with the Southeast RACs modification and OSMs conclusion to remove the seven day reporting period.

Charlie Brower: Second by public member Brower.

Dave Schmid: Thank you Charlie. The Forest Service agrees that harvest reporting is important for monitoring wolves in Unit 2 however reporting harvest at seven days and then again in 15 days after harvest is unnecessary and redundant.

It could also result in confusion and regulatory fatigue by subsistence users. Reporting harvest within 15 days of take including the date and location of take is sufficient to provide the data needed to allow management agencies to estimate the wolf population effectively in Unit 2 without the added burden for subsistence users having to report their harvest twice. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Dave. Any questions, comments or discussion? I offer the question. Call for the question from the board?

Gene Peltola: Yes, I (unintelligible) question.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Gene. All in favor of the motion say aye?

(Group): Aye.

Anthony Christianson: Opposed same sign? Motion carries unanimously to support the proposal. Thank you. We'll go ahead and call on the staff for the next proposal Sue. Thank you.

Man: Mr. Chair, I think Sue may have gotten dropped.

Anthony Christianson: Okay, thank you. Lisa, are you still on?

Lisa (Gredigan): Hi Mr. Chair. Yes, I'm here.

Anthony Christianson: All right, Lise I'll just call on you to call the next Wildlife Proposal and staff up please. Thank you.

Lisa (Gredigan): Okay, yes the next proposal is WP22-04. And that would be Rob Cross.

Robert Cross: Hello. Mr. Chair, members of the board, can you hear me okay?

Anthony Christianson: Loud and clear. Yes, real clear Rob. Thank you.

Robert Cross: Thank you Mr. Chair. My name is Robert Cross. And I'm the Subsistence Coordinator for the Tongass National Forest.

Wildlife Proposal 22-04 submitted by the Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council can be found on Page 572 of your meeting book. The proposal requests the establishment of a year round federal elk hunt Units 1, 2, 3 and 4 except on Etolin, Zarembo, Bushy Shrubby, Kaskevarof Islands in Unit 3 with the harvest limit of one elk by federal registration permit.

The proponent requests that a federal general season be established to aid in the control of non-native elk and to provide a meaningful subsistence hunting

opportunity. The proponent cites the previous state general elk season that encompassed the proposed area and was closed in November of 2018.

Elk were transplanted to Etolin Island in 1987 and became established on both Etolin and Zarembo Islands. An elk hunting season began in 1997 and remains open on Etolin Island through draw and registration hunts.

Elk hunting on Zarembo Island was closed after the 2005 draw hunt. It remains closed due to conservation concerns. In 2001 ADF&G attempted to limited the dispersal of elk outside of the Zarembo and Etolin Island population by instituting a general elk season for Units 1, 2, and the remainder of Unit 4.

Six elk were harvested in the general season from 2004 to 2005. And they were all cows taken from the neighboring Bushy and Shrubby Islands.

In 2012 Bushy and Shrubby - sorry Bushy Shrubby and Kaskevarof Islands were added to the restricted area due to concerns of false reporting and illegal harvesting of Zarembo Island elk. In 2018 the state issued an emergency order to discontinue the general elk hunt due to concerns that one or more of the elk harvested during the general season had been harvested illegally from Zarembo or Etolin Islands.

The state was not able to verify harvest locations of elk taken during the general season and believed that hunters may have been killing elk in the closed or managed areas and then submitting false reports or not reporting. The proposed regulation would allow federally qualified users of Units 1 through 5 to harvest one elk by federal registration permit from Units 1, 2, 4 and the remainder of Unit 3.

The proposed harvest would provide additional subsistence opportunity for residents of Units 1 through 5. However, 35 years after being planted sightings of elk on islands other than Etolin and Zarembo have been rare and anecdotal suggesting that the harvest opportunity will be very limited.

The same management goal for elk in Unit 3 includes limiting the dispersal of elk to islands other than Etolin and Zarembo. The OSM conclusion is to support WP22-04. Again there are no conservation concerns for elk outside of the Unit 3 elk management area.

The federal general elk season may provide limited subsistence opportunity to residents of the area while helping to manage the spread of elk. Thank you Mr. Chair, members of the board, and I'm happy to address any questions.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Tom. Any questions for Tom. Okay, move on to summary of written public comment.

Robert Cross: Thank you Mr. Chair. This is Rob Cross again for the record. And there were no written public comments submitted during the comment window.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. At this time we'll open up the floor to any public online that wants to be recognized.

Coordinator: If you would like to make a public comment over the phone please press Star 1. Again, that a Star followed by 1.

Make sure your phone is unmuted and record your name properly. Thank you.
No comments coming in at this time.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. No comments operator, is that what you said?

Coordinator: Yes sir. There is no comments at this time.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Regional Advisory Council recommendation?

Don Hernandez: Thank you Mr. Chair, Don Hernandez for the record from Southeast Advisory Council. The council supported this proposal.

The Council this proposal to create a subsistence harvest opportunity while avoiding restrictions to non-federally qualified harvesters or harvest closures. The council recognized local knowledge of elk existing outside of the elk management area and believes that a federal season would control the spread of elk.

The proposed federal elk season is in line with established fish and wildlife principles and would stop elk from spreading to neighboring islands and potentially out competing deer. There are no conservation concerns and this opportunity would be beneficial to subsistence users. Thank you very much.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Don. Tribal Alaska Native Corp Com Native Liaison?

Orville Lind: Thank you Mr. Chair. Again, Orville Lind native Liaison for OSM. During the consultation session there were no comments or recommendations. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: The Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments, state liaison?

Ben Mulligan: Thank you Mr. Chair. For the record Alaska Department of Fish and Game opposes the proposal. It has been over 30 years since elk were introduced and

there is still no verified accounts of elk becoming established outside of Etolin and Zarembo Islands.

Consequently, this is hunt is unnecessary for confining the elk to those islands and provides no real opportunity for subsistence harvest. But as, you know, we've had concerns in the past and will if this proposal passes would again invite unlawful harvest from those two island populations.

As you heard earlier the state general season hunt for elk was eliminated because of concern that elk we're being unlawfully harvested from Etolin and Zarembo Islands and reported as harvested during the general season hunt outside the GMU 3 elk drawing hunt area. Unlawful take of elk from these islands remains a concern for us.

And we had an example even just last winter when a joint enforcement - or patrol found the remains of a cow elk on Beach Road in Northern Zarembo Island. And so that's - I mean it seems like this is a very real concern for us.

But if passed this would - we feel that this would enable some illegal take to resurface. And it would be important for the US Forest Service to make sure that they're enforcing those regulations and making sure that does not happen. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any questions from the board? Okay, ISC Staff Committee recommendations?

Robbin LaVine: Good morning Mr. Chair. This is Robbin LaVine. For Wildlife Proposal 2204 the Interagency staff Committee provided the standard comment. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. We'll move on for a board discussion with council chair, state liaison any questions? Hearing none we'll open up the floor for federal board action?

Rhonda Pitka: Wait, this is Rhonda. I do have a question.

Anthony Christianson: Yes Rhonda, you have the floor.

Rhonda Pitka: So in the book it's a little bit confusing because it shows 2204 and 2205, but this is specifically on 22-04, right?

Anthony Christianson: Lisa?

Lisa (Gredigan): This is Lisa (Gredigan) for the record. And yes Rhonda the analysis for 2204 and 05 are combined because they both concerned elk in Unit 3. But 2205 is on the consensus agenda whereas 2204 is on the non-consensus agenda since the state and the Regional Advisory Councils recommendations were different. So yes so this is only on 2204.

Rhonda Pitka: Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Lisa. Any other board discussion questions? The floor is open for board action.

Dave Schmid: Mr. Chair Forest Service.

Anthony Christianson: You have the floor Dave.

Dave Schmid: Thank you Mr. Chair. I move to adopt proposal, Wildlife Proposal 22-04 submitted by the Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. And following a second I will explain why I intend to support my motion.

Gene Peltola: BIA with a second.

Dave Schmid: Thank you Gene. I support my motion with the reasons given by the Southeast Regional Advisory Council. Specifically the council has traditional ecological knowledge establishing that elk occur outside the state elk management area.

These elk could provide additional harvest opportunity when incidentally encountered by federally qualified subsistence users. The proposed season could also help reduce the spread of non-native elk outside the elk management area and thereby reduce competition with native deer.

And also commit in response to ADF&G's comments that the Forest Service will continue to commit to enforcing any illegal harvest on those islands.

Thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Dave. Any questions or comments discussion from the board? All further question?

Man: A question.

Anthony Christianson: A question has been called. All in favor of this proposal signify by saying aye?

(Group): Aye.

Anthony Christianson: Hello. Motion carries unanimously, sorry. I had my phone on mute there. How about we take a ten minute break come back at 10:30? I need to take a ten minute break. So we'll reconvene, and please don't hang up at 10:30.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you are - is everybody online now operator, everybody can hear.

Coordinator: Yes ma'am.

Sue Detwiler: Okay, thank you. And (Tina) is the - are you recording now?

(Tina): Yes I am Sue.

Sue Detwiler: Okay, thank you. I'll just quickly go through and make sure we have a quorum back online. Park Service, Sarah Creachbaum?

Sarah Creachbaum: I'm here. Thank you Sue.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Tom Heinlein BLM?

Tom Heinlein: Good morning. Tom is here.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Fish and Wildlife Service, Sara Boario?

Sara Boario: I'm back.

Sue Detwiler: Great. Forest Service, Dave Schmid?

Dave Schmid: Dave's back, thanks.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Gene Peltola, BIA?

Gene Peltola: Present.

Sue Detwiler: Public member, Rhonda Pitka?

Rhonda Pitka: Hi, I'm here.

Sue Detwiler: Public member Charlie Brower? And Chair, Anthony Christianson? Tony, did we lose you?

Anthony Christianson: No, I'm here. Thank you Sue. I was just literally chopping my lips.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. So have everybody on. Charlie, waiting for Charlie.

Anthony Christianson: We'll just go - yes give Charlie another minute and we'll get - then we'll go ahead and move on to the next proposal. Thank you Sue.

And I'm sure Charlie will come on pretty quick there Sue we better go ahead and just get started. We'll go ahead and call on the next lead author for the next proposal online. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: That would be Jake Musselwhite for WP22-07.

Robert Cross: Mr. Chair this is Robert Cross with the Forest Service Jake Musselwhite is off the call right now so I will be presenting 22-7 if that's okay?

Anthony Christianson: You have the floor.

Robert Cross: Thank you Mr. Chair, members of the board. Again, for the record my name is Robert Cross. And I'm the Subsistence Coordinator for the Tongass National Forest.

Wildlife Proposal 22-07 requests the federal public land of Admiralty Island draining into Chatham Strait between Point Marsden and Point Gardner in Unit 4 be closed to deer hunting September 15 to November 30 except to federally qualified subsistence users. It was submitted by the Southeast Regional Advisory Council.

The staff analysis of the proposal begins on Page 594 of the meeting book. The proponent states that it has become more challenging for subsistence harvesters in Angoon to harvest sufficient deer to meet their subsistence needs due to increased hunting pressure from non-federally qualified users. They state that regulatory change is needed to protect the deer population from further depletion and increased opportunities for federally qualified assistance users.

The portion of Unit 4 covered by the proposal consists of the majority of the west coast of Admiralty Island. The area is primarily federal public lands within the Admiralty Island National Monument and the Kootznoowoo Wilderness. With the exception of land surrounding and Angoon and a strip along the short line of Mitchell Bay. Rural residents of Unit 1 through 5 have a customary and traditional use determination for deer in Unit 4.

The current federal season for deer in Unit 4 is August 1 to January 31 with a limit of sixth deer. Antlerless deer may taken after September 15.

The state general season runs from August 1 to December 31. And also allowed antereless deer to be taken only after September 15.

In 2019, the state bag limit was increased from four to six deer. Based on the available data deer populations in Unit 4 appear to be healthy. To assess the deer population ADF&G uses pellet count transaction aerial surveys.

While no pellet counts have been done in the proposed area recently pellet counts conducted in 2019 in Privates Bay on the eastern side of Admiralty Island increased by 106% from the previous survey in 1998. Data from aerial surveys also indicate that - indicate an increasing trend in deer populations with Admiralty Island having the highest aerial survey accounts within Unit 4.

The amount of deer hunting effort within the proposal area was measured using both the number of hunters and the number of hunter days. Graphs of the hunting effort data on Page 604 of your meeting materials.

The amount of effort has been relatively stable from 2000 to 2019. The majority of effort is by non-federally qualified users, most of which reside in Juneau. Most of the federally qualified hunters using the area reside in Angoon.

The success rate and harvest was measured using the number of days hunted per deer harvested and the number of deer harvested per hunter. The graphs for those measures are on Page 605 of your materials.

The days per deer has been variable but stable with federally qualified hunters consistently taking less time to harvest a deer. The number of deer per federally qualified hunter declined somewhat over the early 2000s thousands but has been stable for the last decade, and is roughly comparable to the non-federally qualified rate.

Overall, the number of deer harvested within the proposal area has been fairly stable over recent years as shown in Figure 10 on Page 606 of your materials. There appears to be a decline in the total harvest by federally qualified users since the early 2000s, but that's largely the result of Angoonians a re shifting effort out of the proposal area into other areas as shown in Figure 11.

This proposal would restrict non-federally qualified users hunt - hunting deer on portions of Admiralty Island during the month of peak effort and harvest. Currently non-federally qualified users represent roughly 60% to 70% of the hunting effort and harvest in the proposal area which is comprised almost entirely a federal public lands.

The proposed September 15 to November 30 closure of non-federally qualified users would likely eliminate over half of the hunter effort and harvest of deer in the proposed area. Non-federally qualified users would likely shift their efforts to other areas of Unit 4 leading to increased competition with hunters in these other areas. It could also lead to increased effort in the proposal area during the month of December after the close period has ended.

Deer populations within the proposal area appear to be healthy and close to carrying capacity therefore eliminating - the elimination of a substantial portion of the harvest is unlikely to result in a significant increase in the deer population and may even increase the risk of population - of the population exceeding its carrying capacity thus the proposal does not appear to significantly improve the ability of federally qualified subsistence users to meet their needs for deer.

The proposal may also have the unintended consequence of preventing non-federally qualified users with local ties to the area from participating in subsistence activities. Many people from Angoon and other rural areas moved to Juneau to seek employment, but return to these communities to participate in subsistence harvesting with family and friends. Under the proposed regulation these users will be prevented from hunting deer in the area during the closed season.

The OSM conclusion for WP 22-07 is to oppose the proposed - Section 8 of ANILCA provides that the board may restrict non-subsistence uses on federal public lands if necessary for the conservation of healthy populations of fish and wildlife or to continue subsistence uses of such populations. Based on available data hunting effort and harvest success rates of subsistence users have been stable and favorable for the last 20 plus years suggesting that the closure is not necessary to continue the subsistence uses of deer - of the deer populations.

Deer populations within the area are healthy and there is no conservation concern for deer on the west coast of Admiralty Island indicating a closure is not necessary for conservation reasons. That's - thus the proposed regulation does not meet the criteria identified in Section 815 of ANILCA the closure or restriction of non-subsistence uses. Thank you Mr. Chair, and I can field any questions at this time.

Sue Detwiler: Tony, did we drop you or are you on mute?

Man: I think he's dropped.

Anthony Christianson: Oh I'm right here. Sorry, it was taking me a second. My fingers are sweaty I couldn't get my phone to work guys. So yes, thank you we'll move on to the next which is a summary of written public comment. Thank you.

Robert Cross: Thank you Mr. Chair, this is Robert Cross again. There were 57 written public comments opposing the proposal and one neutral comment.

The one neutral comment from the Sportsman's Alliance asked the board to only approve the proposal if it was supported by scientific evidence. And then among the concerns commonly brought up in the 57 comments opposing the proposal were, the proposal will force non-federally qualified hunters into a smaller area leading to overcrowding and unsafe conditions.

The deer population is unhealthy making a closure on - the deer population is healthy making a closure unwarranted. The proposal is not based on sound science or justified by data.

The proposal will further divide user groups. The assertion that federally qualified subsistence users have had trouble meeting their needs is not supported by evidence.

Environmental conditions such as harsh winters are the primary drivers of deer abundance rather than hunting so the proposal will not increase the availability of deer. The area covered under the proposal is too large.

The proposal would exclude non-qualified family members from qualified - of qualified users from hunting together. The existing January season for federally qualified users provided them with sufficient priority for deer. And that's all Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any questions from the board? Move on to we will open the floor to public testimony. So operator anybody online who would like to speak to this make the line available?

Coordinator: If you would like to make a public comment over the phone again that's Star followed by 1. Please make sure your phone is unmuted and record your name when prompted.

Please allow a moment for me to get the names. Thank you. First public comment comes from (Mike). Your line is open sir.

(Mike Betters): Thank you Mr. Chair. I'm (Mike Betters) from Auke Bay. Proposal 2207 presently involves a huge area of southwest Admiralty Island. It's located at least 50 miles from Juneau.

It's huge, many thousands of acres with a large robust deer population and almost - there are very few non-qualified hunters using it. I know of only a couple of Juneau families that hunt in Angoon, and some of that is with local residents. The non-qualified hunters hunting federal lands in this area are not impacting Angoon subsistence deer hunting and I don't think they ever will because the area is just too remote.

And further qualified users need to understand that if passed this proposal would displace non-qualified hunters from hunting in the federal uplands. These hunters disgraced - displaced from those federal uplands could then only hunt locally on state managed beaches in the subject area where they would be allowed a limit of six deer of any sex or size.

This proposal could actually cause more hunting pressure and possible conflict on the local beaches than then the qualified hunters are having at the

present time. Wildlife Proposal 2207 will not solve any perceived problem, and it may actually increase possible hunter conflict on the beaches.

I think the qualified users understanding this impact would not support it and I too would urge you not to support this proposal. Thank you very much Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. I appreciate you taking the time to call in today. Operator, are there any other public online?

Coordinator: Yes sir. The next one comes from Kevin. Your line is open.

Kevin Meyer: Thank you. For the record my name is Kevin Meyer. And I'm here representing the ADF&G Juneau-Douglas Advisory Committee.

I want to thank the staff and members of the board for the opportunity to briefly comment on Proposal 2207. And I'd like to ask that these comments to be considered when you deliberate on Proposal 2208 and 2210 as well as all three impact deer hunting in Southeast Alaska.

And we're hoping today that you help maintain consistent and equitable access to deer hunting opportunities for all residents of our sparsely populated region by opposing these three proposals. The full version of our written comments can be found in the meeting materials Pages 658 to 659.

For background our 15 members citizen volunteer committee represents diverse user groups and perspectives. We have designated seats for commercial, sport, and charter fishing, hunting, and hunting guiding, trapping as well as nonconsumptive users.

We strive to represent the interests of our diverse constituencies holding a half dozen meetings each year to both discuss fishing game issues as well as to create a public forum for consideration of proposed regulations that impact our region. Most importantly, like the Federal Subsistence Board, we believe we need to support rules and regulations that create equitable and sustainable fishing and hunting opportunity well into the future.

In this instance we see that there are legitimate concerns raised by those who participated in the RAC process that led to these proposals. And the lack of ferry service and broader impacts from the pandemic has created real impact on food security in rural communities.

We are not convinced however that these proposals best address the issues raised in the comments. Instead of addressing these very real food security hardships we worry the proposals could instead amplified tensions between federally qualified non-federally qualified hunters, straining family ties between communities in Southeast Alaska.

In each of these proposals we also concur with the position of the Department of Fish and Game as well as the Forest Service there that the proposals respective to non-federally qualified users are not warranted for conservation concerns. As the meeting materials note as well the Unit 4 deer populations appear to be doing quite well and our near carrying capacity.

