

**NWX- US FISH & WILDLIFE**

**Moderator: ROBBIN LAVINE**

**April 15, 2022**

**11:30 am CT**

Coordinator: Good afternoon and thank you for standing by. I would 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 now like to turn the call over to Ms. Sue Detwiler. Thank you. You may begin.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you, operator. And I want to confirm that Tina, the court reporter, is on and is recording this.

Tina: I am on, Sue, and yes.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you, Tina. So this is Sue Detwiler. This is day four of the Federal Subsistence Board's regulatory meeting for the 2022-24 wildlife regulatory meeting. And I'm going to start with a roll call to see which Board members we have on. National Park Service, Sarah Creachbaum?

Sarah Creachbaum: Good morning. This is Sarah. I'm present.

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

Thomas Heinlein: Good morning. This is Tom.

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

Jill Klein: Good morning, Sue. This is Jill Klein. And I'll be on for Sarah Boario for the beginning of the meeting this morning. She will join when she's done with a meeting, most likely mid-morning.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Thank you, Jill. Forest Service, Dave Schmid?

Davd Schmid: Good morning, Sue. Dave is here from sunny Juneau.

Sue Detwiler: Thanks, Dave. BIA, Gene Peltola?

Gene Peltola: Good morning, all. BIA is on.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Public member Rhonda - actually, I think Rhonda Pitka is not able to make it, but I will call public member Rhonda Pitka, are you on by chance? Public Member Charlie Brower?

And Chair Anthony Christianson? So we're waiting for the Chair and Public Member Brower. We have five members on so let's just hold on and wait for Tony to come on.

Anthony Christianson: Hello, anybody there?

Sue Detwiler: Tony, this is Sue Detwiler. Yes, I'm glad you're on. We just finished completing a roll call. Yes and actually I neglected to see who else was on the line, liaisons to the Board.

But we have five Board members present. Rhonda Pitka is not going to be on the call today. I understand we are still waiting for Charlie Brower to sign on and you just joined us. So we have six out of eight members now so we have a quorum.

And my mistake. I had neglected to go through the rest of the roll call to see who the other folks were on this meeting. So if you'd like me to go ahead and do that, Mr. Chair, I will or just have them - just maybe not go through that, either way.

Anthony Christianson: You have the floor, Sue. Go ahead. Go ahead and ask the roll today and then we'll go ahead and get started with the business this morning. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Thank you. Okay. So moving on to legal counsel, Department of Interior Regional Solicitor's Office, Ken Lord.

Ken Lord: Good morning.

Sue Detwiler: Good morning, Ken. USC Office of General Counsel, (Jim Yusechefskey), liaisons to the Board, Department of Fish, Ben Mulligan or Mark Burch?

Ben Mulligan: Good morning, Sue. I know I'm on and so is Mark.

Sue Detwiler: Great. Okay. And moving to the Regional Advisory Council Chairs, Region 1 Southeast, Dawn Hernandez? Region 2, South Central, Gloria. Did you choose Southcentral Gloria Stickwan?

Gloria Stickwan: Good morning. I'm here.

Sue Detwiler: Good morning. Gloria. Region 3, Kodiak/Aleutians, Della Trumble.

Della Trumble: Good morning. I'm here.

Sue Detwiler: Bristol Bay, Nanci Morris Lyon? Y-K Delta, Raymond Oney?

Eva Patton: Good morning, Sue. This is Eva and I'll be speaking on behalf of Chairman Raymond Oney if anything comes up for Y-K Delta. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Thank you. Region 6, Jack Reakoff?

Jack Reakoff: Jack Reakoff, here. Good morning.

Sue Detwiler: Good morning. Regions 7, Seward Peninsula, Louis Green or Nissa?

Nissa Pilcher: Good morning, Sue. Nissa Pilcher here for Chairman Green.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Thank you. Region 8, Northwest Arctic, Thomas Baker?

Brooke McDavid: Good morning, Sue. This is Brooke McDavid, the council coordinator for Northwest Arctic. Chairman Baker will not be available today so I will be presenting in his stead.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you, Brooke. Region 9, Eastern Interior, Sue Entsminger?

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

Sue Detwiler: Good morning, Sue. Region 10, North Slope Borough, Gordon Brower.

Eva Patton: Good morning, Sue. Gordon Brower, North Assistance Regional Advisory Council chair will not be on today so I will be providing the council's recommendation on the special action. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Chair, yes, so back to you.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you, Sue. Good morning, everybody. We'll go ahead and get started with the order of business this morning and we'll go ahead and open up the floor for non-consensus agenda items. So this is an opportunity at the start of the day for the public to talk to items or subjects that may not be listed on the agenda that are important.