So we look forward to continuing to listen and to better understand - understanding the concerns raised by federally qualified hunters. And we stand ready to create a forum to discuss ways to address these issues.

We did meet with the RAC briefly this fall but before adopting drastic measures like these we would prefer to work with the RAC or the federal

board to propose champion changes through the Alaska Board of Game process that could alleviate some of the problems.

So to conclude, we hope that you vote to maintain consistent access to deer hunting opportunity for all residents of the region by opposing Proposals 2207, 2208 and 2210. I'm available to answer questions and I look forward to your deliberations.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. I appreciate you taking the time to call in and present your talk today. Any questions?

Coordinator: A question over the phone from Ryan. Your line is open.

Ryan Beason: Thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Ryan Beason. And I'm representing the Territorial Sportsmen of Juneau, Alaska.

We're an outdoor conservation group that represents over 1000 members in Juneau and surrounding communities. Like the similar individual who spoke we oppose 2207, 2208, and 2210. Based on the merits that were previously given I'll try to keep this brief as I know that some of this may be repetitive.

But there's no proven conservation issue based on the data from Alaska Department of Fish and Game Office of Subsistence Management and the numerous comments opposing this. I think these are drastic measures that should not happen at this time.

I think it needs to be further work on this with, you know, the user groups that are currently being affected. Some comes - then if needed come do a compromise on this. Again, if there's no deemed conservation issue there's -

this, you know, under Section 815 of ANILCA this is not allowed to close these areas.

Again, as (Mike Betters) previously mentioned this could create the opposite and have more conflicts on, you know, as users are stable - still able to hunt the beach and have larger conflicts with beach hunters as I know a lot of the aging populations in these small communities rely on the beach hunting. And if the non-federally qualified users are limited to the beach it can only increase that and potentially backfire on what their ultimate goal is here.

I think all of us here listing in would agree that if there is a conservation issue proven through scientific data we all agree that there should be some sort of conservation measures, but that has not been proven here. I feel these proposals are being fast tracked with very little public input.

Again, I know like up north where there have been numerous meetings on issues on closing lands I think if that - if they're going to close these to non-federally qualified users there needs to be a lot more user group input, alot of work on both sides to really value and see if there is a deemed conservation issue.

With that I'll just leave it at that. We are opposed to 2207, 2208 and 2210. And if there's any questions I'll be happy to answer those, and thank you everybody for your time.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. I appreciate you for taking the time to call in today. Operator, is there any other tribal testimony?

Coordinator: No questions or comments over the phone at this time. As a reminder please press Star 1.

Anthony Christianson: All right, next we're call on the Regional Advisory Council recommendations here.

Don Hernandez: Thank you Mr. Chair. Don Hernandez for the Southeast Regional Advisory Council. Our council spent a lot of time deliberating on this proposal, and the other two dealing with the Unit 4.

I would say that we considered most of the factors that the public testimony, those 57 letters brought out. The council ultimately supported the proposal with some modifications. We removed some of the areas that were less - used less by local Angoon hunters from the closed area.

So this proposal restricts the deer hunting season for non-federally qualified users. The harvest data have shown a decline and deer harvest by subsistence users.

And the local council member testified that Angoon residents are having a hard time getting deer. A decrease in competition from other non-federally qualified users will be beneficial to subsistence users. The proposed closure is not necessary for conservation purposes, but it will be necessary to ensure continued subsistence uses by residents of Angoon whose harvest levels of fallen in recent years.

The council removed sections from the original proposed closure area that had the highest rates of used by non-federally qualified users. The intent of the modification was to reduce the impact of the closures on those users.

While the council acknowledged that wildlife analysis areas could not be used in federal regulation OSM staff developed a modified regulatory language to reflect the council's intent.

And that language instead of using wildlife analysis areas the wording that the staff was able to come up with to reflect those areas was federal public lands of Admiralty Island draining into Chatham Strait between Fishery Point and Point Gardner and Unit 4 except lands draining into Thayer Lake, Hasselborg Lake, and Hassleborg Creek are closed to deer hunting from September 15 to November 30 except by federally qualified substances users hunting under these regulations.

And we did end up having a split vote on this, but it did pass by a vote of eight in favor and two opposed. Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any questions for the board chair? Hearing none thank you, Don. We'll move on to Tribal Alaska Native Corporate comments Native Liaison.

Orville Lind: Thank you Mr. Chair, board members, Orville Lind, Native Liaison. We did not have any recommendations or comments. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Orville. We'll Move on to Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments state liaison.

Ben Mulliugan: Thank you Mr. Chair. For the record Alaska Department of Fish and Game opposes this proposal as originally submitted as well as with the changes suggested by the Southeast RAC during their meeting in October 2021.

There is no evidence that hunting by non-federally qualified users has negatively affected federally qualified users overall ability to harvest. Adopting this proposal would deprive non-federally qualified users of sustainable deer hunting opportunity contrary to the terms laid out in Title 8 of ANILCA.

This proposal would also unnecessarily restrict Alaskans who many are former residents of the area who had to move away for a variety of reasons. They would be then put into a situation where they would be restricted in their ability to come back to their home communities to practice the traditional cultural way of life with family and friends.

Approximately 90% of land within GMU 4 is federally managed and current federal regulations provide greater opportunity to federally qualified deer hunters compared to non-federally qualified users. Federally qualified users are eligible to hunt an entire month longer than non-federally qualified users with the season extending through the month of January as well as the liberal designated hunter program giving people ability to have someone hunt for them.

As directed by congress in Section 802 of ANILCA subsistence uses of wildlife shall be the priority consumptive use on federal public lands. When it is necessary to restrict taking in order to share the continued viability of a fish and/or a wildlife population or the continuation of subsistence uses of such population.

Section 815 of ANILCA provides that a restriction on taking wildlife for non-federally qualified hunters is only authorized if necessary for the conservation of healthy populations of fish and wildlife for the reasons in Section 816

continuous subsistence uses of such populations or pursuant to other applicable law.

When being discussed at the Southeast RAC we heard statements of folks wanting to hunt in peace or if going to their favorite spot seeing another boat there it doesn't matter whether or not they're successful hunters or not it's just the fact that they're there altered the way you hunt. Based on ADF&G's analysis of the available data none of these conditions apply from ANILCA.

There is no conservation concern for the deer population and the continuous assistance uses the deer or not being impacted by non-federally qualified users. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. And I did get a mention that there is one more public comment. So thank you for that state, and we will go ahead and back up.

There was also a board member who would like to be recognized. So first we'll call upon the board member and, and then we'll recognize the public. Gene, you have the floor.

Glenn Chen Hello Tony. This is Glenn Chen from the BIA. Gene wanted me to speak on his behalf briefly. He's right here, actually.

So Mr. Chair Mr. Peltola was wanting to ask Mr. Hernandez, the Chair of the Southeast Council to provide some additional information as to why the folks from Angoon were not being able to get the deer that they need?

Anthony Christianson: Okay, Glenn so Don if you're available it sounds like the BIA would like to know, you know, the specified reasons that Angoon was

struggling with their deer and to meet their needs. If Don could elaborate on that question? Thank you Don.

Don Hernandez: Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. Yes, I can elaborate on that a little more. I think the main issue here with the folks in Angoon is this factor of competition.

And, you know, they like to point out that they, for the most part hunt fairly close to home. They don't have a lot of means to go uh further away from home. They don't feel that they should need to go further away from home to do their harvesting.

And their factors that they consider is, you know, what the state mentioned essentially competition. And they see it as a significant factor if, you know, they go to a spot where they have gone for, you know, generations and they expect a successful hunt and if there is competition there it does affect their ability to harvest.

They may not want to hunt there at all, lots of reasons for that. There may be some issues of some potential, you know, local depletions if a particular area gets impacted too much, even though the overall unit has no conservation concerns there is some potential for specific areas that are popular for hunting to be somewhat depleted by intensive use, you know, areas that have good anchorages in particular get hit harder.

So the main issue here with the folks in Angoon is competition. And, you know, as has been pointed out there are two provisions, you know, for a closure. One of the conservation concern and the other is the continuation of subsistence users - uses.

And how you want to interpret that provision, of course it leaves a lot of leeway as to what is required to continue a subsistence use. And does that mean the ability to go out and harvest in the most efficient way close to home, is that important for continuing subsistence uses?

The folks in Angoon would say it is, and the council after a lot of discussion, agreed with them on that. So I think that's the best explanation can give.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Don. Gene, I hope that helps answer your questions.

Glenn Chen: Yes, it did Mr. Chair. I appreciate the effort.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. And again operator, we have somebody online for the public who would like to be recognized?

Coordinator: Yes, we have a question or comment from (Todd) your line is open.

(Todd Sharp): Thank you. I'm asking the board to reject this proposal, and I didn't submit any letter previously. My name is (Todd Sharp). I'm currently residing in Juneau.

I myself have hunted deer and met my needs in this specific area for over 40 years. Angoon and the western shore of Admiralty Island is where my family, my father, my grandfather and ancestors hunted deer.

I've hunted this area mostly during the months of August and November, sometimes in September. And I've hunted this area also several times in October and December over the years.

First, I'd like to address the section of the proposal stating why this regulation should be changed. The statement is, "Over the past years it has become more challenging for subsistence hunters in Angoon to harvest sufficient deer."

Over the past several years the winters have generally been milder, which has resulted in an increased deer population, but due to these mild winters the majority of deer have not been forced to the beach and estuaries. This is most likely the major factor that has reduced harvest by local subsistence hunters.

There are many times in late November and early December when I harvest deer at or well above 1200 feet. I find a very good number of deer residing high on the terrain as possible. And I've noted this by citing deer, taking deer and observing a great deal of fresh pellets at these higher elevations.

There's also the statement that says, "As hunting pressure from non-subsistence hunters has increased concern his reason for the future prospects of local subsistence hunter." On this one I'm wondering and questioning what data was used to determine the increase use by knowledge existence hunters.

But my statement, personal observations, during the period of time in the area where I've been hunting, which is generally from south of Cube Cove to Whitewater Bay in the last four years, I have rarely and almost never seen any other hunters other than local hunters. Two years ago in November there was a big game guide vessel anchored in the South Arm of Hood Base, which appeared to have been deploying a couple of hunters there in the South Arm.

As a side note I think and agree moving forward with this proposal could have some unintended consequences specifically for tribal members and others who presently are not qualified as subsistence hunters due to the location of the

residences based on economic and other reasons that require them to live outside of the area that they traditionally hunt and gather.

Also, if this proposal does move forward I question why the month of December has been excluded. The proposal states, "The regulation change includes the dates closing deer hunting to non-subsistence hunters between September 15 and November 30."

Excluding the month of December seems counterproductive to the objective of this proposal by not allowing non-qualified hunters to hunt deer in December. The month of December should be one of the most concerned for external hunting pressure by non-qualified federal subsistence hunters due to urban hunters having holidays, time off work, et cetera, and the greater potential of heavier snowfall that forces deer on to the beach where they're more easily harvested.

If non-qualified federal subsistence hunters are responsible for reduced harvest by qualified federal subsistence hunters it seems more appropriate to close during the month of December than any other time. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you (Todd) for taking the time to call in today. Operator, is there anybody else on the public who would like to be recognized?

Coordinator: No further questions on the phone at this time. And as a reminder to ask a question or comment please press Star 1.

Anthony Christianson: All right, we'll get back to the order of the agenda which was the Interagency Staff Committee comments ISC Chair.

Robbin LaVine: Thank you Mr. Chair and members of the board. This is Robbin LaVine. For Wildlife Proposal 2207 the Interagency Staff Committee acknowledges the extensive discussion by the council members about the closure policy application to this situation.

This was one of four proposals for Unit 4 which overall has a healthy population of deer, but is experiencing sub areas where subsistence users are not able to harvest enough deer for their needs.

The council submitted this proposal because of concerns brought to them by the affected federally qualified subsistence users in Angoon about not meeting subsistence needs for deer. The proposal review process allowed them to review the available data and hear testimony from all affected users of the resources.

During the meeting they acknowledge that the data in the state reporting system used to measure effort does not reflect success in subsistence hunting because subsistence hunting of deer is opportunistic and users generally only report when they are successful. They crafted a modification in area and season that limits the impacts to the non-federally qualified users and addresses the needs of subsistence users. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you ISC. At this time I'm going to recognize operator I hear there is one more public commenter online. So we want to make sure we give everyone the opportunity, so I'll entertain it again at this time.

Coordinator: Yes sir, just a moment. Question are comment over the phone come from (Steve). Your line is open.

(Steve Hoffman): Yes, this is (Steve Hoffman). I live in Ketchikan, Alaska. And I'm - I want to address the chairman and the board members concerning proposals 2207, 08 and 10 and stuff.

I've hunted in those areas for the last 40 years and stuff and I've never seen a shortage of deer for both rural and urban residents except following the heavy winter kill that we all experienced in '07 and '08. Therefore, I'm encouraging the board to vote these proposals down because I think it's unwarranted.

And ADF&G's data indicates that the deer populations in all these areas are doing quite well, and I think it would be unfair to pass these proposals. Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: All right, thank you for taking the time to call in today. That opens up the floor for board discussion with the council chair and state liaison any questions from the board? Any further discussion, questions comments?

Gene Peltola: BIA?

Anthony Christianson: Yes, Gene, you have the floor.

Gene Peltola: How am I coming through? I was told we're really weak on volume earlier.

Anthony Christianson: Yes, you were a little bit. Now you sound a lot better. Thank you.

Gene Peltola: Okay, and I think we found - located the speaker in the ceiling in our office building, apologize for that. I'd like to put for something for the board's consideration on this proposal as well as a couple others. I as a board member, in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, has been supportive of closures in the past.

Although like when we discussed other closures, we wanted to be as specific as we can be. And like the testimony we received and analysis which is given in discussion with some of my colleagues, I'd like to put forth to the board for their consideration to defer proposals 7, 8 and 10, excluding 9 which is on the consensus agenda, and ask that be taken up for consideration in the winter meeting.

In addition to I did not want to speak on behalf of the Forest Service, but I think they'd be willing to facilitate with OSM, a group of users together to try to finetune something for our consideration in the immediate future. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you, Gene. Any other board wish to discuss? Dave, any comments.

David Schmid: Yes. This is Forest Service, Dave. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I concur here, I believe, with BIA and Gene Peltola. Based on our OSM analysis, based on some of the testimony we've heard, I would - I'm going to, or ask BIA to maybe put a motion forth here to move to defer those deer proposals, I believe it is 7, 8 and 10, until we can see if there's opportunity to work between some of the user groups and some of the members there, on the RAC, to see if we can't come up with a little bit better solution that's supported more by some of the evidence here.

And so that's what I'm looking forward to moving forward with. I do certainly appreciate the testimony that was given to the Southeast RAC for members. But at this time I'd like to put some more work in, and I do commit to working with OSM and working with the RAC and the other user groups here in Southeast Alaska, to see if we can't craft a proposal that might work a bit better. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Gene Peltola: Mr. Chair, BIA.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you, Dave. Yes, Gene, you have the floor.

Gene Peltola: Thank you, Mr. Chair. BIA moves to defer as stipulated.

David Schmid: Forest Service seconds.

Anthony Christianson: There's been a motion made and seconded, to defer this wildlife proposal. I have a question as the Chair. Now we have four of these proposals before us. Are we looking at a sweep of these, or are we looking at specific, this proposal?

Gene Peltola: Mr. Chair, BIA, if I may.

Anthony Christianson: Yes, Gene. You have the floor.

Gene Peltola: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My motion was to defer 7, 8, and 10 with 9 being on the consensus agenda. So therefore, if it's impacting and potentially deferring the three proposals on questions 7, 8, and 10.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. I was just trying to make sure everyone was clarified on the record. Thank you for that, Gene. Any other board comments, questions, or discussions about the motion to defer as specified? Hearing no comments we'll call for the question.

Man: Question.

Anthony Christianson: All in favor for the motion to defer, signify by saying aye.

Man: Aye.

Woman: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Woman: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Woman: Aye.

Anthony Christianson: Opposed same sign. Motion carries unanimously to defer these proposals to a future meeting, so we get more time to work out some specifics that might incorporate a little more of the user group to the area, and give us a better handle on all that that entails. And so I appreciate the leadership on the board here in wanting to finetune something that doesn't create additional user problems. But may clearly find a priority use for the rural (unintelligible) consent of (unintelligible) there. And so, just thanks everybody.

And also keep in mind that we want to still keep this on top of the plate and make sure that we can pull this together sooner than later. So thank you, guys. We'll go ahead and move onto the next proposal. Sue, could you call up that one? Thank you.

Sue Detwiler Yes. That's Wildlife Closure Review 22-01 and the lead for that is Gregg Dunn.

Gregg Dunn: Hello, Mr. Chair, can you hear me? This is Gregg Dunn.

Anthony Christianson: Yes. You have the floor.

Gregg Dunn: Thank you. Well Mr. Chair, members of the board, my name is Gregg Dunn and I'm a wildlife biologist, Tongass National Forest. Wildlife Closure, WCR 22-01 is a review of the closure to non-federally qualified subsistence users for deer, from August 1st through August 15th in Unit 2 and (unintelligible) sound on page 912 of your meeting books. Federal public lands in Unit 2 were closed to deer hunting in early August, to non-federally qualified users for the continuation of subsistence usage.

A number of reasons for discussion is the justification for the closing - the long term trend of declining deer habitat of which we only have 6% of clear cuts remaining huntable; size of deer population, Unit 2; apparent increase in hunter participation; and the competition between user groups that resulted in a decline in subsistence opportunities, especially in the most road accessible portions of Prince of Wales Island, And to coincide with the earlier July 24th start date for federally qualified users.

In 2003 the Federal Subsistence Board adopted WP 03-05 which initially closed federally public lands for deer hunting August through August 21st. August was chosen to coincide with the earlier start date of July 24th with proposals WC 03-04, provide a total of 28 days to hunt for federally qualified subsistence users.

In 2004 the board adopted proposal WP 04-15 with modifications to change the federal public land exposure date from August 1-21 to August 1-15. And to keep the closure in perpetuity. So Prince of Wales has the highest amount of (unintelligible) in Southeast Alaska. Since 1954 Prince of Wales received

the most logging activity in the region, which resulted in a 94% reduction of contiguous high volume forest (unintelligible) production.

Logging activity has reduced deer habitat to North Central Prince of Wales by 46% and South Prince of Wales by 18%. Public group data in Unit 2 suggests an increasing population of (transitional) low during the 1990s and early 2000s. You can see that in figure 2. Recent agencies have harvest statistics suggest the deer population is currently stable. Those post count data of 1.4 and deer harvest data, have exceeded minimum projections since 2008.

Alaska's Board of Game in fall 2000 established a harvest objective of 2700 deer for Unit 2 and a population goal of 75,000 deer. And consider the population that's important for satisfying high levels of (unintelligible). The estimated average total annual harvest was 3467 deer (unintelligible) from 2005 to 2018 and you can see those in figure 5.

Harvest are at or above the Unit 2 harvest objective in 2005 and 2016, but fell below harvest objectives during the 2017 through '19 seasons. Deer harvest reached historically high levels in 2015 and then began to decline. There's a similar pattern seen (unintelligible) in the Unit 2 deer (unintelligible). Also, you can see that in figure 5.

Much of the harvest in Unit 2 takes place during three time periods - late July/August, October, and November. This is when competition is greatest between user groups. July/August is the opening of the hunt for Unit 2 and people are in the Alpine areas looking to secure bucks. November is the most popular month to hunt because it coincides with the rest.

Federally qualified subsistence users from Unit 2 had a higher success rate than other hunters from '97 to 2017, with an average success rate of 74% compared to 60% success rate for non-federally qualified.

And you can see that in table 3. Rescinding the closure would increase the opportunity on federal public lands for non-federally qualified users during (unintelligible). This could increase both the number of non-federally qualified users, and encounters between federally qualified subsistence users and non-federally qualified.

This could potentially decrease harvest opportunity for federally qualified subsistence users through increased (unintelligible). Long term trend of declining deer habitats - decreasing the deer population size leads to increase in hunter participation, competition between user groups in the most road accessible portions of Prince of Wales Island an effective perception of increases competition between federally qualified users and non-federally qualified users.

The harvest objective has not been met since 2017, and the deer per user has dropped as well. Finding deer in traditional areas has decreased because of weather, competition, (stem) exclusion, predation and road access. This shows there are maybe less deer in the landscape, and could be a reason for maintaining (unintelligible).

And the OSM preliminary conclusion was to maintain status quo. That is all I have. Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the board. I'd be happy to address any questions.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any questions from the board or the staff? All right.
Thank you. We'll move on to summary of written public comment.

Gregg Dunn: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Gregg Dunn again. We had one written comment and it opposed the - so we should rescind the closure order is what they came up - and - because people want to hunt back in June and July and July and August (unintelligible).

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. And there is somebody with a line open. If you could please mute it? Thank you. We'll go ahead at this time, open up the floor for public testimony on this proposal.

Coordinator: As a reminder, to ask a question or comment, please press star 1. As of now there are no questions or comments over the phone.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. We'll go ahead and move to the Regional Advisory Council recommendation.

Don Hernandez: Okay. Thank you. This is Don Hernandez, the Southeast RAC. The council voted to maintain the status quo on this closure. This seasonal closure has been in place for a good number of years. It was originally recommended by a stakeholders' group that sought solutions to federally qualified substance users' needs for deer not being met in Unit 2.

So I just want to point out on that statement, that much like was suggested on the previous deferrals on Unit 4 deer proposals, for a stakeholders' group, we did convene a stakeholders' group. I think it was 18 years ago now. Chairman Christianson and myself, both took part in that stakeholders' group.

And this closure policy was initiated from that effort. And it was an effort that was - had participation from all users. So that's the history behind that. So this closure is one of the solutions crafted by that group, which is a compromisable

federally qualified substance users and non-federally qualified hunters. This closure is in line with recognized principles of fish and wildlife management. It doesn't exclude non-subsistence hunters.

They still have opportunity. But it does provide a meaningful priority for subsistence users. In addition to the seasonal closure there is also a harvest limit restriction for non-federally qualified users. That was implemented by the board just several years ago. Harvest limit restriction has resulted in less hunter effort from non-federally qualified subsistence users, most of whom live in Ketchikan.

And Ketchikan is in Unit 1, which has a greater harvest limit as well as a good success rate for deer hunters. So the harvest limit restriction in Unit 2 may have shifted some effort to Unit 1. All of this is worked towards solving a problem in Unit 2, where there was a lot of competition, which was - resulted in subsistence users having a hard time meeting their needs.

The seasonal closure and harvest restriction collectively have been a good successful strategy, ensuring the subsistence needs are being met. That concludes our comments.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you, Don. Thank you for the shout out there too. That was always a fond memory of mine getting involved in this, the Unit 2 subcommittee work and trying to find a user group conflict resolution. So Im a true believer in that being part of a process. So thank you for your position there. Any questions for Don? Hearing none, we'll move onto Tribal Alaska Native Corporation comments, our Native Liaison. I'll be calling on Ms. Lavine at this time.

Robbin Lavine: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the board. This is Robbin Lavine standing in for Tribal Liaison Orville Lind. There were no comments or recommendations during the consultation. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. We'll call on the Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments, State Liaison?

Man: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the record, Alaska Department of Fish and Game supports eliminating the restrictive bag limit for non-federally qualified use, non-federally qualified deer hunters in GMU-2. Those restrictions have never been and cannot be justified as necessary to assure the continued viability of the fish or wildlife population or the continuation of subsistence uses in such population.

Maintaining this closure will continue to deprive non-federally qualified users and deer harvest opportunity in GMU-2. Over 70% of land in the unit is federally managed and the pre-2018 federal regulations already provided a greater opportunity to federally qualified deer hunters compared to non-federally qualified ones.

Those advantages included a season with 54 days when only federally qualified users were eligible to hunt, a higher federal bag limit, including one doe harvested after October 15th, and a federal season that extended through January when deer are at low elevations.

In contrast, non-federally qualified users hunt under state regulations with an open season from August 1 to December 31 and a bag limit of four bucks - four male deer. However, currently only two bucks may be taken on federal land, and those federal public lands are closed to hunting by non-federally qualified users in the month of August.

As directed by Congress in Section 802 ANILCA, subsistence uses of wildlife shall be the property consumptive use of federal public lands when it is necessary to restrict taking in order to assure the continued viability of official wildlife population as a continuation of subsistence uses of such population.

Section 815 of ANILCA provides that a restriction on taking wildlife and non-federally qualified users is only authorized if necessary for the continuation of healthy population of fish and wildlife for the reasons in 816, the continued subsistence usage of such populations are pursuant to other applicable laws. (AF&G) can find (unintelligible) these reasons apply.

There is no conservation concern from GMU-2 deer populations, and no restrictions are needed to continue subsistence use of deer in GMU-2 as an (ANS) has consistently been met. The deer population continues to be viable and productive. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any questions for the state? Hearing none, we'll move onto United Interagency Staff Committee comments. ISC Chair?

Robbin Lavine: Good morning again, Mr. Chair. This is Robbin Lavine, Policy Coordinator and the Interagency Staff Committee Chair. For Wildlife Closure Review 22-01 the Interagency Staff Committee provided the standard comment. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. We'll move onto board discussion and Council Chair, State Liaison? Hearing none, we'll go ahead and open up the floor for board action.

David Schmid: Mr. Chair, Forest Service.

Anthony Christian: You've got the floor, Dave.

David Schmid: And Mr. Chair I move to maintain status quo for the WCR 22-01. Following a second, I will explain why I intend to support my motion.

Man: Second.

David Schmid: Thank you. So my justification is based on the analysis by OSM and the comments given by the Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council.

Overall, the long term trend in the deer population, on Prince of Wales, can be summarized by declining deer habitat, decreasing deer population size, increase in hunter participation, decreased harvest success, inability to meet the harvest objective since 2017, and increased competition between user groups in the most road accessible portions of Prince of Wales Island and Unit 2.

Based on the testimony from federally qualified subsistence users, the current seasonal closure and harvest restriction appears to be a successful strategy that is helping meet subsistence needs. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you, Dave. Any comments, questions, discussion?

Coordinator: No questions over the phone.

Anthony Christianson: All right. We'll call for the question.

David Schmid: Question.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you, Dave. All in favor of the motion to keep status quo signify by saying aye.

Man: Aye.

Woman: Aye.

Woman: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Anthony Christianson: Opposed, same sign. Motion carries unanimously. Thank you, guys. We'll move onto the next proposal on the agenda, Sue.

Sue Detwiler: Yes. That action closes out the non-consensus agenda items for the Southeast Region. And so we'll now be moving it to the South Central proposals starting out with Wildlife Proposal 22-12. And I believe (Milo Bertrand) is going to be presenting that one.

(Milo Bertrand): Can you hear me?

Anthony Christianson: Yes, (Milo). You have the floor.

(Milo Bertrand): Hello. This is (Milo Bertrand) of the Chugach National Forest. And I'm here to present a summary of the analysis of WP 22-12. The full analysis begins on page 941 in your book. Proposal WP 22-12 submitted by the South Central Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council requests that the deer season in Unit 6 be extended from the current closing date of December 31 to January 31.

The proponents believe that lengthening the deer season in Unit 6 from December 31st to January 31st, should be authorized because many subsistence users are not able to harvest enough deer to feed their families due to mild winters, which decrease hunter success. Winter snow that push deer to the beaches where they are more easily accessed by hunters have occurred later in recent winters.

Hunters that cannot participate in early season hunts must wait until later in the season when reduced foliage allows deer to be more easily seen and heavy snow pack forces deer down near the coast where they are more accessible. In 1990 the board adopted subsistence regulations for deer hunting from state regulations.

The initial federal deer season was August 1st to December 31 with a limit of five deer, but antlerless deer could only be taken September 15 to December 31. The current season dates including the October 1 through December 31 antlerless deer season, was adopted in 1991. (Unintelligible) tail deer were introduced to Unit 6 between 1916 and 1923. The deer population in Prince William Sound is limited by snow depth and duration.

Heavy snow events have caused major winter mortality events in the area. Deep snow concentrates deer along the beaches. And if deer are forced to remain there for an extended period of time it can result in starvation. Deer are also more vulnerable to harvest while concentrated on beaches. And harvesting under these circumstances could - harvest under these circumstances could become additive mortality rather than compensatory mortality and result in higher total winter mortality.

Approximately 45% of the reported resident harvest is by local federally qualified subsistence users. And that would be residents of Cordova, Chenega Bay, Tatitlek, and Whittier. And 50% is by non-federally qualified Alaska residents, and 5% by non-local federally qualified subsistence users. Approximately 98% of the reported harvest by local federally qualified subsistence users are from Cordova residents.

From 2006 to 2012 the sex ratio of the harvest was approximately 62% male and 38% female. Harvest reports between 2005 and 2006, and 2009 and '10 show that most of the animal deer harvest occurred during October and that was 19% to 35%; November, 25% to 35%; and December, 18% to 24%.

Deer have been harvested during the extended January season since the season was lengthened in 2016. A large portion of the yearly take of deer by residents of Cordova, the largest of the three communities, occurs on Hawkins Island which is in relative close proximity to town. If this proposal is adopted it would lengthen the deer season by one month, through January 31st, in Unit 6.

A longer season would provide increased opportunity for federally qualified subsistence users, to harvest deer during the winter when they are more accessible because snow often pushes deer to lower elevations and onto beaches in Prince William Sound. By allowing the harvest of either sex deer during the extended season, hunters would not have to discriminate between does and bucks that have already shed their antlers.

Although the deer population in Unit 6 has largely recovered from the decline after the severe winter of 2011, '12, deer are more vulnerable to harvest when pushed to beaches where they are easily accessed by hunters on boats. It is thought that when winter conditions are severe hunter harvest can become an

additive source of mortality to winter kill. Additionally, heavy harvest of does can flow the recovery of deer after severe winter events.

Federally qualified subsistence users, especially residents of Cordova, harvest a significant portion of the deer take in Prince William Sound, and are responsible for most of the harvest from Hawkins and Hinchinbrook Islands. While few bucks have been harvested from (60) during the January season since 2016, increasing the harvest limit and allowing the harvest of does late in this season, would likely increase participation in the late season hunt.

The OSM preliminary conclusion of this - from this analysis, was to support WP 22-12 with modification, to restrict the harvest limit during the January season, to two deer rather than the five proposed. And the justification is that while lengthening the deer season by one month through January 31st and allowing the harvest of does, would provide additional opportunity to harvest red meat.

It also increases harvest pressure at a time when deer could be pushed to beaches by deep snow where they are most vulnerable. Qualified rural residents already have a long and liberal season for deer in Unit 6, extending five months from the 1st of August through the 31st of December, for up to five deer, an additional month, through January 31, for up to one buck.

The proposed modification would reduce the impact to deer populations, by limiting the harvest during the time when they are most vulnerable but still provide additional opportunity for qualified rural residents. This would also reduce additive mortality during more severe winters and speed recovery of the deer population following these events. That concludes my presentation of the analysis.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any questions for the staff? We'll move onto the summary of written public comments.

(Milo Bertrand): There were two - the Federal Subsistence Board received public comments in the form of two letters, on WP 22-12, both in opposition. While both letters focus on issues surrounding Southeast Alaska deer proposals, they included concerns that non-federally qualified hunter opportunity was being unfairly reduced, and that extending the season in Unit 6, would harm deer populations there.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. We'll move on to open the floor to public testimony. Anybody online Operator, that would like to speak?

Coordinator: Thank you. As a reminder, to ask a question or a comment or testimony, please press star 1. No questions or comments over the phone at this time.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. We'll move onto Regional Advisory Council recommendations.

DeAnna Perry: Mr. Chair, this is DeAnna Perry, Council Coordinator. I believe Vice Chair, (Gloria Strickland) is online to provide that.

(Gloria Strickland): Yes. Yes, I am. I was just waiting to be - I thought - okay. The Councils supported this proposal with modifications to restrict the harvest limit during the January season, to one deer in all of Unit 6. Lengthening the season better serves the federally qualified user in adapting to climate change situations. And increases harvest opportunities.

It also recognizes the mobility issues of some hunters and allows more choice for timing a hunt. Youth tend to climb mountains and hunt easier, and elders

tend to hunt during the second phase of the season when deer are in the lower lands. Removing the (unintelligible) requirement will lessen the likelihood of unintentional illegal harvest, and decrease the number of deer to be harvested in January.

From OSM's suggestion of two deer to - Council suggesting one deer should address any conservation concerns with the deer population in Unit 6. This action is supported by local knowledge and biological information presented in the analysis, including consideration of weather conditions during the hunting season. And it benefits subsistence users. Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you, (Gloria). Moving on to Tribal Alaska Native (Court) comments. Native Liaison, Robbin?

Robbin Lavine: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Robbin Lavine standing in for Native Liaison, Orville Lind. There were no comments or recommendations during the consultation. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. We'll move onto the Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments. State Liaison?

Man 2: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the record, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game opposes this proposal. Excessive harvest of female deer resulting from this proposal is likely to affect sustainability of the current level of deer in GMU 6 and cause conservation concerns for the population, which runs contrary to ANILCA. Deer were introduced to Prince William Sound and occur at the northernmost extent of their range.

As a result, the population is very susceptible to mortality during extreme weather events. Snow accumulation that could lead to major concentrating

events at sea level, is far more common after January than in the last two months of the existing season. Harvest of females is higher in years with significant late winter harvests, which can slow population rebounds following large snow events.

With a higher number of federally qualified users in close proximity to federal public land, harvest during January could be very high and potentially detrimental to the population. Existing season on bucks only in GMU 6(d) provides reasonable opportunity, while slowing harvest and protecting females. Analysis given indicate recent harvest is normal although available household survey data and harvest data were not included in analysis.

There is also little information to suggest that users are not able to meet their needs with the existing season. And one last important point to make is that, you know, acknowledged by the proponent of the proposal as well as OSM that you just heard, oftentimes deer during this time of year during the proposed extension, are located on the beaches below the ordinary high watermark, and therefore, cannot be illegally harvested, is that would be the jurisdiction of state regulations. Thanks, Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Interagency Staff Committee comments - ISC Chair?

Robbin Lavine: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Robbin Lavine, Policy Coordinator and ISC Chair. For Wildlife Proposal 22-12, the ISC provided the standard comment. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you, Robbin. We'll move on forward discussion with Council Chair and State Liaison. We will open up the floor for board (action).

David Schmid: Mr. Chair, Forest Service.

Anthony Christianson: You have the floor, Dave.

David Schmid: Thank you. I move to adopt Wildlife Proposal 22-12 as modified by the Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council, to extend the deer season through the end of January while restricting the January season harvest limit to one deer in all of Unit 6. Following a second, I will explain why I support my motion.

Gene Peltola: BIA seconds.

David Schmid: Thank you. My justification is based on the analysis by OSM and as modified by the Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. Lengthening the deer season by one month through January 31st but limiting the harvest to either one buck or one doe, would provide additional opportunity to harvest red meat by federally qualified subsistence users while minimizing pressure at a time when deer are most vulnerable. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thanks, Dave. Any board discussion, comments? Call for the question.

David Schmid: Question.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you, Dave. All in favor of the proposal as presented, signify by saying aye.

David Schmid: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Woman: Aye.

Woman: Aye.

Anthony Christianson: Opposed, same sign. Motion carries unanimously. I think we're moving right along. Thank you guys, for this diligence this morning. We'll go ahead and come back at 1:20. So if we could have everybody coming back after lunch at 1:20 that would give us a few minutes to get everybody online and check our quorum and get back with the order of business in the Southwest there. So we'll take a quick lunch break. We'll be back 1:20. Thank you all.

Man: Thanks, Tony.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you, Operator.

Coordinator: Oh.

Sue Detwiler: Hi. This is Sue Detwiler with Office of Subsistence Management. We're just gathering back up here after lunch. Operator, let's see I believe the operator - Operator, can you confirm that everybody who's called in now is able to listen, both the speakers and the people who called into the non-speaking line?

Coordinator: That is correct. There are no more host codes in the main line. They're all in the speakers. And the participants are able to hear as well. So we're ready to go.

Sue Detwiler: Okay, and - thank you. And (Tina) are you on? Are you - have you started recording this?

(Tina): Sue, I am on and ready to go.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Thank you. Let's see. So we'll start going through the roll call. But first, Tony Christianson, Chair, have you called in yet? Okay. While we're waiting for Tony we'll see what other board members we have online, starting with Park Service, Sarah Creachbaum?

Sarah Creachbaum: Yes. (Unintelligible) Sue and everyone. I'm present.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you, Sarah. Thomas Heinlein, BLM? I think I heard you earlier. Are you still on?

Tom Heinlein: BLM is still on.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Thank you. Fish & Wildlife Service, Sara Boario?

Sara Boario: Hi, Sue.

Sue Detwiler: Hi, Sara. Forest Service, Dave Schmid?

David Schmid: I'm on, Sue. Thanks.

Sue Detwiler: Thanks, Dave. BIA, Gene Peltola? Public member, Rhonda Pitka? I heard you earlier. Are you still on?

Rhonda Pitka: I am on.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Public member, Charlie Brower? I heard you also. Are you still on?

Charlie Brower: I'm here.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you, Charlie. Chair, Anthony Christianson? Okay. So we're waiting for Chair Christianson and Gene Peltola.

Coordinator: This is the operator. So there are about three speakers coming in right now. They're being prompted.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you.

Coordinator: (Brent Vickers) is on the line.

Sue Detwiler: I'm sorry, Operator, who is on the line?

Coordinator: (Brent Vickers).

Sue Detwiler: Oh. (Brent Vickers)? Okay. Thank you.

(Brent Vickers): So hey, I don't need to be talking. I don't understand why I keep getting put into that room. Sorry, everyone. This is (Brent Vickers). That's all.

Sue Detwiler: We're just waiting on Tony Christianson and Gene Peltola.

(Glen Shen): Good afternoon, Sue. This is (Glen Shen) with BIA. I'm calling in on behalf of Gene Peltola until he is available to join the meeting. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Then we're just waiting on Tony Christianson for now. And if Tony Christianson is having trouble logging on, the default would be to go next to Rhonda Pitka as the Chair.

Rhonda Pitka: Absolutely. So I believe that we are on Wildlife Proposal 22-20. Is that correct?

Sue Detwiler: Yes. That is correct. Would you like us to get started with that, Madam Chair?

Rhonda Pitka: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Rhonda Pitka: ...Charlie Brower on?

Sue Detwiler: I believe Charlie is on.

Rhonda Pitka: Okay, cool. Okay. Yes, let's get started then. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: And that would be - I believe that's Hannah Voorhees presenting that proposal.

Hannah Voorhees: Good afternoon.

Rhonda Pitka: Go ahead, Hannah.

Hannah Voorhees: (Unintelligible) Madam Chair. Good afternoon, Madam Chair and members of the board. This is Hannah Voorhees, anthropologist with OSM. And I'll be presenting Wildlife Proposal WP 22-20. This proposal was submitted by (Michael Adams) and analysis begins on page 158 of the Board Book. This

proposal requests that the board recognize the customary and traditional use of moose in Unit 15(c), by residents of Cooper Landing.