So we'll go ahead and, operator, open up the floor for any public that want to speak to a non-agenda item. Thank you.

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.

We have a question or comment from Jill. Your line is open.

Jill Weitz: Thank you. Can you hear me okay?

Anthony Christianson: Yes. You have the floor.

Jill Weitz: Great. Good morning, Mr. Chair, and members of the Board and many thanks for your time. My name is Jill Weitz and I currently serve as the director of Beyond Borders here in (unintelligible), Juneau, Alaska.

Salmon Beyond Borders is a community driven campaign that works to defend the transboundary salmon rivers that originate in Northwest British Columbia and spill out into Southeast Alaska. These rivers, the Taku, Stikine and Unuk Rivers are the largest salmon producing rivers, historically producing 80% of our region's King salmon.

Across the international border, BC has more than a dozen industrial projects in varying stages from the abandoned and polluting Tulsequah Chief Mine in the Taku River watershed to the operating large scale open pit Red Chris Mine in the Stikine River watershed to the permitted KSM Mine, which would be the largest open pit mine in North America - one of the largest open pit mines in North America and in the world if built as proposed.

The majority of these projects are gold mines with earth and tailings dams and require water treatment in perpetuity.

With salmon populations declining throughout the state and these rivers, now with kings listed by ADS&G of stocks of concern, it is important that we do everything we can to ensure that the spawning and rearing habitat of these fish remains intact and productive for generations to come.

Southeast Alaskans led by tribes throughout Southeast Alaska have for years been calling for elevated federal engagement as it relates to this international issue.

This issue is currently managed by a nonbinding Memorandum of Understanding between British Columbia and the State of Alaska. And effectively Alaskans have been calling for binding and enforceable protections to not only to ensure our salmon watersheds remains healthy and productive but that Alaskans have accountability should catastrophic events from tailing sand failure occur or cumulative impacts from multiple open pit projects in these very significant watersheds continue to be developed as the BC mining industry has identified this region as the Golden Triangle.

As I mentioned, the Memorandum of Understanding, it doesn't work. It's not binding. It's not funded. It does not allow for Southeast Alaska Tribes or Alaska Tribes to have a seat at the table in determining how these watersheds are managed.

And, of course, on the U.S. side of these watersheds, we have federally protected areas such as Misty Fjords National Monument, which is 19 miles from the international border where the KSM Mine would be built.

We have the Stikine-LeConte Wilderness Area at the mouth of the Stikine where 80% of that entire watershed on its BC side has been staked with BC mining claims. And of course impacts to the Taku and the impacts to the Tongass writ large are of great concern.

We've identified roles for the federal government. And over the course of the last decade, there has been with great support from the Alaska federal delegation to activate relevant federal agencies to engage on this issue, not only with interagency cooperation but with coordination and collaboration across the international border.

However we have yet to get closer to obtaining these binding protections and really create opportunities and platforms for concerns from Alaskans to be heard and elevated and taken into consideration for developing these policies that will ensure that we have a seat at the table going forward.

Most recently through the course of the last year following a letter that the Southeast Alaska Indigenous Transboundary Commission sent to British Columbia requesting a pause in the permitting of new mines and expansion of existing mines until a formal consultation process is in place, many Tribes throughout Southeast Alaska as well as nine municipalities throughout Southeast Alaska have passed resolutions calling for a pause until international protections are in place as well as a permanent ban on tailings dams within these specific transboundary watersheds because of the risks that tailing dams posed to these watersheds writ large.

I won't take up too much more of your time, but I think it is incredibly important, of course, for relevant agencies including the U.S. Forest Service to increase their engagement with this issue, especially as it relates to coordination with Tribes in Southeast Alaska who have been working so hard to exert their sovereignty and garner a seat at the table in determining the management of these transboundary watersheds/

And the Southeast Alaska RAC has identified this issue as an important issue for our region's access to clean water and resources. And I support those concerns and I support increased engagement from relevant departments and agencies within the Biden administration and look forward to opportunities working in closer coordination with these agencies, both here in Juneau and within our nation's capital.

I appreciate your time and I am happy to answer any questions if any members of the Board have any.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Thank you for calling in this morning. Any questions from the Board? Thank you for presenting the information this morning. I hope you have a good day.

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

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

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. At this time we'll go ahead and open up any Board sharing or discussions this morning before we get started with the agenda. All right. Hearing none, Sue, we'll go ahead and start where we left off yesterday. This morning, we're going to pick up the Wildlife Proposal WP22-36.