A proponent states that residents of Cooper Landing have a history of customary and traditional use of resources including moose, throughout Unit 15. She indicates that Cooper Landing residents participate in all subsistence opportunities in the region. The proponent argues that exclusion from these customary and traditional use determinations, has denied Cooper Landing residence subsistence opportunity.

Currently, in the customary traditional use determination for moose in Unit 15(c) includes residents of Ninilchik, Nanwalek, Port Graham, and Seldovia. Cooper Landing's use of - customer traditional use of moose has been recognized by the board for much of the Kenai Peninsula. In 2008 the board recognized the customary and traditional use of moose in Unit 7, 15(a), and 15(b), by residents of Cooper Landing.

In 2014 the board rejected a proposal requesting the recognition of Cooper Landing's customary and traditional use of moose in 15(c). At that time the Southcentral Council did not support the proposal due to lack of information and testimony from residents of Cooper Landing.

In 2020 the board recognized customary and traditional use of caribou in Units 15(b) and 15(c), and use of goat in all of Unit 15 by residents of Cooper Landing. Therefore, customary and traditional use determinations have previously been made for residents of Cooper Landing, for other wildlife species in Unit 15(c), and specifically, for goat and caribou.

When conducting a customary and traditional use determination analysis, eight factors are holistically considered. These are listed starting on page 163

of the Board Book. But please note, this is not a checklist. (CNT) determinations are made for recognizing the pool of users who generally exhibit the eight factors, and not for resource management or restricting harvest.

Of note, at the fall 2013 meeting, the Southcentral Council made a recommendation to "change the way determinations are made, by making area-wide customary and traditional use determinations for all species." In June 2016, the board clarified that the eight factor analysis applied was considering customary and traditional use determination, is intended to protect subsistence use rather than limit it.

In terms of Cooper Landing's use of moose, (ADS&G), Division of Subsistence, conducted a subsistence survey in Cooper Landing in 1991. Twenty-eight percent of surveyed households hunted moose and moose were shared among residents. As part of the same study, (ADS&G) matched 50 Cooper Landing households use areas for moose during their lifetime, living in the community.

Matched community use areas should not be considered exhaustive, but do provide some useful information. Cooper Landing residents harvest resources most intensively in areas closest to the community, typical of a subsistence practice, characterized by (efficiency) of effort and cost. However, they also harvest resources throughout the Kenai Peninsula.

Areas used for moose hunting by residents of Cooper Landing included the far northern portion of Unit 15(c). Please see the map on page 166 of the Board Book. From 1987 through 2019 (unintelligible) harvest records show there were 14 hunts for moose in Unit 15(c) by residents of Cooper Landing.

The OSM conclusion is to support proposal WP 22-20 with the following justifications - the board has previously recognized Cooper Landing's customary and traditional use of other wildlife in Unit 15(c). Based on these previous determinations, Cooper Landing has already established a recognized pattern of harvest and use of wild resources in these areas, consistent with the eight factors.

Cooper Landing residents' pattern of moose hunting and harvest, generally exhibit the characteristics of customary and traditional use, as shown through subsistence surveys and data some residents hunting under state regulations. Thank you. That concludes my presentation.

Rhonda Pitka: Thank you, Hannah.

Sue Detwiler: So I believe - is Charlie back on? I got a text he was on. I'm not sure if he's on a speaker's line. I mean not Charlie, I'm sorry, Tony.

Rhonda Pitka: Oh, okay. I'm not sure. I haven't heard anything (unintelligible). The next, I believe we're on the summary of the written public comments?

Sue Detwiler: Yes.

Hannah Voorhees: Madam Chair, for the record, this is Hannah Voorhees again. Two written public comments were received on this proposal, both in opposition. The Alaska Kenai chapter of the Safari Club International stated that they do not support a subsistence priority for rural residents on road connected portions of the Kenai Peninsula.

The Alaska Outdoor Council specifically states that providing a priority to certain users on the Kenai Peninsula exacerbates conflict between federally

qualified hunters and Alaskans living in non-federally qualified areas of the state.

Rhonda Pitka: Thank you. Was that for written public comment?

Hannah Voorhees: Yes. That completes the comment.

Rhonda Pitka: Thank you very much. At this time I'd like to open the floor to public testimony on Wildlife Proposal 22-20.

Coordinator: Thank you. As a reminder, to ask a question or give a testimony, please press star 1. We do have a comment at the moment...

Rhonda Pitka: (Operator), any testimony?

Coordinator: Yes, ma'am. Just a moment.

Rhonda Pitka: Thank you.

Coordinator: First question or comment comes from Darrel. Your line is open.

Darrel Williams: Thank you. I hope everyone can hear me. My name is Darrel Williams. I'm here today representing Ninilchik Traditional Council. And I'd like to be able to speak to Wildlife Proposal 22-20 regarding (unintelligible) (CNT) for moose in Unit 15(c). And I want to be able to assist with a discussion item that was brought up from the comments from yesterday morning. I wanted to communicate our position and contribute to this discussion.

The best place to start is that this proposal had been reviewed by the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council and was voted down. We've had

several of these kinds of proposals over the years that we've had to deal with. For example, Ninilchik when we presented our information, gosh it was like 2006-2007, our (CNT) or the data supported (CNT) much, much further than what anybody even asked for.

However, when we started looking at this particular proposal, when we started looking at this idea of historical use, I remember some of the conversations we had at the Regional Advisory Council was that most of the use seemed to be indicated that it was on state land versus federal lands. And of course we know that federal lands is where subsistence takes place.

We also saw that there was some really clear delineation in use. When we look at the material that was presented to the Federal Subsistence Board, we can see that delineation in the maps on page 166 and 167. Page 166 shows the game management units and how they're laid out. And on page 167 is the results from the survey information. And it's pretty clear that it doesn't look like any harvest goes down beyond game management unit, beyond 15(b).

So that was - I remember that was a big part of that discussion that we had. There were also some questions in the analysis that was discussed at the Regional Advisory Council, where they not feel that the eight factors for support are well enough to provide the (CNT) determination. And there's also the issue of the data that was used.

And we made this argument for many, many years, where data that's generally prepared by the State of Alaska can, you know, be referred to as a stratified random sample. And really it's the weight of the stratified random sample. It's different. There are some interesting quirks on how data is managed. And it's actually - it shows up in the stuff that was submitted to the board.

If you looked at the table, on page 168, you know, it's really interesting because you have 13 years of reported harvest activity, right, with zero harvest. However, it also details that there was one moose taken. Well, I mean, you know, there's a big question there about how do you have zero harvest and then all of a sudden say oh, yes, we took a moose? And we've got to be real careful with that.

This is where the (unintelligible) weights and types of evaluation start to show up. It changes how subsistence is looked at and how it's evaluated, especially from the Federal Subsistence Board. You know, it's not really clear about how that's actually put together. So we want to look at that and - carefully, you know, when reviewing this kind of stuff. But at the same time this is another one of these reasons why we really oppose this kind of proposal.

There is an awful lot of area that is open in game management units, that is supported by the data. It seems like we're just starting to reach further and further and further into the things. You know, the example that we had, we experienced many, many years ago, was, you know, some of our data support our subsistence use in Kodiak; strong support for it; significant.

And there was an awful lot of trouble because that would - that didn't work well with how the Regional Advisories are set up and how these decisions were made. And it wasn't something that we wanted; it was just supported by the information. Now, you know, and that was really good support. But the difference here is, is that this information demonstrates zero with an implied value of one, which really doesn't - I don't think it meets that criteria very well.

You know, the other thing that I think is worth talking about as part of this discussion, is that the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council also went

through another rigorous set of proposals for Moose Pass. And they were Proposals 22-16 through 26. And this is the same kind of discussion, the same kind of evaluation where we have to do due diligence in looking at what the proposals are and where these areas are and how that's going to work.

So in short, Ninilchik Traditional Council, the tribe, we oppose the (CNT) determination. But I also want to comment about, you know, this can get to be a really slippery slope when we start doing things like this, because somebody may go to the Regional Advisory Council and not get the answer that they like. And then they call the Federal Subsistence Board and it gets brought back up and put into the process.

And, you know, there is the due diligence to the RAC for a reason. It's actually there. But when we start using weighted averages and implied numbers and things like that, it's a slippery slope, because when you have no harvest that statistically becomes harvest, it's a different problem. And we're going to end up reinventing how subsistence works and how it's measured, by making these kinds of determinations.

And I think that's a larger issue when we're looking at proposals like this. I think the wait and the review process needs to really be looked at before we pick up different proposals, because it seems to be something that somebody would like. Mr. Chairman, members of the board, thank you very much. If you have questions or comments...

Rhonda Pitka: Thank you, Mr. Williams. Just to clarify, Ninilchik opposes the tribe proposals?

Darrel Williams: Yes. That is correct.

Rhonda Pitka: Is there any other additional public testimony or questions for this (unintelligible)? Operator, did we have any additional public comments?

Coordinator: Yes. We have a question or comment from (Michael). Your line is open.

Rhonda Pitka: Thank you. Go ahead, (Michael).

(Michael): Good afternoon, Madam Chair and the board. Thank you for the chance to speak in favor of Proposal 20. I spoke about this yesterday, but I know that since then the board has heard testimony on lots of proposals. So I hope you'll forgive me if I repeat some of the points that I mentioned before. Can everyone hear me okay?

Rhonda Pitka: Yes. Please go ahead.

(Michael): Okay. Thank you. I'd like to start by pointing out that the OSM findings do support this proposal and that this proposal was also initially supported as written, by the Southcentral RAC with a majority of votes in favor to one against. After being modified by the RAC, the RAC seemed to - excuse me. After being modified the RAC seems to have voted on three proposals all at once, not taking up proposal 20 individually. They voted five votes in favor to four against, with two abstentions. And the modification effectively killed proposal 20, which the RAC had already voted strongly in favor of.

So although this resulted in a RAC recommendation against the proposal, I think that this shows the RAC was not strongly or unanimously opposed to it. In fact, it appears that they didn't vote on this proposal on its own and their votes were for support of three proposals together. It just came out this ended up being opposed. So I just don't see that as a very clear position against the proposal by the RAC.

I can tell you that from my own personal experience, Cooper Landing community members do have a history of traveling to Unit 15(c) to harvest game, including moose and shellfish, ocean fish, to gather products from the forest. And this is supported by the OSM conclusion. You know, we'd all like to provide food from the land as close as possible to home.

The nature of subsistence has always required people to travel to areas of greater abundance. And Cooper Landing residents have and do travel to Unit 15(c) to hunt and to gather. Just as Ninilchik residents travel to Cooper Landing to harvest salmon, we also travel to (Kasiwa) and Ninilchik, and (Deep) Creek and Anchor River and Homer, and other areas of the Peninsula, to hunt and to gather.

And I can tell you that myself and many of my neighbors in Cooper Landing, to travel to those areas to put up food under existing regulations. Wildlife populations fluctuate over time, and regional subsistence users should be allowed to exercise their time-honored practice of traveling within the region to feed themselves and their community members by utilizing the areas with populations of greater abundance in accordance with their customary and traditional practices.

And there does seem to be consensus on this point demonstrated by the OSM findings and their statement justifying support. I also agree with the OSM that the data does show proof of use. I also don't think the data tells the whole story. I think there's probably more moose hunting - well I'm sure there's probably more moose hunting in Unit 15(c) by Cooper Landing residents, than is reflected in the data.

I also think that many hunters hunting on a state harvest ticket might hunt several different areas. And it's possible that not all areas hunted are reported when those hunts are not successful. I also feel that the lack of a subsistence priority for Cooper Landing residents has contributed to lower participation in sections of Unit 15(c) and that additional community members would like to participate, especially during the late season hunt, if given the opportunity.

And I personally know several people who travel to (Sasamino) Lake to hunt for moose. And under current regulations, we have the opportunity for subsistence moose harvest on one side of the lake and not the other. As I mentioned yesterday, I wrote this proposal as a result of multiple conversations with Cooper Landing community members. And I can attest that many subsistence users in Cooper Landing, do support the proposal.

I'd also like to point out that Cooper Landing is a small community, and many community members are older and do not hunt for themselves anymore. So even one moose harvest is significant and can provide meat for several community members. Furthermore, a decision not to support a (CNT) determination in this case, seems out of balance.

In the past the board has approved proposals to allow subsistence harvest, fish and wildlife resources in Unit 7, by residents of Unit 15(c), sometimes despite very strong opposition from Cooper Landing community members. A case in point is a subsistence dipped net fishery at the Russian River Falls. Unit 7 is in a period of historical low moose abundance, and non-subsistence hunters from other areas besides the Kenai Peninsula, seem to be hunting here more often.

This proposal will create opportunity for subsistence harvest for community members that might not otherwise have that opportunity, particularly in the late season hunt with fewer hunters around the landscape, encouraging greater

subsistence community participation. I believe this proposal will restore some balance to the sharing of resources between communities on the Kenai Peninsula. And that board support for this proposal would show fairness to both communities in Unit 7 and 15(c).

And once again, thank you to the board for your time, and for the chance to speak today.

Rhonda Pitka: Thank you very much for your comments. Do we have any public comments, Operator?

Coordinator: No further comments over the phone at this time. As a reminder, press star 1 to ask your question or comment.

Rhonda Pitka: Okay.

Coordinator: No questions or comments over the phone at this time.

Rhonda Pitka: Oh, sorry. Go ahead.

Coordinator: No questions or comment over the phone.

Rhonda Pitka: Oh. There are none? Okay. AT this time, I'd like to ask for Regional Advisory Council recommendations.

(Gloria Strickland): Council on Reconsideration supported WP 22-20, 25(a), 27, with modification to include only those lands within 7, 15(a), and 15(b). Initially, the council supported all proposals but then realized that reconsideration was necessary to address the inconsistency between the Council (CNT) to recommendation, for Moose Pass, and those for Cooper Landing. As with the

decision on Moose Pass (CNT) and WP 22-16, plus it provides resources needed by Cooper Landing subsistence users.

The Council supported granting (CNT) for Cooper Landing in Units 7, 15(a), and 15(b), but felt that the data showing proof of use did not support granting C, G, and Unit 15(c). The Council found that the combination of these proposals were a little confusing, but did eventually support WP 22-20, 25(a), 27, to include only those lands in Units 7, 15(a), and 15(b). The vote passed 5 to 4 with two abstentions. Thank you.

Rhonda Pitka: Thank you. And I believe Chairman Christianson is back on the line. So please, take it away. And maybe he's not on the line again. Okay. So just to clarify, (Gloria), the South Central Regional Advisory Council supports...

Coordinator: Mr. Christianson is on the line.

Rhonda Pitka: ...WP 22-20? Is that correct?

(Gloria Strickland): I would like you to have DeAnna Perry answer that question. She's online.

Rhonda Pitka: Oh, okay. Because in our Board Book it says opposed. So I just wanted to make sure that we're clear on that.

DeAnna Perry: Madam Chair, this is DeAnna Perry, Council Coordinator for the South Central Council.

Anthony Christianson: They were having problems with my line being muted. So I appreciate everybody (unintelligible) this one. Thank you. So DeAnna, you have the floor.

DeAnna Perry: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I could clarify that, Rhonda. When these proposals came before the South Central Council, they came combined - 20, 25(a), and 27. When the Council gave its recommendation it supported that group of proposals with modifications, to include only those lands in 7, 15(a), and 15(b). So in a sense, it actually opposed 20 because 20 only addresses Unit 15(c). Does that help?

Rhonda Pitka: Yes. Thank you. I appreciate that.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any other questions from the board? All right. Thank you. Hearing none, any - where does that put us on the agenda, Sue?

Sue Detwiler: Next would be Tribal Corporation comments. Alaskan ANCSA Corporation comments.

Robbin Lavine: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the board. This is Robbin Lavine, standing in for Tribal Liaison Orville Lind. There were no comments or recommendations during the consultation. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you, Robbin. Next will be State Liaison.

Man: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the record ADF&G is neutral when it comes to the eligibility to participate in federal subsistence hunting opportunities. I will say though that we do encourage that additional subsistence harvest and use research for Kenai Peninsula residents be conducted to provide adequate data when assessing subsistence harvest needs before any (CNT) use determinations are made. Thank you, sir.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any questions for the state? Hearing none, we'll go onto the Interagency Staff Committee recommendation.

Robbin Lavine: Yes. Hello again, Mr. Chair. This is Robbin Lavine. For Wildlife Proposal 22-20 the Interagency Staff Committee provided the standard comment. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Opening up the floor for discussion or a board motion. No discussion - the floor is open for a motion.

Sara Boario: (Unintelligible).

Anthony Christianson: Somebody's breaking up there. The floor is open for a motion.

Sara Boario: Mr. Chair?

Anthony Christianson: Yes. You have the floor.

Sara Boario: Mister...

Anthony Christianson: Whoever is trying to be recognized keeps breaking up. Sue, can you hear me on this one?

Sue Detwiler: Yes. I can hear you. And I can also hear whoever is trying to speak is breaking up.

Anthony Christianson: Yes. So I believe this is time for board action. Somebody is trying to be recognized at this time. I'll call again for a board motion on this.

Sue Detwiler: Mr. Chair, I believe it might be Sara Boario trying to call in. Okay. So yes, I understand Sara Boario is trying to ask questions, but she can't get through. So

we need to figure out a way to get her question asked and - so that - so she can hear the answer. So if someone could...

Coordinator: This is the operator. If she...

Sue Detwiler: (unintelligible) that question, we'll get it out on the floor. Mr. Chair, may I read the question? I'm seeing it on my screen here.

Anthony Christianson: Yes. Please, Sue, do.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. The question is from board member Sara Boario, Fish & Wildlife Service. The question is, is Mr. Williams with Ninilchik Traditional Council related to the data that was included in the analysis for the decision-making of the eight factors that show use patterns? Can OSM respond to Mr. Williams with respect to the data used in the analysis? And that is question one. I can read that question again, while folks are pulling their thoughts together on this one.

Mr. Williams, with NT - I'm sorry, was somebody trying to interject there?

Hannah Voorhees: Yes, Sue, this is Hannah. And I'm looking forward to responding, but I'm not sure I understand the question completely. And I was hoping if maybe member Boario could clarify what she's looking for. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: I'm also seeing a message that member Boario is also trying to join in on a different phone now. So maybe that connection will be better. So maybe there was another board question or comment in the interim, if somebody wanted to jump in.

Anthony Christianson: Yes. The floor is open for board deliberation or discussion as we wait for Sara.

Hannah Voorhees: And through (unintelligible) this is Hannah, again.

Anthony Christianson: You have the floor, Hannah.

Hannah Voorhees: Thank you. So I will try to just give an overview of the data that we use when making - when doing analysis for (CNT) determinations. The primary data source that we'll go to is subsistence surveys that are conducted by ADF&G. Those are surveys conducted approximately every ten years for a community, in which we - that's a separate term harvest reporting. It has - a very high percentage of households in a community are surveyed.

And from that data we are able to see - we're able to develop a good sense of what the overall harvest patterns are for a community; what percentage of households might attempt to harvest, and actually harvest a particular species. And what percent is using and sharing species. Those surveys often also include key informant interviews that might give us a picture of long term use for resources in that community. A traditional means of harvest and preserving, patterns of seasonal harvest, etc.

And I can go through the eight factors, but I don't want to necessarily belabor the point. But another feature of those surveys is that we often get search and use areas for a particular species. So there's not data that shows, you know, within a certain time span where people have looked for a species and have harvested a species. And that's not considered exhaustive, but it is very useful for this kind of analysis. I'm happy to answer further if that hasn't hit the nail on the head. Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you for that discussion. I believe Sara's on now as well.

Sara Boario: Yes. Mr. Chair, and Hannah, my apologies for the technical difficulties on my end. I think I heard some of your answer. I apologize, Hannah, Mr. Chair I have another question; maybe that will be a little clearer, if I may.

Anthony Christianson: You have the floor, Sara.

Sara Boario: I understand in 2014 the board voted down something similar and due to a lack of information and testimony, and I was wondering if there was new information since that time. And maybe Hannah, you already answered that, but I didn't catch all of it if you did.

Hannah Voorhees: Through the Chair, thank you, member Boario. And so the primary subsistence survey that was used in this analysis dates to 1991. That's when the study year was. And there hasn't been any significant new data since 2014. There is I believe one more year of data on harvest reported to the state, for moose, in 15(c). But other than that, no, no new significant data. Thank you.

Sara Boario: Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Any other board questions or discussion? We'll open up the floor of board actions.

Sara Boario: Mr. Chair, Fish & Wildlife Service.

Anthony Christianson: Yes. You have the floor.

Sara Boario: I move to adopt 22-20. Following a second, I will explain why I oppose the motion. My motion.

Charlie Brower: Second. Public member Brower.

Sara Boario: Thank you. I recognize - am I still there? I apologize.

Anthony Christianson: Yes. You're still on.

Sara Boario: Yes. I recognize that the board has a history of inclusiveness on (CNT) proposals and the OSM analysis does show a history of use for residents in 15(c) for Cooper Landing. And deference provided from the RAC, the South Central RAC citing insufficient evidence. And while new significant data would be useful, we want to provide - excuse me, and the lack of insufficient evidence or new information since the last vote. And I oppose.

Anthony Christianson: And the floor is open for discussion, comments, questions from the board. Call for the question.

Man: Question.

Anthony Christianson: Question has been called. Sue, do you want to do a roll call on this one, please?

Sue Detwiler: Yes. The motion is to adopt WP 22-20. I will start out with the maker of the motion, Sara Boario, Fish & Wildlife Service.

Sara Boario: No.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Sarah Creachbaum, National Park Service.

Sarah Creachbaum: Yes.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Gene Peltola, BIA.

(Brian Shen): Hello, Sue. This is (Glen Shen) and Mr. Peltola has asked me to sit in for him for this vote.

Sue Detwiler: Okay.

(Glen Shen): The BIA votes to oppose this motion, for the reasons articulated by board member from the Fish & Wildlife Service. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you, (Glen). Thomas Heinlein, BLM?

Tom Heinlein: Yes. Adopt.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

David Schmid: The Forest Service will oppose the motion as - with the justification provided by the Fish & Wildlife Service.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Thank you. Public member, Rhonda Pitka.

Rhonda Pitka: I oppose based on the justification by the Fish & Wildlife Service. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you, Rhonda. Public member, Charlie Brower.

Charlie Brower: I oppose for the same reason. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Thank you. And finally, Chair Christianson.

Anthony Christianson: I oppose, as stated.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Thank you. So the motion fails, 6 to - or fails 2 yeas, 6 nos.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you, Sue. We'll all go ahead and have this call on mute to call on the staff for the next proposal. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. That would be Wildlife Proposal 22-25(b). And I'm not sure who that would be. Brian Ubelaker presenting that one.

Brian Ubelaker: Correct. Hello. Good afternoon, Mr. Chair and members of the board. For the record, my name is Brian Ubelaker. I'm a wildlife biologist with the Office of Subsistence Management. I'll be presenting a summary of the analysis for Wildlife Proposal, WP 22-25(b), which was submitted by (Michael Adams) of Cooper Landing, and WP 22-26(b), which was submitted by (Lisa Lopetski) of Moose Pass. The analysis begins on page 958 of your meeting books.

Both of these proposals request that a federal subsistence cheap season be established in Unit 7. Proposal WP 22-26(b) asks for just that. While proposal WP 22-25(b) specifically requests establishing a season of August 10th through September 20th with a harvest limit of one doll sheep. And that the Kenai Wildlife Refuge Manager be delegated authority to open and close the season in consultation with ADF&G and the Chair of the South Central Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council.

The proponents state these changes are needed to provide federal subsistence opportunity to harvest sheep in Unit 7. And that there is a history of sheep harvest by rural residents of Unit 7. The proponents further state that the requested change would provide opportunity to rural residents of Unit 7, to

engage in consistent sheep hunting and provide a meaningful subsistence priority.

Historically, sheep hunting has occurred on the Kenai Peninsula for as long as it has been inhabited. However, sheep hunting was closed in 1942 due to a conservation concern. Since then sheep hunting has changed little to the recognized regulations of today. In 1959 a 3/4 curl harvest limit was established. Then in 1964 the season was extended and a 7/8 curl harvest limit was established. In 1989 the harvest limit was changed to a full curl.

Sheep populations have recovered enough by 2016 for the Board of Game to establish a non-resident and a youth only hunt. No federal sheep hunts existed on the Kenai Peninsula prior to 2020 when WP 20-24 established a federal sheep hunt for Unit 15 residents of Ninilchik. The Kenai Peninsula sheep population experienced a sharp decline in the early 20th Century. The population then increased through 1968 to 2190 individuals before declining to 1600 sheep in 1992.

There has been an estimated population decline of 80% since the 1960s. The 2011 to 2020 population estimate in the Kenai Peninsula, ranged from 379 to 644 individuals. As of 2015 the subpopulation estimates for the Kenai Peninsula, excuse me, as of 2015 the subpopulation estimates were 163 for the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge, 165 for the Resurrection Trail subpopulation, 77 for the Grant Lake subpopulation, and 50 for the Cooper Mountain and Crescent Lake subpopulations.

It is not believed that harvest is limiting population but rather results of climate change and habitat loss. As stated before, historically there has never been a federal sheep hunt in Unit 7. Federally qualified subsistence users have

had to compete with sport hunters for a limited number of state sheep permits, which currently total 9.

A full curl management plan has been in place since 1989. Average harvest from 2010 to 2019 is 3.9 sheep, while from 2000 to 2009 the average was 6.9 sheep. Since 2000 the number of sheep hunters on the Kenai Peninsula, had decreased by roughly half. Reported harvests over the last ten years has broken down to 10.2% nonresident harvest, 15.7% rural resident, and 74.1% non-rural resident.

Other alternatives considered included setting a harvest limit of 3/4 curl horn or greater by federal drawing permit. And another was to delegate authority to an in season manager who would set harvest limits, sex restrictions, and quotas. If this proposal is adopted, the established federal sheep hunt would provide additional opportunity to federally qualified subsistence users.

However, declining sheep populations are susceptible to over-harvest if not managed carefully. Therefore, federal drawing permits should be established within the harvest framework used by the state. In season management should be delegated to the Seward District Ranger, to set harvest quotas, number of permits, and any needed permit conditions.

The OSM conclusion is to support WP 22-25(b) with modification to establish a federal drawing permit hunt for sheep in Unit 7 with a harvest limit of one ram with full curl horn or larger, and to delegate authority to the Seward District Ranger of the Chugach National Forest, and to take no action on WP 22-26(b).

That concludes my summary. I would be happy to answer any questions anyone might have.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any questions? If not, we'll move onto summary of public comment.

Brian Ubelaker: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, is that somebody trying to ask a question, or was it just background noise?

Anthony Christianson: That was me saying the floor was open for questions. And if there was none, we can move on to summary of public comment.

Brian Ubelaker: Okay. Brian Ubelaker, OSM. The only submitted written public comment was one letter in opposition. And that letter came from the Kenai chapter of the Safari Club International. And they were opposed because they do not support any rural determinations or subsistence priorities for the road connected Kenai Peninsula.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. I appreciate that. We'll move on to the - open up the lines for any public who wants to comment on this proposal. Thank you, Operator.

Coordinator: Yes, sir. If you would like to make a public comment please press star followed by 1. Please make sure that your phone is unmuted, and record your name when prompted. Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you.

Coordinator: Comment comes from (Michael). Your line is open.

(Michael): Thank you. I'd like to once again, thank the board for the opportunity to provide testimony. I'm testifying in support of proposal 25(b). I strongly

support a subsistence priority on sheep in Unit 7, for the Cooper Landing community. However, in consideration of the current sheep population in Unit 7, I think it is appropriate to modify the proposal.

While I do not feel that the modified language provides for a subsistence priority, it does provide for a subsistence opportunity. I believe a 3/4 curl regulation would provide a subsistence priority and would support that modification instead. But I understand the current conservation concerns for sheep and I trust the discretion of the board.

I believe that any subsistence hunt should take into account the conservation of the sheep population and harvest opportunities, should err on the side of caution, so that opportunity will continue to exist in the future. I would fully expect the delegating authority to manage this hunt in such a manner as to protect the resource for future generations while providing opportunity when possible.

And I hope the board will be very conscious of the language adopted so that the (minute) you will have the ability to manage the hunt with a conservation priority including the ability to cancel or close the hunt necessary. If the board at their discretion, decides to wait until a future cycle, to establish a subsistence season in light of current population concerns, I would also support that decision.

However, I believe that if the population is considered healthy enough for a state season to occur, a subsistence opportunity should also exist. Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you.

Coordinator: There are no other...

Anthony Christianson: Any questions? Any other public on the line, Operator? Thank you for calling in, Michael.

Coordinator: No, sir. There is not. No other public comment at this time.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you, Operator. We'll go ahead and move onto the Tribal Consultation, Native Liaison.

Robbin Lavine: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Robbin Lavine standing in for Tribal Liaison Orville Lind. There were no comments or recommendations during the consultation. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you, Robin. Moving onto the ISC recommendation. Or RAC chair, sorry. Sorry, RAC. Regional Advisory Council.

(Gloria Strickland): Council reported it with OSM modification of one ram with full curl horn or larger by a federal drawing permit, and to provide for delegated authority. The Council believes that a federal drawing permit is warranted because of the significant interest in hunting sheep in Unit 7. There are a few permits given by the state and under ANILCA. A priority needs to be extended to the federal subsistence user.

With the declines in sheep population in recent years, establishing a preference for rural residents to meet their subsistence needs and delegating authority to a manager to protect discreet sheep populations, will provide the priority and additional opportunity for federally qualified subsistence users. Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any question from the board? Hearing none, we'll move onto the Interagency Staff Committee recommendation.

Robbin Lavine: Mr. Chair, this is Robbin. Did we miss state liaison response? Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Yes, we did. Sorry about that, Mr. Mulligan. State Liaison (unintelligible). I'm operating off memory today. So I think my computer just crashed on me, sorry.

Ben Mulligan: No worries, Mr. Chair. If you don't mind, did we miss the - oh, never mind, we did get the RAC. My apologies. I'm going off of memory myself. So for the record, Alaska Department of Fish & Game opposes this proposal. Any additional harvest jeopardizes the population of doll sheep in the area. If a federal season is established, current harvest restrictions, only one ram, full curl horn ram with both horns broken, or a ram at least eight years old, as determined by counting annual horn rings, should be maintained.

Harvest should only be allowed in areas where a harvestable surplus is available as indicated by an open state season. Allowing federally qualified users to hunt within boundaries of closed areas could lead to these hunts never again being opened under a state permit system and would disrupt the current state management system. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any questions for the state? All right. Hearing none, we'll move on. Thank you.

Robbin Lavine: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the record again, this is Robbin Lavine, Policy Coordinator and Interagency Staff Committee Chair. For Wildlife Proposals

22-25(b) and 26(b), the Interagency Staff Committee provided the standard comments. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you, Robbin. I appreciate that. I'll open up the floor now for board discussion; deliberation. The board - the floor is open for board action.

David Schmid: Mr. Chair, Forest Service.

Anthony Christianson: Yes, Dave. You have the floor.

David Schmid: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move to adopt WP 22-25(b)/26(b) as modified by OSM, to establish a federal drawing permit hunt for sheep in Unit 7, with a harvest limit of one ram with full curl horn or larger, and delegate authority to the Seward District Ranger of the Chugach National Forest, to close the season, set the harvest quota and number of permits to be issued and any needed permit conditions via delegation of authority letter. Following a second, I will explain why I support my motion.

Robbin Lavine: Second.

Man: Second.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. There's a motion been made and seconded. Floor is open for discussion.

David Schmid: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Chair, my justification is based on the analysis by OSM as modified, and the comments given by the South Central Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. Currently, there is no federal subsistence season for sheep in Unit 7, and federally qualified subsistence

users must rely on the limited number of state drawing permits in Unit 7, or use a harvest ticket in Unit 7 remainder in order to harvest sheep.

Establishing a federal sheep season in Unit 7, would provide additional opportunity for federally qualified subsistence users consistent with Section 804 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, which calls for priority consumptive use of fish and wildlife populations by rural Alaska residents.

In addition, delegating authority to the Seward District Ranger of the Chugach National Forest to open and close the season, set harvest quota, determine the number of permits to be issued in any needed permit conditions would be the most efficient way to implement the proposed federal sheep season. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you, Dave. The floor is open for discussion; questions. Call for the question.

David Schmid: Question.

Anthony Christianson: All right. Well, question has been called. We'll go ahead and do roll call on this one, Sue. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Will do. The motion is to adopt as modified by OSM. We'll start with Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

David Schmid: Yes, thanks. I support the motion that I - with the justification I just provided.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Thomas Heinlein, BLM.

Tom Heinlein: BLM supports.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. BIA, (Glen) or Gene?

(Glen Shen): Yes, Sue. This is (Glen Shen) from BIA. I'll be casting the vote for Regional Director, Gene Peltola. And the BIA votes to support the Forest Service's motion, which also concurs with the recommendation from the South Central Regional Advisory Council. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Thank you. Sara Boario, Fish & Wildlife Service.

Sara Boario: Fish & Wildlife Service supports.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Sarah Creachbaum, Park Service.

Sarah Creachbaum: National Park Service supports.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Public member Rhonda Pitka.

Rhonda Pitka: I support in deference to the Regional Advisory Council. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Public member, Charlie Brower. All right. Maybe on mute or trying to get back in. Chair, Anthony Christianson.

Anthony Christianson: Yes. I support.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Charlie Brower, did you come back on?

Charlie Brower: Yes. I'm back on. I had to step out real quick.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. We are taking a vote on WP 22-25(b), 26(b), and the motion to adopt as modified by OSM has been made and all seven members who have voted so far, have voted in the - in favor of the proposal. So yours is the last vote, Mr. Brower.

Charlie Brower: I support.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Thank you. So the motion passes unanimously. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you, Sue. We'll go ahead and call out staff to move onto the next proposal.

Sue Detwiler: That would be WP 22-28 and 29, and that would be Mr. Ubelaker I believe, presenting that.

Brian Ubelaker: Yes. Good afternoon again, Mr. Chair and members of the board. For the record, my name is Brian Ubelaker. And I am a wildlife biologist with OSM. I'll be presenting a summary for the analysis of Wildlife Proposal WP 22-28, which was submitted by (Michael Adams) of Cooper Landing, and WP 22-29, which was submitted by (Seth Wilson) of (Glen Allen). And this analysis begins on page 983 of your meeting books.

Both of these proposals, excuse me, both of these proposals request to extend the length - Unit 7 remainder from September 20th to September 25th. The proponents state the federal subsistence season should not be more restrictive than the state season, which currently closes five days later than the federal season. And that this proposal would allow more opportunity for the participation by federally qualified subsistence users.

Relevant regulatory history includes the Board of Game adoption in 2015 where the moose season was shortened and shifted to later from August 20th through September 20th, to September 1st through September 25th. This caused the seasonal closing dates between federal regulation, to be misaligned. Then in 2018 the Board of Game established the 50-inch plus or three or more (brow) time harvest limit.

A unit-wide survey and population estimate has never been conducting in Unit 7. But the population trend is decidedly declining and has been since the '70s. The most recent trend count conducted in Unit 7 has a bull to cow ratio of 25 to 100, which is within ADF&G's management objective. Moose harvest in Unit 7 has been declining since 2000, with the average harvest from 2015 to 2019 being 20 moose per year.

Another alternative to consider was suggested by the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge. It stated that since the current federal season is longer than the state season, the season opener should be shifted from August 10th to August 20th, but still maintain the proposed close date of September 25th. While this would shorten the overall federal season by five days, it would move it closer to when the (rut) occurs, which should allow for more, excuse me, which should allow for hunter success more like current levels.

Plus federally qualified subsistence users would still be able to hunt without state competition for 12 days at the beginning of the season. Adopting the proposal and extending the season would allow federally qualified subsistence users greater access to the resource. It would also allow for the alignment of federal and state seasons.

Therefore, it OSM's conclusion to support Proposal WP 22-28 and to take no action on WP 22-29. And that is the end of my summary. If anybody has any questions I would be happy to answer them.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any questions for staff? Thank you. We'll go ahead to move on to any public comment. Thank you.

Brian Ubelaker: Yes, Mr. Chair. Brian Ubelaker once again. There was one letter submitted in opposition to this proposal, and it also came from the Kenai chapter of Safari Club International, who are opposed because they do not support any rural determinations or subsistence priorities for the road connected Kenai Peninsula. Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Operator, at this time if there's anybody who would like to be recognized online, this is time for public comment online. Thank you.

Coordinator: Thank you, sir. If you would like to make a public comment, again that's star 1. Please unmute your phone and record your name when prompted. Thank you. First public comment comes from (Michael). Your line is open.

(Michael): Thank you. I'm speaking in support of proposals 28 and 30. These proposals seek to provide additional opportunity for subsistence moose hunting in Units 7 and 15. We just heard I guess, the existing regulation compared to the proposed regulation. And I personally support both proposals as written, and believe that this will provide a meaningful subsistence priority.

The amended proposals will eliminate the first ten days of the existing subsistence season. While I would prefer the proposals to pass as originally written, I do think that the amended proposals do increase the opportunity in

comparison to the existing regulation. In addition to my personal position to these proposals, I've also been asked to read the following statement on behalf of the Cooper Landing Fish & Game Advisory Committee.

Would it be all right if I read the proposals for both - or excuse me, the comment for both proposal 28 and 30 now, or would it be more appropriate for me to call back for the comment for proposal 30?

Anthony Christianson: Thank you.

(Michael): I was asking a question to the board, if that's all right. I was wondering if it would be more appropriate to read the Fish & Game Advisory Committee statement for proposal 30 separately, or would it be all right to read the statement for proposals 28 and 30 right now?

Anthony Christianson: Well if you plan on coming back they're all pertinent. I mean if you - if you're going to come back and do it then, or you can do it now. They're all related.

(Michael): Okay. So on behalf of the Cooper Landing Fish & Game Advisory Committee, I've been asked to read the following statement. The Cooper Landing Fish & Game Advisory Committee unanimously supports proposal WP 20-28 as amended by the South Central Regional Advisory Council, to include the following language, with modification of season dates as August 20 to September 25th.

And the Cooper Landing Fish & Game Advisory Committee unanimously supports proposal WP 20-30 as amended by the South Central Regional Advisory Council to include the following language - with modification of season dates as August 20th through September 25th. Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Thank you for calling in. Operator, are there any other public online who would like to be recognized at this time?

Coordinator: Not at this time, sir.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. That concludes the public testimony part of this. We'll next call on our Tribal ANCSA Corporation Consultation.

Sue Detwiler: Mr. Chair, actually I think it would be RAC recommendations before the tribal...

Anthony Christianson: Oh, sorry about that, Sue. Yes. I'm just - the sun is shining down here, so it keeps making my head jump ahead. Sorry. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Sorry.

(Gloria Strickland): Council supports with modification of season as August 20th through September 25th. The Council believes this proposal as modified, provides a priority to federally qualified subsistence users, by having an extended hunting season. Although this would result in ten days eliminated from the beginning of the season, taking from August 10th to August 20th, there will still be ample opportunity for subsistence users, harvest before their state season opens.