Sue Detwiler: Yes. That is the only remaining item from the non-consensus agenda. That was deferred from earlier this week to allow staff some time to work on the maps. I understand those maps are completed and they should be up on the Web site fairly soon.

And I believe that we're ready to take that up, and I'll turn it over to Lisa Grediagin.

Lisa Grediagin: Thank you, Sue and Mr. Chair. This is Lisa Grediagin, Wildlife Division supervisor for OSM for the record.

And just to recap a little bit on where we're at with Wildlife Proposal 22-36, this proposal was submitted by the Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission

and requests modifications to community harvest systems for moose and caribou in Units 11, 12 and 13.

On Wednesday afternoon, we heard Pippa, the analyst, give the presentation for this analysis and covered the written public comments.

And then we were taking public testimony when we heard from AITRC about a proposed area for the community harvest system in Unit 12. And then the Board decided to table this proposal to allow time for everyone to review that area.

Staff created maps and distributed that to Board members. And as Sue mentioned we're currently in the process of posting that map to the OSM Web site so that, you know, anyone from the public is able to access that map as well.

And again, we can pick back up with that proposal process with asking for any additional public testimony unless the Board has, you know, any other questions or clarifications on this proposal or where we're at in the process, but thank you, Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson:      Thank you. Any questions for staff? Sue, we didn't get through the public testimony on this proposal?

Sue Detwiler:      I will defer to Lisa on that. I think she said we were in the midst of public testimony.

Lisa Grediagin: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Lisa. And we were taking public testimony when the Board decided to table this proposal. So my recommendation is to

ask if there's any additional public testimony on this proposal before moving on to the next step in the process. Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Yes. That's where I'm at. I'm just making sure that we're on track to do the same here. So if there's any other public testimony, this would be your time to speak to this.

So we'll go ahead and open up the floor. Operator, if anybody would like to speak to this agenda item, this is their opportunity. Thank you.

Coordinator: As a reminder to make a comment or give a testimony, please press star 1. Our first question or comment comes from Bruce. Your line is open.

(Bruce Urban): Hi. Good morning. Can you hear me okay?

Anthony Christianson: Yes. You have the floor.

(Bruce Urban): All right. Thank you, Chair and Board members. I just wanted to say that I support Karen Linnell and AITRC on WP22-36. And I was wondering if possible, you know, could we work out maybe an additional map to maybe acknowledge the Upper (unintelligible) traditional territories, the boundaries of them? Maybe like a little supplemental map or maybe just to put it on the record.

I can email that to you guys if you want. I found a couple documents. And so just to summarize, I support Karen Linnell and AITRC with WP 22-36. Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any questions for the caller. Thank you. Operator, if there's anybody else in the queue , we'll recognize them now.

Coordinator: The next question are comment comes from Donna. Your line is open.

Donna Wilson: Yes. Hello. This is Donna Wilson. Thank you for recognizing me, Chair.

I have some comments to make in regard to - this initially Proposal 22-24 with the Fish and Game has already passed. And it looks like there was some interesting confusion or overlay here with the federal and state lands.

However it doesn't reflect the public comment from Fishing and Game when they were deciding this in the proposal. So I might add this just because I don't know if it was even considered.

I agreed with everything in this well-reasoned proposal for Unit 13 and I commend (Tony Gillam) for addressing this so eloquently.

There's a number of problems with this hunt. If the reasons cited aren't enough to pass this, I can add the following. That particular hunt in Unit 13 is called CM - well it's community moose hunt 300. And that is in the state regulations.

I don't know about the other areas that they hunt, but I do know that the section along the Glenn Highway between Chickaloon and Glennallen but it's a narrow section of highway that Unit 13 has access all along the highway, numerous trails with a deep end but there are so many people on the road that hunt in their yard, et cetera.

This being open here is decimated with the mouse. There are generations of people that have been hunting this area as a community but not with a permit. And since this community moose permit thing has been allowed in '13, there have been a number of people signing up and hunting this community

subsistence harvest hunt, moose and caribou, I believe, along the highway here that don't live in the area.

They qualify for subsistence but they do not live in the area and they are hunting for people that don't even reside in Alaska. And if you look at the permits that they issued, you'll see that the addresses aren't all Alaska.

It opens before the regular harvest and any bull means by the time these hunting parties have driven the highway, they have shot every bull within the narrow corridor of the Northern Mountains and the Matanuska River. Nothing is left.

The highway is lined line by homes, property, private property, Tribal lands and people living along the miles of inescapable road for man or beast with numerous historic trailheads between that service hunters, hikers, miners, trappers, skiers, dog sledders and rural homesteaders like myself for generations from Chickaloon to Glennallen.