The addition of extra days toward the end of this season, during prime hunting time with cooler temperatures, is better for subsistence users having harvesting - users harvesting meat. Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any questions for the Regional Advisory Council?
Hearing none, we'll move on to the Tribal Consultation.

Robbin Lavine: Hello, Mr. Chair, members of the board, this is Robbin Lavine. And I have been standing in for Tribal Liaison Orville Lind. I believe Orville has rejoined us on the line?

Orville Lind: Yes, Robbin. I'm on now. Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Welcome back, Orville. You have the floor.

Orville Lind: And this is for proposal...

Woman: 28/29.

Orville Lind: Okay. 28/29? We had no comments or recommendation on that proposal.
Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you, Orville. And then we'll to the next one, the state liaison.

Ben Mulligan: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the record, ADF&G opposes this proposal as federal subsistence regulations already provide a significant advantage for federally qualified users over non-federally qualified users. Federal subsistence regulations in GMU-7 provide for an extra 17 days on the front end of the season already. And so we feel that that's enough of a priority already within the existing regulations. Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Moving on to Interagency Staff Committee comments?

Robbin Lavine: Yes, hello, Mr. Chair. This is Robbin Lavine. For Wildlife Proposals 22-28 and 29, the Interagency Staff Committee provides the standard comment. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. We'll open the floor now for board discussion and deliberation. Floor is open for board action.

David Schmid: Mr. Chair, Forest Service.

Anthony Christianson: Yes, Dave. You have the floor.

David Schmid: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move to adopt WP 22-28 and 29 as modified by the South Central Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council, to shift the moose hunting season in Unit 7 remainder, to August 20th through September 25th. Following a second, I will explain why I support my motion.

Charlie Brower: Second.

Woman: Second.

Charlie Brower: Public member.

David Schmid: Thank you, Charlie. My justification is based on the comments and modification by the South Central Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. Recently, moose harvest in Unit 7 has decreased during the early part of the season, because of warming climatic conditions that make meat spoilage more likely.

Extending the shifting moose season in Unit 7 remainder until later in the fall will continue to provide for subsistence priority and at the same time, enable

harvest when the weather is more suitable for preservation of meat. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you, Dave. The floor is open for discussion; comments. Call for the question.

Woman: Question.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Question has been called. We'll go ahead and do roll call again, on this, Sue. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Thank you. The motion is to adopt WP 22-28 and 29 as modified by the South Central Regional Advisory Council. We'll start with the maker of the motion, Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

David Schmid: Thank you. The Forest Service supports in deference to the RAC and with the justification I provided.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Thomas Heinlein, BLM.

Tom Heinlein: BLM supports as modified by and in deference to the RAC.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. BIA. (Glen), on behalf of Gene?

(Glen Shen): Yes. The BIA votes to support as modified by the Regional Advisory Council and as articulated by Mr. Schmid from the Forest Service. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Great, thank you. Sara Boario, Fish and Wildlife Service?

Sara Boario: Fish and Wildlife Service supports.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Sarah Creachbaum?

Sarah Creachbaum: National Park Service supports.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Public member Rhonda Pitka?

Rhonda Pitka: I support the reference to the Regional Advisory Council and staff support.
Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Public member Charlie Brower?

Chaqrlye Brower: Support as stated.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Chair Christianson?

Anthony Christianson: I support as stated.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Motion passes unanimously.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Sue. And we'll go ahead and take a ten minute break until 3 o'clock, ten minute break. Thank everybody yes so we'll make it a brief one, but a ten minute break. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Conference has resumed.

Anthony Christianson: Welcome back Sue. And we'll go ahead and just make sure we have a quorum, whenever you're ready. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Okay, thank you. I understand we have everybody in listening mode and in the speakers' room on the line listening now so I just want to confirm with the court reporter that we're now on the record?

(Tina): I am, go ahead.

Sue Detwiler: Okay, thank you. I'll do a quick call? Sarah Creachbaum, Park Service?

Sarah Creachbaum: Hi Sue. I'm here.

Sue Detwiler: Great. Tom Heinlein BLM?

Tom Heinlein: Present.

Sue Detwiler: Sara Boario, Fish and Wildlife Service?

Sara Boario: Present.

Sue Detwiler: Dave Schmid, Forest Service?

Dave Schmid: I'm here Sue.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. BIO, Glenn or Gene?

Glenn Chen: Yes, Sue this is Glenn Chen. I'll continue to represent Gene this afternoon.
Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. All right, thank you. Public member Rhonda Pitka?

Rhonda Pitka: Hi, I'm here.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Public member Charlie Brower? And Chair Anthony Christianson I heard you on so it looks like you have seven or eight members online right now.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Sue. We'll go ahead and get started with the next proposal. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Okay, that would be Wildlife Proposal. WP22-30 and 31. And that would be Brian Ubelaker.

Brian Ubelaker: Thank you Sue. Good afternoon again Mr. Chair and members of the board. For the Record Brian Ubelaker, Wildlife Biologist with OSM.

And I'll be presenting you a summary of the analysis for Wildlife Proposal WP22-30 which was submitted by (Michael Adams) at Cooper Landing and WP22-31 which was submitted by Chugach Regional Resources Commission. And this analysis begins on Page 994 in the reading books.

These proposals request to extend the length of the moose hunting season and Unit 15 from September 20 to September 25. The proponents state the federal subsistence season should not be more restrictive than the state hunting season, which is currently open five days later than the federal season and would allow for more opportunity for participation by federally qualified subsistence users.

In 2014 establishment by the Federal Subsistence Board of the Cow Moose Hunt in Unit 15C. In 2015, the Board of Game aligned all state moose seasons in Unit 15 to September 1 through the 25th with the harvest limit of 50 inch

plus or four or more brow tines. They also established a non-resident general season in Unit 15C at this time

Then in 2019 the Board of Game changed harvest limits to 50-inch plus or three or more brow times. They also established a general season hunt and 15B and a resident any bull draw permit at the same time.

State management objectives for the moose population in Unit 15 include in Sub-Unit 15A, to maintain a post hunting bull cow ratio of 25 to 100, in Sub-Unit 15B West to maintain a bull cow ratio of 20 to 25 to 100 for maximum hunting opportunity, in 15B East to maintain a bull to cow ratio of 40 to 100 for maximum harvest of large antlered bulls and in 15C to maintain a bull to cow ratio of 20 to 25 to 100 for a healthy productive population.

Units 15A and C went under intensive management from 2012 to 2017. And then the population objective 15A at that time was 3000 to 3500 with a sustainable harvest of 180 to 350 animals.

Unit 15C's population objective was the same (unintelligible) 3500 but with the harvest goal of 200 to 350. In Unit 15A bull to cow ratios have been above state management objectives since 2012, but for the same timeframe population estimates have been below management objectives. In Unit 15B there has been no population census since 2001, but all metrics indicate the population is increasing.

Unit 15C has a bull to cow ratio at or above the management objective and has been since 2002. Moose harvest in Unit 15 has been increasing since harvest restrictions were lifted for 2013.

Federal harvest has averaged 12 months per year over the last five years, which equates to 4.4% of the total harvest. Since the establishment of the cow hunt in 2014 cows of averaged 27.2% of the federal harvest.

Another alternative considered was the same as for the last proposal, 22 - WP22, 28 and 29. This was just put forth by the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge, and they suggested to shift the start date from August 10 to August 20, but to maintain the proposed end date of September 25 which would shorten the season by five days, but would move closer to the red. And federally qualified subsistence users would still have 12 days at the beginning of the season to hunt without competition from sport hunters.

If this proposal were to be adopted the resulting extension of moose season would allow more federally qualified assistance users greater access to the resource. It would also align federal and state closing dates.

Therefore, OSM's conclusion is to support proposal WP22-30 and take no action on WP22-31. Thank you and I would be happy to answer any questions anyone may have.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you any questions for the board? Thank you for that. Now we'll take any public comments that you may have received? Thank you.

Brian Ubelaker: Yes, Mr. Chair. There was one letter submitted in opposition to this proposal, same as for the last, it was from the Kenai Chapter of Safari Club International. And they were opposed because they do not support any rural determinations or subsistence priorities for the road connected Kenai Peninsula. Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you very much. And with that we'll open it up to the public online. Operator, if anybody online would like to be recognized at this time this is their time to speak?

Coordinator: Thank you. If you would like to make a public please press Star 1. One moment please. We do have a public comment from Darrel. Your line is open.

Darrel Williams: Hi everyone, Mr, Chairman, members of the board. My name is Darrel Williams with the Ninilchik Traditional Council.

We oppose this proposal for a lot of the same reasons that we opposed Wildlife Proposal 22-20. And there's also a little bit of a problem because if we didn't approve the C&T for 15C for Cooper Landing it would be really difficult to include - or to be able to prove a bag limit in 15C with proposal 22-30.

And our concerns are the same reasons I stated before. And just for the sake of saving some time for everyone I'd just like to refer to the comments made earlier.

I will say that the analysis in this proposal looks like it's aggregated where we're talking about Units 15A, B and C other than just Unit 15C which was a large part of the discussion that we had on Wildlife Proposal 22-20. So with that said we propose - we opposed the proposal.

Coordinator: Once again to make a public...

Darrel Williams.: Thank you.

Coordinator: ...comment please press Star 1.

Anthony Christianson: Anyone else operator?

Coordinator: I am showing no further public comments.

Anthony Christianson: All right, thank you. We'll move on to the tribal consultation process.

((Crosstalk))

Orville Lind: Chair, I think it's Regional Advisory Council recommendations.

Anthony Christianson: Oh yes it is. Thank you Orville. A Regional Advisory Council recommendation?

Woman: Council supported with modifications of seasons as August 20 to September 25. The council voted to align the same season to Unit 15.

And it previously recommended for Unit 7 for the same reasons to provide a preference to the subsistence user adding hunting opportunities during the time when temperatures are better for meat preservation. Climate change in recent years is a factor in considering extensions of seasons to accommodate users of the resource.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any questions for the RAC? Hearing none we'll move on. Orville Tribal Native Liaison?

Orville Lind: Thank you Mr. Chair, Federal Substance Board members, Orville Lind, Native liaison. During the consultation period we had no comments or recommendations on that proposal. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Orville. We'll move on to the state liaison.

Ben Mulligan: Thank you Mr. Chair. For the record Alaska Department of Fish and Game opposes this proposal as federal subsistence regulations already provide a significant advantage for federally qualified users over non-federally qualified users.

Federal hunting regulations for federally qualified users in GMU 15 are currently less restrictive than state hunting regulations. The hunting season for federally qualified users in GMU 15 begin 22 days before the general state season and 12 days before the bull only season for 15A and B.

Additionally federal - federally qualified users have a late season that runs from October 20 to November 10 for an additional 22 days, which means federally qualified users currently have over a month of additional time to hunt moose not available to non-federally qualified users under the state's hunting season.

Federally qualified users also have a more relaxed bag limit as they are able to harvest a fork antlered bull or a cow during the first portion of the season and the forked bull during the late season in addition animals available for harvest under state regulations. Thank you sir.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any questions for the state? Hearing none Interagency Staff Committee recommendation?

Robbin LaVine: Yes. Thank you Mr Chair. This is Robbin LaVine. For Wildlife Proposal 22-31 the Interagency Staff Committee provided the standard comment. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Robbin. That opens up the floor for board discussion or deliberation. Hearing none that opens the floor for board action on this proposal. Thank you.

Sara Boario: Mr. Chair, Fish and Wildlife Service. I move to adopt Wildlife Proposal 22-30 as modified by the South Central Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council to shift the moose hunting season in Unit 15 to August 20 to September 25 to align with the Unit 7 season and to take no action on Wildlife Proposal 2231. Following a second I will explain why I support my motion.

Man: Second.

Sara Boario: My justification is based on the comments given by the South Central Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council and the OSM analysis. Recently moose harvest in Unit 15 has decreased during the early part of the season because of warming climate conditions that make meat spoilage more likely.

Extending and shifting the moose hunting season in Unit 15 until later in the fall will continue to provide for subsistence priority and at the same time enable harvest when the weather is more suitable for preservation of meat.

In addition, aligning Unit 15 moose season with the Unit 7 season will create less user confusion. Thank you. Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any further board discussion, deliberation? Hearing none we'll call for the question?

Man: Question.

Anthony Christianson: Question has been called. Roll call please Sue.

Sue Detwiler: Yes. The motion is to adopt WP22-30 and 31 as modified by the South Central Council. And I'll start with the maker of the motion Sarah Boario, Fish and Wildlife Service?

Sara Boario: Fish and Wildlife Service supports.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Gene - sorry BIA, Glenn Chen?

Glenn Chen: Yes Sue, the BIA board supports with the modification provided by the South Central Regional Advisory Council and for the reasons articulated by the US Fish and Wildlife Service. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. BLM, Tom Heinlein?

Tom Heinlein: BLM supports.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Dave Schmid, Forest Service?

Dave Schmid: Yes, the Forest Service supports the proposal as modified by the uh South - I'm sorry Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. And with the justification provided by Fish and Wildlife Service. Thanks.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Park Service Sarah Creachbaum?

Sarah Creachbaum: National Park Service supports as modified.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Public member Rhonda Pitka?

Rhonda Pitka: Hi. I support as modified and as amended. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Public member Charlie Brower?

Charlie Brower: I support.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you Charlie. Chair Christianson?

Anthony Christianson: I support as specified.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. And the motion passes unanimously Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Sue. We'll go ahead and move on to the next wildlife proposal and the staff. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. That would be WP22-35. And that would be Tom Plank presenting that one.

Pippa Kenner: Hello Sue. This is Pippa Kenner with OSM. I think we are on WP22-36. Am I correct?

Sue Detwiler: I have 22-35.

Pippa Kenner: Okay, great thank you. When there was nobody coming on I thought maybe it was. Thank you very much.

Sue Detwiler: Yes, I think the first presenter for this one is Tom Plank. And he may be having trouble getting on. But maybe Lisa (Gredigan) knows what the situation is?

Lisa (Gredigan): Yes, Sue...

Sue Detwiler: Go ahead Lisa.

Lisa (Gredigan): Mr. Chair this is Lisa (Gredigan) and Tom is trying to unmute his phone. Yes, I just got a message he's going to call back in. Yes, and others are saying they've had - I think that happened to Pippa earlier too where she had to call back in to get off mute, so Mr. Chair if you're able to just give him a couple minutes to call back in.

Anthony Christianson: You bet Lisa. I got stuck in another room too, the speaker room only. So - but I thank everyone for the patience today, it's valuable that we get all the insights that we need. Thank you.

Coordinator: Mr. Plank, your line is open.

Tom Plank: Thank you. Hi, this is Tom Plank. Can you hear me now?

Anthony Christianson.: Yes Tom. We can hear you loud and clear. You have the floor.

Tom Plank: I do apologize for that. So I'll go ahead and get started here. Hello Mr. Chair, members of the board. My name is Tom Plank and I have a Wildlife Biologist in the Office of Subsistence Management.

And I will be presenting a summary of the analysis for Wildlife Proposal WP22 35 submitted by Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission requesting to establish a may be announced caribou season in Unit 11 with the harvest limit of one bull by federal permit and an 860 analysis. And this begins on Page 1012 in your books.

The proponent states their understanding is that recent scientific research and assessment has determined that the Mentasta caribou herd population has stabilized at a lower level than that envisioned by the now outdated Mentasta Caribou Herd Management Plan as necessary in order to resume subsistence caribou hunting opportunities in Unit 11.

The proponent further states that understanding - their understanding is that Nelchina bull caribou collar data demonstrates that the Nelchina bulls frequent the Mentasta herd such that a bulls only caribou hunt during times that the Nelchina herd is present in Unit 11 would not affect the biological status of the Mentasta caribou herd since the state Mentasta cow caribou would not be open to hunting.

The proponent would like to resume the continued subsistence use of caribou in Unit 11 within the Ahtna traditional use territory. Note that this analysis only considers the establishment of a season and harvest limit, the 804 analysis may be conducted at a later time if a caribou hunt is open in Unit 11.

There has not been a federal season for caribou hunting Unit 11 for most of the last three decades and have been a few proposals to establish one. In 1993 a proposal is adopted by the Federal Subsistence Board to close federal public lands to caribou hunting in Unit 11.

The combination of low caribou numbers and low recruitments were direct indicators of a continuing conservation concern which warranted protection of the small Mentasta caribou herd population under ANILCA Section 815, Section 3.

In 1996 the Federal Subsistence Board adopted a proposal with modification to reopen the caribou season with a total quota of 15 bulls only to residents of

the seven communities identified consistent with the requirements of ANILCA Section 804. Based on the objectives of the Mentasta caribou Herd Cooperative Management Plan being met for calf production and recruitment of the Mentasta caribou herd despite a decline in population.

In 1998 the Federal Subsistence Board adopted a proposal requesting to close all caribou hunting within Unit 11 due to the recruitment being below the management objective. Caribou in Unit 11 have been part of the Nelchina caribou herd or Mentasta caribou herd as these ranges of the herds overlap as you can see in Map 2 on Page 1018.

These two herds are considered distinct herds because females calf in separate areas although the herds mix during some breeding seasons. The Nelchina caribou herd calving grounds and summer range lie within Unit 13.

The Mentasta caribou herd and the primary herd within Unit 11 calves and summers within the Upper Copper River Basin and in the northern and western flanks of the Wrangell Mountains within the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve.

The Mentasta caribou herd declined from the estimate around 3200 caribou in 1987 to an estimated 495 caribou in 2021 as you see on Table 2 on Page 1022. The fall population estimate in 2020 was almost 1200 caribou however the increase from 2019 is not explained by calf production the previous year but may be due in part in the Nelchina caribou returning late from the winter grounds or may have failed to migrate back to the traditional calving grounds.

The number of caribou observed during the 2021 Mentasta caribou June survey dropped back down to levels observed in 2019. The Mentasta caribou

population has remained stable at relatively low level since 2004, as evidenced by low calf survival.

The bull cow ratio, total bulls observed has fluctuated wildly between 1987 and 2021 which is also on Table 2 and on Page 1022. And while the Nelchina bulls have wintered within the range of the Mentasta herd there's limited ability to predict the extent or frequency of mixing between Nelchina and Mentasta bulls and is impossible to discern whether the harvest of a bull would be from either herd.

The Nelchina caribou herd is a popular herd to hunt and experiences heavy harvest pressure due to its road accessibility and proximity to Fairbanks and Anchorage. Over 95% of the Nelchina caribou herd harvest occurs in Unit 13. And between 2001 and 2019 harvest from the Nelchina caribou herd under state regulations has averaged around 2300 caribou year.

Federal regulations for Unit 12 and 13 combined averages 421 caribou per year. Harvest for the Mentasta caribou herds in the 1996 and '97 season was one caribou with 15 permits issued. And then in the 1997 and '98 season 12 permits were issued, but no harvest was reported for caribou.

There has been no report of harvest from the Mentasta caribou herds since 1998 as there has been no state or federal season for caribou in Unit 11. However, some incidental harvest of Mentasta caribou may take place during winter hunts targeting the Nelchina caribou herd in areas where herds overlap in the adjacent units.

If this proposal is adopted the additional harvest is unlikely to have a biological effect on the Nelchina caribou herd. However, impacts to the

Mentasta caribou herd are a conservation concern and deters for the principles in the Mentasta caribou herd management plan.

The Mentasta caribou herd has fallen short of any metric that would support opening a season for the past 25 years. Current low population numbers are indicative of poor recruitment and low survival rates among cohorts within the population.

And an increased opportunity for incidental harvest could further exasperate the decline of population as currently of conservation concern. If this proposal is adopted it would allow a harvest of caribou when the Nelchina caribou herd migrates through Unit 11 providing an increased subsistence hunting opportunity.

Based on participation and harvest of federally qualified subsistence users from 1996 to 1998, when a very limited open federal caribous season occurred in Unit 11 harvest from a yellow - from a Unit 11 caribou herd hunt may be expected to be very low. However, if the Nelchina caribou are easily accessible along the Nabesna Road hunting efforts and harvest could be higher than was experienced in 1996 and 1998.

OSM's conclusions is support proposals WP2235 with modification to delegate authority to the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve Superintendent to announce season dates, harvest quotes - quotas and the number of permits to be issued to define harvest areas and to open and close the season via delegation authority letter only.

Timing of this migration differs from year to year and the number of Nelchina bulls that mix with the Mentasta caribou herd within Unit 11 also varies year to year. The Wrangell-St. Elais National Park and Preserve Superintendent

would have the needed data to make these announcements during the as timing and numbers vary. Thank you Mr. Chair, members of board, I'd be happy to field any questions.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any questions from the board? All right, hearing none we'll move on to any public comment may be received?

Tom Plank: This is Tom Plank with OSM. And there were no written public comments received.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Tom. We'll go ahead and move on. Operator, is there anybody online wants to be recognized at this time this is their opportunity for the public comment period for this agenda item?

Coordinator: Thank you. If you would like to make a public comment please press Star 1. One moment please. We do have a public comment. Our comment comes from Karen Linnell. Your line is open.

Karen Linnell: Thank you Mr. Chair. For the record my name is Karen Linnell, Executive Director for the Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission which represents eight tribes and two ANCSA corporations located within the Ahtna traditional use territory.

AITRC submitted WP2235 to restore at least some limited federal subsistence hunting opportunity for caribou on federal public lands in Unit, Game Management Unit 11. We have unable to hunt caribou in Unit 11 since the '90s because of the Mentasta caribou herd size was in decline.

The Mentasta herd continues to be in a predator pit such that the herd has stabilized at a much smaller size than originally desired within the

management plan. AITRC requests involvement in a new planning process to revise this plan but in the meantime requests that limited federal subsistence caribou hunting be allowed for bull caribou during times when the Nelchina herd is present in Unit 11.

Allowing a limited federal hunt for those federally qualified users who are customary and traditionally most dependent on resources in GMU 11, and the caribou there, can sustainably provide - be provided when then Nelchina caribou are present in Unit 11 with bulls only limited hunt.

We ask for a bulls only hunt as the Mentasta herd is only genetically distinct through the mitochondrial. Let me say that again, mitochondrial DNA which is passed from mother to offspring.

Such take would be sustainable due to the high bull cow ratio with a ten year average of 82 to 100 bulls observed in the Mentasta herd. AITRC has heard some concerns from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game about allowing take of Nelchina caribou in Unit 11.

And even their stated desires to take the allowable harvest prior to the herd crossing the Richardson Highway and entering into GMU 11 is no wonder they are opposed to this proposal. Alaska residents and federally qualified subsistence users should not be prevented from opportunity to hunt Nelchina caribou in Unit 11 when they are present.

In fact ADF&G should not be attempting to take all of the harvestable surplus prior to the herd migrating into the GMU 11. Allocation determinations among Alaska residents living within the range of the Nechina herd may need to be taken the board - to the Board of Game to ensure reasonable

opportunities for state subsistence uses are being provided to all Alaskan residents, however that's a state of Alaska concern.

The Federal Subsistence Board - the concern before the Federal Subsistence Board is whether federal subsistence uses by federally qualified users of caribou in Units 11 and 12 are being provided for - if they're being provided a federal priority by existing caribou allocations to the Federal Subsistence Management Program.

AITCR supports the amendment proposed by OSM. And we look forward to the passage of this proposal and working with the federal in season manager at Wrangell-St. Elias SRC, the RACs, OSM and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game in partnership to restore some customary and traditional harvest opportunities and to develop a revised Mentasta caribou management plan to better restore the herd to abundance and ensure continuation of priority federal subsistence uses and reasonable opportunities for state subsistence uses and other uses of caribou in Unit 11.

Thank you Mr. Chair. And I'll take any questions if you have any.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Karen. Any questions from the board? I appreciate you taking the time to call in today Karen.

Karen Linnell: Thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Operator, is there anybody else online who would like to be recognized at this time?

Coordinator: I'm showing no further public comments.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you operator. We will move on to Regional Advisory Council recommendations.

Woman: Council supported with OSM modification to delegate authority to Wrangell-St.Elias Superintendent to announce season dates, harvest quotas, number of permits, define harvest areas and open or close seasons via a delegation of authority letter only.

The council supported this proposal which would allow a may be announced season. This may - this would have an opportunity for local people to get caribou and spread the hunt into Unit 11 which could possibly alleviate some of the hunting pressure in Unit 13.

Delegation of authority to open and close the hunt helps conservation of Mentasta bulls because of Mentasta and Nelchina herds will be monitored. And the in season monitor - manager open or close the harvest based on when the Nelchina herd is in the area. The opportunity benefits federally qualified subsistence users.

Anthony Christianson: Okay, is there any other Regional Advisory Council members who would like to make a comment at this time?

Coordinator: This is the operator. We did have another public comment come in.

Anthony Christianson: Okay, well at this time we'll entertain the public comment. We'll recognize you. You have the floor.

Coordinator: Barbara Cellarius, your line is open.

Barbara Cellarius: Thank you, can you hear me?

Anthony Christianson: Yes Barbara Cellarius, you have the floor.

Barbara Cellarius: Thank you Mr. Chair. My name is Barbara Cellarius, and I'm the Cultural Anthropologist for Wrangell-St.Elias National Park and Preserve.

But what I want to present to you is the comments from the Wrangell-St.Elias Subsistence Resource Commission. And so on the Wrangell-St. Elias National Parks and - sorry I'm sort of rushing here. The commission advises the national Wrangell-St.Elias National Park on subsistence issues it's a Citizen Advisory Committee.

And so the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park Subsistence Resource Commission supported WP22-36 with the OSM modification plus an additional modification to establish a working group on the Mentasta Caribou Herd Management Plan with tribal involvement in the plan.

The proposal would provide for subsistence opportunity when Nelchina caribou are present in Unit 11. Considerable concern was expressed about potential harvest of Mentasta caribou and the delegation of authority to the superintendent would provide important tools for managing a hunt.

Updating the management plan is similarly important for ensuring agreement on the consistent cooperative approach for management. And thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any questions from the board for the public? Thank you for taking the time to call in today Barbara. Any other Regional Advisory Council boards wish to speak to this proposal?

Lisa (Gredigan): Mr. Chair, this is Lisa Gediagin. And the Eastern Interior Council also had a recommendation on this proposal. And I think Sue Entsminger is on the call but is having trouble being heard.

Anthony Christianson: Yes, I'm not hearing her come through there Lisa either. And just trying...

Lisa (Gredigan): Okay, yes perhaps the Council Coordinator could provide that recommendation then for the Eastern Interior Council?

Anthony Christianson: Thank you for that. Yes, we'll hear from that council coordinator at this time. Thank you Lisa.

Sue Detwiler: Hello. This is Sue Detwiler. So that would be either Sue Entsminger if she can't join then Brooke McDavid, the Council Coordinator would have those comments.

Anthony Christianson: Yes, I think they're calling on Council Coordinator now Sue, so thank you.

Brooke McDavid: Mr. Chair, this is Brooke McDavid, Council Coordinator for the Eastern Interior RAC. I'm sorry it appears that both myself and Sue Entsminger, the Chair, are having issues with our phone lines. If - I'll just give a shout out to Sue. Sue Entsminger, are you on the line?

Sue Entsminger: I am on the line. Can anyone hear me?

Anthony Christianson: Sue, you have the floor. Go ahead.

Sue Entsminger: Okay, thank you. Yes, Sue Entsminger, Eastern Interior RAC Chair. That's - our council supports WP2235 with the OSM modification - with additional modification to reinstate and update the Mentasta Caribou Management Plan.

The council stated that passage of this proposal as modified by OSM would be beneficial to existence users and additional modification recognizes the importance of updated caribou herd management plans for current and future subsistence needs.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Sue. Any questions from the board for Sue? All right, thank you Regional Advisory Council chair for sharing the position of your board.

We'll go ahead and move on Tribal Liaison Orville.

Orville Lind: Thank you Mr. Chair. Again, Orville Lind, Native Liaison for OSM. The consultations there were no comments or recommendations made on WP2235. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Orville. We'll go ahead and move on to the state liaison, Mr. Mulligan.

Ben Mulligan: Thank you sir. For the record ADF&G opposes to what could amount to the harvest of animals from the Mentasa herd at this time. Any additional federal harvest from the Nelchina herd should only be done by cooperative interagency agreements to ensure the sustainable harvest of Nelchina caribou is maintained.

Unrestricted federal harvest from two existing federal hunts account for 5% to 34% of Nelchina harvests annually with a most recent five year average of

10% of total harvest. Federal harvest varies widely due to changes in migratory patterns, weather conditions and hunter effort from year to year.

Federal harvest for the existing two hunts is impossible to predict which makes Nelchina management and the goal of achieving, but not exceeding harvestable surplus annually, incredibly difficult. There are already existing hunts in place that allow for the take of any harvestable surplus associated with the Nelchina herd and there is no harvestable surplus available for the Mentasa herd.

This hunt would unnecessarily complicate hunt administration adding in an additional highly variable federal harvest opportunity with no restrictions or framework for interagency coordination would only add to the complexity and difficult - difficulty currently associated with co-management of this important subsistence resource.

Harvest when Nelchina caribou are present in GMU 11 will require constant monitoring of the two herds to ensure a Mentasa herd collars are not present in the hunt area and may not be feasible in years when GMU 13 state and federal subsistence opportunities have achieved available harvest before the herd migrates into GMU 11. Thank you sir. Appreciate it.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any questions for the state? All right, thank you. And we'll move on to the Interagency Staff Committee recommendations.

Robbin LaVine: Thank you Mr. Chair. This is Robbin LaVine. For this proposal the Interagency Staff Committee provided the standard (unintelligible). Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Robbin. We'll go ahead and move on to board deliberation and discussion? Hearing none the floor is open for board action.

Sarah Creachbaum: National Park Service.

Anthony Christianson: Yes sir - you have the floor. Yes, Park Service you have the floor.

Sarah Creachbaum: Thank you Mr. Chair. I move to approve Wildlife Proposal 2235 to establish and may be announced caribou season in Unit 11 with the OSM modification. And if I get a second I'll explain why I intend to vote in support of my motion.

Man: Yes, I second.

Man: Second.

Sarah Creachbaum: Thank you. Approval of Wildlife Proposal 2235 would increase hunting opportunities for federal qualified subsistence users when Nelchina caribou herd migrates through Unit 11. My support for the proposal is modified by OSM is consistent with recommendations of the Southcentral and Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council and the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission.

Delegation of authority to the Wrangell-St. Elias Superintendent to announce season dates, harvest quotas and the number of permits to be issued, to define harvest areas and to open and close the season would facilitate timely in season management and ensure the long term conservation of the Mentasa and Nelchina caribou herds.

Although updating the Mentasta Caribou Herd Management Plan is outside the scope of the proposal park staff are aware of the need and the Eastern Interior RACs request for updating the plan. Regional office staff will be available to support that effort when ongoing analysis of long term monitoring data are complete and results can be used to inform the plan development.
Thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any board discussion, questions, comments? Call for the question?

Man: Yes, any question?

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. We'll do a roll call on this again too, Sue. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: So the motion is to adopt WP22-35 with the OSM modification. And I'll start with Sarah Creachbaum National Park Service for her vote.

Sarah Creachbaum: Thank you. The National Park Service supports Wildlife Proposal 2235 to establish and may be announced caribou season in Unit 11 with the OSM modification.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Sara Boario, Fish and Wildlife Service?

Sara Boario: Fish and Wildlife Service supports.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Gene Peltola, BIA?

Gene Peltola: BIA supports indifference to the Regional Advisory Councils. I have commented in addition to by the reasons articulated by the National Park Service in their motion.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. BLM, Tom Heinlein?

Tom Heinlein: BLM supports.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

Dave Schmid: Yes, the Forest Service supports indifference to the Southcentral and Eastern Interior RACs and as justified by the Park Service. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you Dave. Public member Rhonda Pitka? Rhonda may be having trouble getting into the speaking line. Mr. Charlie Brower, public number?

Charlie Brower: Support.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you Charlie. Rhonda, was that you? Chair Anthony Christianson...

Rhonda Pitka: Can you hear me?

Sue Detwiler: Yes, yes Rhonda.

Rhonda Pitka: Oh great. Okay, I support in-deference to the Regional Advisory Council as modified by OSM. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Okay, thank you Rhonda. Finally, Chair Christianson?

Anthony Christianson: Yes, I support. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Motion passes unanimously.

Anthony Christianson: All right, thank you Sue. Thank you everyone for that one. We'll go ahead and move on to one more WP proposal today. And I'll call on Sue to call on the next order and staff. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Okay, this will be the last Wildlife Proposal for the Southcentral Region, that is WP22-36. And that will be presented by Pippa.

Pippa Kenner: Thanks Sue, now? Can you hear me?

Sue Detwiler: Yes.

Pippa Kenner: Wonderful. Good afternoon Mr. Chair, and members of the Federal Subsistence Board and Regional Advisory Council Chairs. The analysis for Wildlife Proposal WP22-36 is part of your supplemental meeting materials. I'll just stop a beat here and make sure you have that in front of you.

So my name is Pippa Kenner. And I'm an Anthropologist at the Office of Subsistence Management in Anchorage. The topic of community harvest systems, and alternative permitting systems and federal regulations or the focus of this proposal.

These systems are intended to provide some flexibility in harvest regulations to make legal the activities of super harvesters in rural communities. You're going to hear more about this during the short presentation.

Proposal WP22-36 was submitted by the Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission, also known AITRC, in a request to codify temporary special actions that expire on June 30, 2022. These proposed changes are necessary to fully implement the AITRC administered community harvest system for caribou and moose and Units 11, 12 and 13.

The regulations in this proposal are the result of extensive work by people at AITRC working with a group of people at federal agencies. Specifically proposal WP22-36 would codify existing temporary regulations by one, allowing community members to opt out of this community harvest system thereby retaining their individual harvest limits.

Two, allowing designated hunters as part of the community harvest system. Three, defining the geographic boundaries of eligible communities is the most recent census designated places established by the US Census Bureau.

Four, specifying that harvest reporting will take the form of reports collected from hunters by AITRC and submitted directly to the land managers in the Office of Subsistence Management which replaces the need for federal registration permits, joint state federal registration permits or state harvest tickets.

Five, setting the harvest quota for the species and units authorized in the community harvest system as the sum of individual harvest limits for those opting to participate in the system. And finally six, adding moose and caribou in Unit 12 to the community harvest system.

The OSM preliminary conclusion that was presented to the Southcentral and Eastern Interior Alaska Councils was to support proposal WP22-36 with modification to just clarify the regulatory language. However, at its fall 2021 meeting the Southcentral Alaska Council, at the request of AITRC, recommended a further modification which was to restrict the community harvest system in Unit 12 to that portion that lies within the Ahtna traditional use territory instead of all federal public lands in Unit 12.

Additionally, at its fall 2021 meeting the Eastern Interior Alaska Council tabled this proposal until it's winter meeting that occurred last month in March of 2022. The Eastern Interior Alaska Council requested OSM and AITRC to develop language to further modify the proposal before the council would make a recommendation.

Specifically the council wanted a description of what lands in Unit 12 would be included in the Ahtna community harvest system, and a description of any changes to the framework describing how the hunt is administered.

In response OSM added an addendum and presented it to the Eastern Interior Alaska Council at its winter meeting last month in March 2022. OSM writes an addendum when an OSM conclusion changes from the OSM preliminary conclusion that we presented to the councils.

And our conclusion has changed, and I'll describe it to you. The addendum begins on Page 16 of the analysis.

So in response to recommendations made by the councils at their fall 2021 meeting the addendum recommends the Federal Subsistence Board support this proposal WP22-36 with two additional substantial modifications.

One, is to modify a provision under Units 11, 12 and 13 so that participants in the community harvest system may not designate another individual to harvest on their behalf, any species for which they have registered within the community harvest system but may serve as designated hunters as the proponent AITRC clarified was their intent at the Eastern Interior Alaska Council's meeting in fall 2021.

And two, specify that the community harvest system in Unit 12 will be implemented only on Ahtna traditional use territory in Unit 12 instead of all federal public lands and Unit 12. This modification was recommended by the Southcentral Alaska Council in response to AITRC's request at its fall 2021 meeting.

However, we have learned that area descriptors and codified federal regulation should be geographic features identifiable on the landscape. And that's the language in this addendum is OSM's best reflection of AITRC's intent.

So this map is on - is Figure 2 on Page 20 of the analysis. The map shows the Ahtna traditional use territory in Unit 12 overlaid with the regulatory area described in the addendum.

The Ahtna traditional use territory is west of the thick blue line. The OSM proposed area is in diagonal striping or cross action.

So AITRC staff reviewed this addendum with OSM staff after the fall 2021 council meeting cycle concluded and indicated they concurred with this modification but that the Ahtna traditional use territory could be better described.

Continuing with council actions on this proposal at its winter meeting last month the Eastern Interior Alaska Council recommended a further modification. The council recommended that the Tok River Bridge on the Tok Cutoff road better reflects the northern boundary of the Ahtna traditional use territory than what OSM proposed. So this is Figure 3 on page 24 is a map showing this area in Unit 12 in green, diagonal striping or cross-hatching. And it was recommended by the Eastern Interior Alaska Council. The Eastern

Interior Alaska Council chair will be presenting its recommendation to you after we hear public comments on this proposal.

So thank you. Mr. Chair, This is the end of my presentation and I will try to answer your question.

Mr. Chair. Did you drop off the line?

Anthony Christianson: No, I'm on here. I was calling for the next agenda item. Maybe I'm not getting picked up. I might've broked out there.

Woman: Yes, we're having trouble with the phone today. Pippa just finished giving the analysis and it was the time for any board questions and if not, then she can also give a summary written public comments.

Anthony Christianson: Yes, I was calling for public comment. Thank you Sara.

Woman: Oh, thank you. Sorry.

Pippa Kenner: Thank you Mr. Chair for the record. This is Pippa Kenner. No public - written public comments were received for this proposal. Thank you.

Man: But so much would...

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. And now I'll go ahead and open up the line. Operators if there's anyone, now is the time for public comment on this agenda item.
Thank you.

Coordinator: If you would like to make a public comment please press Star 1 One moment. Our first public comment comes from Barbara Cellarius. Your line is open.

Barbara Cellarius: Thank you Mr. Chair. Again, it's Barbara Cellarius. I'm with Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve, but presenting comments on behalf of the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park Subsistence Resource Commission. The Wrangell-St. Elias National Park Subsistence Resource Commission supported WP-22-36 with the OSM modification plus an additional modification to limit the land in Unit 12 to that portion of Unit 12 within the Ahtna traditional use territory. The additional modification was recommended by representatives of the Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Thank you for calling. Any other public online operator?

Coordinator: Yes, we do have another public comment from Karen Linnell. Your line is open.

Karen Linnell: Thank you Mr. Chair and members of the board. In regards to the proposed changes made by Eastern Interior RAC I think there was some misunderstanding. While we had agreed to the ending point ending at the Little Tok River where it meets the Tok cut off and the furthest north point and then going to Noise Mountain from there the rest of Unit 12 got left out and that includes all the hunting off of the Nabesna Road.