Imagine the disappointment when watching illegal moves on your land for weeks, waiting for regular harvest to open and suddenly shots from the highway and people walking through your fence hunting any moose in your yard. They already have the advantage of any bull. Why do they have every bull and extra days to do it before anyone else can?

It does not leave any legal ones. They shoot everything they see. They don't live in the game unit and some aren't even real residents or have ever hunted. There have been some confrontations.

It's hard to report a violation without some contact. Never good when guns are involved. Some don't want to show their permit or just, you know, to anybody.

So how do you police this? It's not working. This is the general feeling of those live on Glenn Highway. There's plenty of hunting for regular season with resident harvest tag.

I think you could either adopt that proposal, which was already I guess looked at by the state, but that does give me concern because a lot of people are using this that are not rural living people. They live in - most of them live in the valley or somewhere else.

But it's possible that some people are, you know, hunting in their yard up there in Glenallen but this was for Copper Basin hunt. And I don't know what could be done about it but maybe a regulation or something put in there that would exclude what is considered the Glacier View community on the Glenn Highway or somehow put something in there to see people from hunting in the community that they are not a part of.

I'm not sure how that, how that works or whether it's something that the Federal Subsistence Board can handle, but I just think it was worth having that acknowledged whether it comes from an individual like myself or the state or you know the fish and game. I think it is important to consider all these people that are affected by a broad hunt area that does overlap with state.

So thank you for hearing my comments and I'll hang up.

Anthony Christianson:      Thank you for taking the time to call in today. Any questions from the Board? All right. I appreciate you taking the time to call in. Operator, we'll go ahead and move on to the next one in the queue. Thank you.

Coordinator:      The next question or comment comes from Karen. Your line is open.

Karen Linnell: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the record, my name is Karen Linnell of Intertribal Resource Commission. I'd like to say thank you to the Park Service for providing and getting the map done to the areas that we agreed on. I appreciate the detail that is included in it and that we can truly understand and see what's going on on the landscape there. So I appreciate that.

And I just want to say that I appreciate the collaboration and the support. Thank you, Donna, for getting on the record the influx of hunters that we see in GMU 13 both under state and federal hunts. And I just appreciate that.

Being on the highway system is both a blessing and a curse. And so I just want to say thank you so very much for all the work that went into getting this done. And I hope the Board will pass this unanimously. Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any questions from the Board?

Karen Linnell: I'm sorry. It was Lisa that made the map. So thank you, Lisa.

Anthony Christianson: Okay. Thank you for that. All right, operator. We'll go ahead and move on to the next one in the queue. Thank you.

Coordinator: There are no further questions or comments in the queue at this time.

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

Sue Entsminger: Yes. This is Sue Entsminger, Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council. On WP22-36, we modified it and by OSM's addendum with further modification to revise the community harvest system hunt area.

And I do want to say that I think Pippa did a very good job of defining how this all went about. And the council was mostly agreed with OSM's conclusion from all of it.

There are several points in it but I thought including the Tetlin Refuge and the Wrangell-St. Elias lands in the Ahtna traditional use territory as unnecessary because those lands were very remote, only accessible by airplane and would be utilized by anyone participating in the community harvest system.

Additionally Upper Tanana communities were concerned about the community harvest coming into the area. This was discussed and the Tok River Bridge on the Tok Cutoff at the northern boundary of the area better reflects the Ahtna traditional use territory.

I was reading what is in the books right now and I just want to say that this was very confusing. And I have talked with Karen Linnell and (Barbara Solarius). She's actually the one that brought it to my attention about the maps and Nabesna Road missing on the maps to understand where we were on it. And I really want to thank (Barbara) for bringing it to my attention.

And I want to say that we worked really well together with Karen. And this new map, we would definitely - I mean, my council and I probably got wrapped around the axle, and myself included, but we would definitely support the hashtag area in the maps that's provided to you.

Thank you. Sorry it took so long.

Anthony Christianson:      Thank you, Sue. Any questions for the Regional Advisory Council?

DeAnna Perry: Mr. Chair, this is DeAnna, coordinator for the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council. And I believe Gloria Stickwan is online and can provide you with a recommendation from that council. Thank you.

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

Gloria Stickwan: We also support WP22-36 with modification to insert additional language to include only those portions of Unit 12 that lie within the untraditional use territory. This proposal is beneficial to subsistence users as It provides for customary and traditional use of resources in Units 11 and 13 in the Ahtna Traditional Territory within Unit 12. Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you, Gloria. Any questions from the Board? All right, hearing none, we'll go ahead and move on to Tribal liaison comments.

Robbin LaVine: Good morning, Mr. Chair. This is Robbin LaVine standing in for Tribal liaison Orville Lind. There were no comments or recommendations during the consultation on this proposal. Thank you. Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. We'll go ahead and move on to our state liaison.

Ben Mulligan: Good morning, Mr. Chair. For the record, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game kind of parsed out aspects of this proposal and so we'll have a few statements on this one.

First, the department supports allowing community members stopped out of a community harvest system and retain their individual harvest limits. We viewed that as something of a fairness. Having someone be stuck into one system seemed unnecessary.

I will at this time also put a pitch in for we wouldn't recommend that quotas or bag limits be set based on number of participating hunters in any federal or state harvest rather quotas and bag limits should be based on the status of the available resource and the harvestable surplus based on biological metrics.

Next, the department took no position on defining the geographic boundaries of eligible communities as the most recent CBP established by the U.S. Census Bureau.

And then the third, you know, as we've testified previously on WP22-01 and 2, you know, we have expressed our concerns over the timeliness and accuracy of data that will be collected.

But, you know, on Wednesday when we took this up the first time, Ms. Linnell from AITRC testified. We heard loud and clear the importance of that data to them and also to us as managers and so we appreciate that statement.

And I will end our testimony there. Thank you, sir.

Anthony Christianson:      Thank you, state. Any questions for Ben? All right. Hearing none, ISC recommendation?

Robbin LaVine:    Good morning, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. This is Robbin LaVine, Subsistence Policy Coordinator and the Interagency Staff Committee chair.

For Wildlife Proposal WP22-36, the Interagency Staff Committee provided the standard comment. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Anthony Christianson:    Thank you, ISC. Any Board discussion or deliberation? Hearing none, I open the floor for Board action.

Sarah Creachbaum: Mr. Chair, National Park Service. Mr. Chair, I move to approve Wildlife Proposal 22-36 to codify temporary regulations that expire June 30, 2022 regarding the community harvest system for moose and caribou in Units 11, 12 and 13 with the OSM modification to clarify regulatory language.

And with the second modification describing the area for the community harvest system in Unit 12 that better reflects the Ahtna traditional territory instead of all federal public lands in Unit 12.

With respect to the harvest system area in Unit 12, my modification includes the Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council recommendation for lands along the Tok Cutoff plus an additional area of Unit 12 that is based on existing moose harvest areas in federal regulations.

Specifically the following would be included, federal public lands in Unit 12 within the Tok and Little Tok River drainages, south of the Tok River Bridge and east of the Tok Cutoff road and within the Nabesna River drainage west and east of the east bank of the Nabesna River upstream from the southern boundary of Tetlin National Wildlife Refuge and that portion of Unit 12 that is east of the Nabesna River and south of the Pickerel Lake Winter Trail running southeast from Pickerel Lake to the Canadian border. This area is consistent with the recommendations of the proponents.

If I get a second, I will explain why and tend to support my motion.

Dave Schmid: Forest Service seconds.

Sarah Creachbaum: Thank you. Approval of 22-36 is necessary to fully implement the Ahtna Region community harvest system that was recently approved by the Board

and is administered in cooperation with the Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission.

It will codify in regulations several provisions that were previously adopted by the Board on a temporary basis. My support for this proposal is consistent with the recommendations of the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council and the Wrangell-St. Elias National Parks Subsistence Resource Commission.

Thank you.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Any further Board discussion, comments or questions? Call for the question.

Man: Question.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you. Roll call, Sue, please.

Sue Detwiler: We will start with the maker of the motion, National Park Service, Sarah Creachbaum.

Sarah Creachbaum: The National Park supports the motion.

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

Jill Klein: This is Jill Klein for Sarah Boario, and Fish and Wildlife Service supports the motion.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you, Jill. BIA, Gene Peltola?

Gene Peltola: BIA supports.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Thomas Heinlein, BLM?

Thomas Heinlein: BLM supports.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Dave Schmid, Forest Service?

Dave Schmid: The Forest Service supports.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Public member Rhonda Pitka - oh, I'm sorry. Rhonda is not on today. I understand public member Charlie Brower is with us now. Charlie, are you on?

Charlie Brower: I've been on. I support.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Thank you, Charlie. Chair Christianson?

Anthony Christianson: I support.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. The motion passes with seven votes.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you, Sue. And I think that concludes our non-consensus agenda items. And as a matter of process, I believe we now have to accept the consensus agenda item. Sue?

Sue Detwiler: Yes, yes. And Lisa Grediagin will be presenting the consensus agenda.