And so we have a different descriptor that we would like to suggest or include. It includes the recommendation from the Eastern Interior RACs for the lands along the Tok Cutoff, Federal public lands and Unit 12 within the Tok and Little Tok River drainages south 1358368 of the Tok River bridge and east of the Tok Cutoff Road and then from there where the - it intersects with the Wrangell-St. Elias boundary within the traditional territory east of this

boundary would extend based on existing Unit 12 Moose harvest areas in federal regulations, currently in federal regulations specifically following the lands - the following lands would be included.

That portion of Unit 12 within the river drainage west of the east bank of the Nabesna River upstream from the southern boundary of the Katmai National Wildlife Refuge, i.e, the Unit 12 portion of the RM 291 hunt area, and that portion of Unit 12 that is east of the river and south of the Pickeral Lake winter trail running southeast from Pickeral Lake to the Canadian border.

I do want to stress in state that we have conducted weekly harvest reports although for this community harvest. However since late October, early November. There has not been any caribou within GMU 13 or on federal lands for any allowable harvest. This year as well as in several of the past years, the caribou have not returned to federal lands in Unit 13 for quite some time.

And actually the snow this year is so deep that they haven't returned it all. They're still way back in the mountains from what I saw this last weekend, and I was out on that Unit 12 section at the end of Nabesna Road this weekend.

So I just want to stress that we AITRC places great importance on western science in addition to indigenous knowledge and this includes accurate and timely harvest reporting. But I have the language here and I worked with Barbara Cellarius with the subsistence coordinator to come up with this language to include those portions that were mistakenly left out at the Eastern Interior RAC Meeting.

It's hard to see and make decisions on the maps that are provided by OSM when there are no landmarks on there including the road or any of the river systems so that we can see it. All we have is the color swatch. And it's very difficult to make decisions on that type of data. Has the chair seen - or seen the Nabesna Road, she would have known that people hunt in that area. And it's just difficult to do.

I would encourage OSM to provide better quality maps on this and I would have hoped that OSM would have contacted AITRCRIC with this modification that Eastern Interior RAC proposed. It would have been really helpful.

And again this is a - I've been listening to you folks and the inability to connect. And the - and be on this meeting. You can see the frustration and - or feel the frustration that we've been trying - experiencing over the last two years and not being able to meet in person and or look at the same map at the same time.

With technology and things and teams and Zoom and all of this, it seems like there would be a better way to be able to share information with folks. I know some communities don't have the bandwidth.

But it would be nice to be able to look at the same maps because how I describe something may not be the same way that the federal agency staff would describe those areas. And I can email this to you or Barbara Cellarius can email it to you. She has it. Te worked on it together today. So thank you Mr. Chair and members of the board.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Karen.

Lisa (Gredigan): Mr. Chair, this is Lisa. I'd like to respond to Karen if that's okay.

Anthony Christianson: You have the floor Lisa.

Lisa (Gredigan): Yes, thank you Karen. This is Lisa (Gredigan) for the record. And I'd just like to speak on behalf of OSM. As far as that Unit 12 boundary goes for the community harvest system, we support A track whatever boundary they would like for that area as long as, you know, you use the geographic features.

So if you're able to yes, send that to us to make sure and I actually agree. I think there was a little confusion and misunderstanding at the Eastern Tier Council meeting, a lot of it due to teleconference issues and also that OSM is short on map making capacity right now, but that's something we would agree could be improved on in the future. So again, I just yes, I think the chair and this is for the comments um, on behalf of them. Thank you.

Karen Linnell: Thank you Miss (Gredigan). I will get you that description in an email right now.

Lisa (Gredigan): Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you for that. Is there anybody else online that would like to be recognized at this time operator? Thank you.

Gene Peltola: Mr. Chair, BIA?

Anthony Christianson: Yes, you have the floor Gene.

Gene Peltola: Thank you. Mr. Chair. I was wondering if we can request the National Park Service to send each of the board members a map so we can visually see what

is explained by Karen from A track. And in addition to if they could differentiate between what was agreed upon yesterday in that forthcoming map hopefully and what is recommended by OSM I appreciate that before we took a action on this proposal. Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Okay Gene thank you for that. So, Sue, is that something that we can take care of here through the park service? Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Yes, we can delay action on this proposal while we try to get those maps and get them out to the board members.

Anthony Christianson: Okay, with no objection from the board, what - can we just move this order of business in this proposal to later in this maybe tomorrow, come back and revisit this? Or is this to another meeting time to be determined situation?

Sue Entsminger: Mr. Chair, this is Sue Entsminger, Eastern Interior RAC. Would - could I just add a little bit here?

Anthony Christianson: Yes, go ahead and Sue you have the floor.

Sue Entsminger: Yes, thank you very much. I have to share and I agree with Karen about several points. And the maps is one because the Nabesna Road was left off the maps which is a very important part of seeing what is in Unit 12 because it doesn't really show in this map. It's very, very tiny and very hard to discern.

And I will say that Karen attended our Eastern Interior RAC and agreed with us when she testified about the Unit 12, the - that Tok River bridge. She said Little Tok, but it's not the Little Tok. It's the Tok, the Big Tok we call it, the big Tok River bridge on the Tok Cutoff. So that's a very discernable place to

put on a map. And they're - actually they're boundary of the A track I mean the Ahtna traditional area is very similar there.

And I just wanted to reiterate the whole problem with teleconferencing and all of this has been very difficult to really do a good job. But and I also wanted to mention how frustrating and how confusing things get. The Subsistence Resource Commission took this up and both myself and Gloria on that.

And it got so confusing that there was four favor, one no and three abstentions during that meeting. So I think that's important for you - the board to know that. And tomorrow whenever you guys get all your maps so if I can then give our position, that would be great. Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you for that Sue. Any further discussion, any other RACs or comments from the board?

Sarah Creachbaum: Mr. Chair?

Anthony Christianson: Yes, you have the floor.

Sarah Creachbaum: Hi. Sarah Creachbaum, National Park Service. We are prepared to produce a map that we could get to all members by tomorrow and also wanted the board to know that we do have Karen, specific language within our motion, ready to go today, so we should be ready to act by tomorrow if everybody has an opportunity to look at the map for their comfort level.

Gene Peltola: Mr. Chair, BIA.

Anthony Christianson: Yes, Gene, you have the floor.

Gene Peltola: Thank you. Mr. Chair. I just wanted to clarify something. It's not necessary a comfort level but I think it's unreasonable to expect the Federal Subsistence Board to act upon something if we have not seen it and not to have time to digest it yet at all. So I would agree to acting upon this at a later date during this meeting or tomorrow morning or such, but I think we have to have ample time to be exposed to what is being proposed. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: All right so at this time what I'll do is just maybe we can table this time to be determined tomorrow. How about we - time to be determined tomorrow after lunch?

Man: That would be a deferral until tomorrow after lunch.

Sue Entsminger: Mr. Chair, this is Sue Entsminger again. I have a question?

Anthony Christianson: Yes, yes, Sue?

Sue Entsminger: I still have more information that I would like to provide from the Eastern Interior. Can I do it at when you guys take this up again?

Anthony Christianson: Yes, we'll pick up this conversation right here at public testimony and the Regional Advisory Council conversation so we can continue to deliver it as we get new information. We'll take this up with that understanding we get a second and a motion.

Sue Entsminger: Okay, thank you. I appreciate it. So I'm thinking second for the deferral for tomorrow after lunch?

Dave Schmid: Forest Service would second if that was the motion. But as I understood it, BIA moved to defer until we've had an opportunity to digest the maps and

have all the information in front of us and would take this up tomorrow afternoon. That would be my second.

Man: Thank you Dave. That's okay.

Anthony Christianson: Okay, so we'll go ahead and just without opposition to the motion, hearing no opposition, we'll just definitely this till tomorrow after lunch, the time to be determined 1-30-ish. So we'll go ahead and at this time Rhonda, looks like Rhonda has to go. So where does that leave us here Rhonda. We hear you today and good luck on your flight, have a safe flight. Sue so that moves us on to the next agenda item?

Sue Detwiler: Yes. So that for today anyway, concludes the Southcentral Region 2 proposals. And then the next one would be the Kodiak Aleutian proposals, but all of their proposals are in the consensus agenda. So that would then bring us to the Bristol Bay proposals. And that - the first one would be W22-39 which would be Tom Plank presenting.

Tom Plank: Hello Mr. Chair, members of the board. My name is Tom Plank. I'm a Wildlife Biologist in the Office of Subsistence Management. And I will representing a summary of the analysis for wildlife proposal, WP22-39 submitted by ADF&G starting on Page 1035 in the meeting books.

The proponent requests to create specific harvest regulations for Alaska hare in Units 9 and 17, stating that the once abundant Alaska hare in Units 9 and 17 are now at a very low density and has a patchy distribution throughout Bristol Bay and the Alaska peninsula. The Alaska hare is sometimes called Jackrabbits, Tundra hare or Artic hare, but the Alaska hare is called the Tundra hare in federal regulations, and Alaska hare appears to be the dominant term in contemporary usage, including in state regulations.

The Alaska hare is a different species than the Snowshoe hare despite being lumped together in federal regulations. And to help kind of alleviate some of that confusion, please see the comparison table on Page 1040 for the two hares.

The Board of Game adopted proposal in 2019 establishing a specific state harvest regulation for Alaska hare in Unit 9 from November 1 to January. 31 and limited harvest to one hare per day with a maximum of four per season. ADF&G adopted Proposal 24 on the Board of Game during the January 2022 meetings to include Unit 17 with an identical Alaska hare management structure as Unit 9. ADF&G has also submitted wildlife Proposal WP22-45 to create specific harvest regulations for Alaska hare in Units 18, 22 and 23.

Alaska hares are among the most poorly understood game species in Alaska. Anecdotally, abundance is well below historical levels throughout the range of the species. The last known erupted population on the peninsula occurred in the winter of 1953 to '54. And the Alaska Peninsula and Becharof National Wildlife Refuge ranks the Alaska hare as the refuge's number three prioritized resource of concern as an ecologically significant endemic species vulnerable to the influence of climate change. In 2018 ADF&G initiated a multiyear study to evaluate movement and mortality as well as long term capture techniques.

Little is known about the harvest of Alaska hare. Household harvest surveys indicate that it is harvested throughout the communities of western and southwestern Alaska. If this proposal is about that, the Alaska hare season will be reduced, although hunters will still have the opportunity to harvest hares during winter when they're out engaging in other subsistence or recreational activities.

The change in daily and overall harvest limits may be effective in reducing harvest, which could translate into an improvement in the conservation status of these populations. Any positive effects these changes have on the Alaska hare population will benefit subsistence users in the long term despite the immediate reduction in subsistence opportunity.

The OSM's conclusion is to support proposal WP22-39 with modification to modify the definition of hare and federal regulations to include Alaska hare. Thank you Mr. Chair and members of board. I'd be happy to field any questions.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Does that include the staff analysis?

Tom Plank: It does.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any questions from the board? All right, hearing none, we'll go ahead and take any public comment you received during (unintelligible).

Tom Plank: And again this is Tom Plank with OSM, and there were no written public comments for this proposal.

Anthony Christianson: Anybody, can you hear me?

Woman: Yes Tony you're on.

Man: Yes Tony.

Anthony Christianson: Okay, sorry, I got a blip there. Could we go to - operator or anybody online for public comment? This is your time.

Coordinator: Yes, if you'd like to make a public comment please press Star 1. I'm showing no public comments at this time.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you operator. We'll go to the row of RACs, thank you.

Woman: I think somebody needs to mute their phone, please. Not you Tony.

Anthony Christianson: So yes, we're calling for RAC chairs.

Nancy Morris Lyon: This is Nancy Morris Lyon with the Bristol Bay RACs.

Anthony Christianson: You have the floor.

Nancy Morris Lyon: Thank you Chairman Christianson. Bristol Bay Subsistence Regional Advisory Council supported WP22-39 with modification to change the season closing date to March 30. The council notes that the number of Alaska hares being seen in recent years has decreased and they appreciate the effort to be attentive to the population. The council stated that Alaska hare is a winter resource and that as winters are starting later in the year an extension of the proposed season is reasonable.

And I'm not sure why it's not in the justification but also we have other closures that would align with March 31. Typically our caribou hunters are out and also hunt hare if the opportunity arises in the closure for our caribou. So that was why that date was chosen over the one that had been previously offered. And I believe that concludes the - just the their (risk rate) subsistence caribou. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Mr. Chair, this is Sue Detwiler, and in addition to Bristol Bay Region, the other regional advisory councils who may wish to weigh in would be YK Delta Region, Western Interior and Seward Peninsula if any of them are online.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Sue. So the other regional (unintelligible) council you want to speak up (unintelligible)? Hearing none, Sue, we'll just - at this time we'll just go ahead and move on to Orville, tribal liaison.

Orville Lind: Thank you.

Robbin LaVine: And this is Robbin.

Anthony Christianson: Yes, Robbin go ahead.

Robbin LaVine: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. We are actually, we are also looking to hear from Kodiak Aleutian Chair Della and then Western Interior Chair, Jack Reakoff. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Okay, thank you. I was just wasn't hearing anything on my end of the queue. Sounded like a drop in the call there or something when I talked. So, thank you, Robbin. We'll wait for the other chairs at this time. Thank you.

Robbin LaVine: Thank you.

Jack Reakoff: So Mr. Chair, this is Jack Reakoff, Western Chair Regional Council,

Anthony Christianson: Yes, go ahead.

Jack Reakoff: Western Chair Regional Council supports the proposal. And so we we feel that climate change is the - is one of the drivers of this decline, rain on snow events that caused decline of Western Arctic caribou herd but also causing hardship for tundra dwelling animals including Alaska hare. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Jack. Next chair? Sue, can you call on the next please?

Sue Detwiler: Yes. Sorry Mr. Chair. I was actually looking at the wrong proposal line when I went through the list of potential council chairs that would speak. And so for this proposal, WP22-39 I think, let's see, we've heard from Bristol Bay and Western Interior and the only one left would be Kodiak Aleutians and that would be Della Trumble. I'm not sure if she is still on or not.

(Lee Honig): Mr. Chair, this is (Lee Honig), Council coordinator.

Anthony Christianson: Yes, you have the floor.

(Lee Honig): Della may have had to step away this afternoon, so I am prepared to read their recommendation if you would like?

Anthony Christianson: Does that conclude the (unintelligible)?

(Lee Honig): Mr. Chair, can you hear me?

Anthony Christianson: Yes, you have the floor.

(Lee Honig): Thank you. Okay. For WP22-39 the Kodiak Aleutian recommended they were opposed to this proposal due to lack of biological data and population estimates. No new information has been presented since last four cycle. And

sport hunters should be limited first support subsistence users. Hares are an important subsistence resource in the region.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. And then there is no additional (unintelligible)?

Robbin LaVine: Mr. Chair, this is Robbin LaVine. I - we are having a hard time hearing you. You're sounding a bit muffled but I do - I did hear that you are asking if there are any other chairs on the line. And I do believe that Western Interior Chair, Jack Reakoff may have something to add. Thank you, Jack. You have the floor.

Anthony Christianson: Yes, I can hear you. So Jack, you have the floor. Thank you, Robbin.

Jack Reakoff: I don't have my notes before me on that one. If you could clue me in on that. I'm going from my recollection. I didn't get the - or justification on that proposal.

Robbin LaVine: Thank you Mr. Chair. I do understand that the Western Interior deferred Wildlife Proposal 22-39 to the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Robbin.

Jack Reakoff: Mr. Chair?

Anthony Christianson: Yes, Jack, you have the floor.

Jack Reakoff: Yes, we did deliberate the proposal. We discussed the proposal. We almost took action on it. It was my recollection that we took, we were going to take

action. But I see that we've deferred but I do not have my notes before me on that proposal. Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Okay, thank you, Jack. Any other questions from the board for Regional Advisory Council? Any other questions or comments deliberation? All right, thank you. Hearing none, we'll go ahead and move on to Orville, Tribal Liaison Chair.

Orville Lind: Thank you Mr. Chair, Orville Lind, Native Liaison for OSM. During the consultation session August 19, there were no comments or recommendations on Wildlife Proposal 22-39. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Orville. We'll go ahead and ask the state liaison

Mark Burch: Mr. Chair, this is - for the record, this is Mark Burch with the Department of Fish & Game. Ben Mulligan, Our Deputy Commissioner had to step away for a moment and I'll provide the position of the Department of Fish & Game. The Department of Fish & Game supports the proposal. As the population of Alaska hares is being investigated, It has been found that the population is such - is at such a level that these restrictions are warranted. Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Mark. Is there any questions for the state? Hearing none, we'll move on to the ISC recommendation.

Robbin LaVine: Yes thank you Mr. Chair, members of the board. This is Robbin Levine and the ISC submitted the standard comment for the Wildlife Proposal 22-39. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you Robbin. Any questions for IC. Hearing none, now open the for board deliberation or questions comments? Hearing none, the floor is open for board action on this proposal.

Woman 1: Mr. Chair, the US Fish & Wildlife Service moves to adopt Wildlife Proposal 22-39 as modified by the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council to establish specific seasons and harvest limits for Alaska hare in Units 9 and 17 with the season end date of March 31. Following a second, I will explain why I intend to support my motion.

Man: BIA seconds.

Woman 1: Thank you Mr. Chair. I intend to support my motion to establish specific seasons and harvest limits for Alaska hare in Units 9 and 17. The analysis presents sufficient evidence for the need to establish specific regulations for Alaska hare in these units distinct from those for Snowshoe har.

Recent observations and local knowledge indicate a reduction in the amount of Alaska hare seen over recent years. Reducing the amount of harvest is biologically appropriate means of aging population recovery while we await the results of the study from the Alaska Department of Fish & Game.

The longer season proposed by the Bristol Bay Subsistence Regional Advisory Council accommodates winters starting later in their region, but still maintains the annual harvest limit of four hare per year which will help achieve the desired management and biological impact for the species, which is to reduce overall harvest while still providing subsistence opportunity. And at the same time it should not disturb them during their late spring mating season. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any board discussion comments, questions?

Lisa (Gredigan): Mr. Chair, this is Lisa (Gredigan).

Anthony Christianson: Yes, Lisa please go ahead.

Lisa (Gredigan): I would just like to clarify for the record whether or not the board is including the OSM modification for the definition change? My understanding is this is a somewhat necessary housekeeping administrative change since we're creating a season for a species that currently isn't defined in federal regulation.

So I'm - I recognize this could also be addressed under WP22-45 which also addresses Alaska hare for different units. But I wanted to just clarify that for the record. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you for that Lisa. Clarification for Lisa on the maker of the motion?

Woman 1: Mr. Chair, Fish & Wildlife Service. Yes, that was the intent to include the OSM definition and season back limit information.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you for that clarification.

Lisa (Gredigan): Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Any other board comments, questions or clarification? Call for questions?

Man: Question BIA.

Anthony Christianson: Questions been called. All in favor of this motion, say aye.

Man: Aye.

Woman: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Anthony Christianson: Oppose, same sign, Thank you, motion carries anonymously.
That's how the chairman goes when he starts getting tired. So I think what I'm going to do guys, I know it's only quarter to 5:00 here, but I think I'm going call it for the day so we can start fresh in the morning on non-agenda items. And then we can get on a fresh proposal. That way we're not starting off the morning in the middle of the business day.

Man: Sounds good.

Anthony Christianson: So I'm going to go ahead and adjourn this meeting until tomorrow at 9:00 am and everybody have a good evening and we'll come back and reconvene starting with the double - where we just left off. Thank you.

Man: Thank you Mr. Chair.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Thank you Mr. Chair.

Woman: Yes. Thank you.

Coordinator: Thank you for your participation. Participants, you may disconnect at this time.

END