Anthony Christianson: All right. We'll go ahead and get started.

Lisa Grediagin: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Lisa Grediagin, the Wildlife Division supervisor at OSM. I'll be reading all of the consensus agenda proposals and closure reviews along with their recommendations into the record.

These are the proposals and closure reviews for which there is agreement among the Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Councils, the Federal Interagency Staff Committee and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game concerning Board action.

The following are consensus agenda proposals and closure reviews.

Proposal WP22-05 requests the establishment of a draw permit hunt for elk in the Etolin Island area of Unit 3 with one permit issued per household. The recommendation is to oppose.

Proposal WP22-06 requests the establishment of a federal draw permit moose hunt with an any bull harvest limit and a harvest quota of up to 20 bulls on Kupreanof and Kuiu Islands in Unit 3. The recommendation is to oppose.

Proposal 22-09 requests that federal public lands draining into Lisianski Strait and Stag Bay south of the latitude of Mite Cove and north of the latitude of Lost Cove be closed to deer hunting October 15 to December 31, except by federally qualified subsistence users. The recommendation is to oppose.

Proposal WP22-11 requests that federal regulation for mountain goats and Units 5A remainder be changed to remove the following language, a minimum of four goats in the harvest quota will be reserved for federally qualified subsistence users.

The recommendation is to support with the OSM modification to remove the language describing an announcement of the quota from unit specific regulations and maintaining the delegation of authority letter only.

Wildlife closure review WCR22-02 reviews the closure to moose hunting from October 8 to October 12 west of the Dangerous River and September 16 to September 30 east of the Dangerous River in Unit 5A except by residents of Unit 5A. The recommendation is to maintain status quo.

Proposal WP22-13 requests that deer be removed from the Unit 6 specific designated hunter regulation. The recommendation is to oppose.

Proposal WP22-14 requests that the black bear harvest limit in Unit 6 be increased from 1 to 2 black bears per year and that the Unit 60 season would close if the harvest quota was met. The recommendation is to oppose.

Proposal WP22-15 request prohibiting trapper stair usage within 1,000 ft of specified trails, roadways and campgrounds. The recommendation is to oppose.

WP22-16 requests that the Federal subsistence Board recognize the customary and traditional use of moose on Unit 7, 15A and 15B by residents of Moose Path. The recommendation is to support.

Proposals WP22-17, 22-18 and 22-19 request the Board recognize the customary and traditional use of moose in Unit 7, 15A and 15B and 15 C, respectively by residents of Moose Path. The recommendation is to support.

The recommendation for WP22-17 and 18 - oh, I'm sorry. The recommendation for 22-17 and 18 is to support. The recommendation for WP22-19 is to oppose.

Proposals WP22-21 and WP22-22 requests that the Board recognize the customary and traditional use of caribou in Units 7 and 15B and 15C, respectively, by residents of Moose Pass.

The recommendation for WP22-21 is to support. The recommendation for WP22-22 is to support with modifications to remove Unit 15C.

Proposals WP22-23 and 22-24 requests that the board recognize the customary traditional use of goats in Unit 7 remainder and Unit 15, respectively, by residents of Moose Path.

The recommendation is to support WP22-23 and to support WP22-24 with modification to remove Unit 15C.

Proposal WP22-26A requests that the Board recognize the customary and traditional uses of sheep in Unit 7 by Moose Path. The recommendation is to support.

Proposal WP22-25A requests that the Board recognize the customary and traditional use of sheep in Unit 7 by residents of Cooper Landing. The recommendation is to support.

Proposal WP22-27 requests that the Board recognize the customary and traditional use of sheep in Unit 15 by residents of Cooper Landing.

The recommendation is to support with modification to only established customary and traditional uses of sheep for Cooper Landing in Unit 15A and 15B and not in Unit 15C.

Proposal WP22-32 requests the Federal Subsistence Board to recognize customary and traditional uses by rural residents of the North Fork Road area and in the Nikolaevsk for black bears, brown bears, caribou, mountain goats, moose and Dall sheep in Unit 15. The recommendation is to oppose.

Proposal WP22-33 requests eliminating the ceiling requirement for black bear in Units 11 and 12. The recommendation is to support.

Proposal WP22-34 requests to change the salvage requirement to a bone-in for sheep taken in Units 11 and 12. The recommendation is to oppose.

Proposal WP22-37 requested the Federal Subsistence Board recognize the customary and traditional use of ptarmigan in Unit 9D by residents of Cold Bay, King Cove, Sandpoint, Belkofski, Sanak, Pauloff Harbor, Unga and Nelson Lagoon.

The recommendation is to support with the OSM modification to recognize the customary traditional use of ptarmigan by residents of Unit 9D.

Proposal WP22-38A requests that the Federal Subsistence Board recognize the customary and traditional use of caribou in Unit 10 Unimak Island for residents of Cold Bay and Nelson Lagoon. The recommendation is to support.

Wildlife Proposal WP22-38B request closure federal public lands in Unit 10, Unimak Island only to caribou hunting except by federally qualified for

subsistence users unless the caribou population estimate exceeds the population threshold.

The recommendation is to support with modification to remove the closure from the unit specific regulations and delegate authority to the Izembek National Wildlife Refuge manager to open and close federal public lands to non-federally qualified users annually based on the current population status of the Unimak caribou herd in consultation with ADF&T staff via delegation of authority letter only.

Wildlife closure of WCR22-07 reviews the closure to caribou hunting except by federally qualified subsistence users unless the population estimate exceeds 900 caribou in Unit 17. Specifically Unit 17A and 17C, that portion of 17A and 17C consisting of the Nushagak Peninsula, south of the Igushik River, (Teklan) River and (Teklan) Hills west to Tvativak Bay. The recommendation is to maintain status quo.

Proposal WP22 42 requests, the Federal Subsistence Board increase the harvest limit of moose from two to three in Unit 18 remainder. The recommendation is to support.

Proposal WP22 43 requests delegating authority to the federal in-season manager to increase the moose harvest quota in Zone 1 of the Kuskokwim hunt area of Unit 18 if the water levels are too low to access Zone 2. The recommendation is to oppose.

Proposal WP22-48 requests modification of the boundary between two hunt areas in Unit 22A. The recommendation is to support.

Wildlife Closure WCR22-09C reviews the closer to moose hunting in Unit 22A remainder except by federal qualified subsistence users. The recommendation is to maintain status quo.

Wildlife closure WCR22-16 reviews the closure to moose hunting in Unit 22E except by federally qualified subsistence users. The recommendation is to maintain status quo.

Wildlife closure WCR22-27 reviews the closure to musk ox in Unit 23 Cape Krusenstern National Monument except by federally qualified subsistence users but not residents of Point Hope. The recommendation is to modify or eliminate the closure as recommended by OSM.

WP22-51 requests elimination of the Minto Flats Management Area registration hunt for moose in Unit 20B. The recommendation is to support.

Proposal WP22-52 requests that the closing date of the moose season in Unit 25A be extended to December 20. The recommendation is to support with modification to extend the moose season in the (Callingfirth) and Old Crow River drainages only.

Proposal WP22-53 requests establishing a trapping season for arctic fox and Unit 25. The recommendation is to support.

Wildlife closure WCR22-22 reviews the closure of moose hunting in Unit 25D West to everyone except residents of Unit 25D West. The recommendation is to maintain status quo.

Wildlife closure WCR22-25 reviews the closure to federal public lands for hunting musk ox in Unit 26C except by rural Alaska residents from the Village of Kaktovik. The recommendation is to maintain status quo.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. That concludes the consensus agenda proposals and closure reviews. And I'd also like to take this opportunity to commend all the analysts for their great work analyzing the proposals as well as all the OSM staff and council members and everyone that contributed to this meeting.

I think we're all pretty frustrated with the teleconference format and looking forward to meeting in person again but besides all the technical and communication challenges, I think this was a pretty successful meeting so far.

And again thank you, everyone, for all the work contributed to this meeting. So I'll turn it back over to you, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

Anthony Christianson:      Thank you, Lisa. And I echo everything that you said there. I appreciate all of the patience from everybody online for this and all the staff working, being available to answer the questions and then to work through issues as they arise as the meeting happens and to be able to come back and pull together packages that gives us enough information to do our job.

I appreciate that from the staff and all the regional Advisory Council members that give us the insight on these proposals in the background. And so I just appreciate everybody that pulls together the collective work that it takes for us to decide on these proposals.

So thank you, Lisa and the staff and Sue. So we'll go ahead and I believe that opens up the floor for Board action on the consensus agenda.

Gene Peltola: Mr. Chair, BIA.

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

Gene Peltola: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The Bureau of Indian Affairs moves to adopt the consensus agenda as presented.

Dave Schmid: The Forest Service will second.

Anthony Christianson: So we have a motion on the floor and seconded to accept. Any discussion by the Board? Call for the question.

Dave Schmid: Question.

Anthony Christianson: All in favor to accept the consensus agenda signify by saying aye.

((Group)): Aye.

Anthony Christianson: Opposed, same sign. Motion carries unanimously. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Mr. Chair, this is Sue Detwiler. That brings us to Agenda Item 8, which is Wildlife Special Action, WSA 22-01 pertaining to Unit 22 and 23 musk ox. This is an action item and that presenter will be Brian Ubelaker.

Anthony Christianson: Thank you.

Brian Ubelaker: Thank you, Sue. Good morning, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. Can everybody hear me all right?

Anthony Christianson: Yes, you have the floor.

Brian Ubelaker: Great. Thank you. Yes, as Sue said, and for the record, my name is Brian Ubelaker. And I'm a wildlife biologist with the Office of Subsistence Management.

I'll be presenting a summary of Temporary Wildlife Special Action WSA 22-01, which was submitted by the National Park Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

This special action has been separated into two parts, WSA 22-1A pertaining to the Seward Peninsula musk ox in Units 22 and 23 and WSA 22-01B for northern Unit 23 Cape Thompson musk oxen.

However I will summarize both parts in my presentation. This analysis is found in your supplemental materials.

Temporary Special Action WSA 22-01 requests the Federal Subsistence Board change the federal musk ox permits in Units 22 and 23 from a registration to a drawing permit for the 2022-2024 regulatory cycle.

This is considered a housekeeping request as these permits have been distributed via a draw since about 1998. In addition, the proponents request to standardize the language in the delegation of authority letters and the change in unit season manager from the Western Arctic National Parkland superintendent to the Anchorage field office manager for the federal musk ox hunts in the southwestern portion of Unit 23.

Both musk ox populations have been managed under a shared quota system with the State of Alaska since 1998. ADF&G has mostly issued permits under

Tier 2 restrictions and federal permits have been issued by drawing since about the same time.

Federal in-season managers used the draw system to distribute permits because unclear language in the delegation of authority letters led them to believe they could. The federal in-season managers consider a draw permit hunt to be the best management strategy for conserving natural and healthy populations while still allowing for subsistence use by federally qualified subsistence users.

Federal musk ox hunts were originally established in 1995 on the Seward Peninsula with a harvest quota of seven musk oxen. In 1998, along with a shared quota system with the state being established, the current season of August 1 through March 15 was established.

Then in 2001 ADF&G initiated musk ox hunts in Unit 23 north and west of the Noatak River. In 2002 authorities for the Unit 23 southwest hunt was delegated to the Western Arctic Parkland superintendent.

In 2005 the Federal Subsistence Board established a musk oxen season within Cape Krusenstern National Monument and the Board of Game established a registration permit in Unit 22B.

In 2010 the Board opened federal land to all users and allowed cow harvest for the entire season in Unit 22B. But in 2014 the cow hunt was eliminated Seward Peninsula-wide as a result of declining population.

In 2016 the Federal Subsistence Board established the musk ox hunt in Unit 23 north and west of the Kobuk River.

In 2020 the Board reviewed federal land closures on the Seward Peninsula and decided to maintain the closures because of low musk ox populations.

Musk oxen were reintroduced to the Seward Peninsula in 1970 and the population grew rapidly until 2010. Then between 2010 and 2012 the population declined by about 23%. After this the population appears to have stabilized at the new lower population number and has average 2,233 musk oxen since 2012.

The Cape Thompson herd was introduced the same time and grew steadily at 8% until 1998. The growth rate continued to 2% until 2005 when the population declined, which is believed to be caused by range expansion. Since then the population appears to have stabilized, averaging 234 musk oxen.

The harvest rate of Seward Peninsula musk oxen declined from a high of 5.8% in 2012, which coincided with the drop in population, to an average of 1.4%, and has remained steady since then.

Approving WSA22-01 will not change subsistence use of musk oxen by federally qualified subsistence users or affect the musk ox population in either area as it is an administrative change only.

However allowing a federal drawing permit hunt for musk oxen insures harvest remains within sustainable levels and responds to both changing hunt and herd conditions. A drawing permit also randomizes the selection of who receives a permit, making permit distribution more equitable among federally qualified subsistence users. Standard, excuse me, standardizing the language in the delegation of authority letters to close the season, set any needed permit conditions, determine the annual harvest quota, the number of permits to issue, and the method of permit allocation between state and federal permits,

provides clarity to the in season managers on what authority they have, and allows for effective and flexible hunt administration, while the change of in season manager better reflects land status in the Unit 23 Southwest hunt area.

Therefore, it is OSM's conclusion to support temporary Wildlife Special Action, WSA 22-01. Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the board. I'd be happy to address any questions.

Sue Detwiler: Yes. This is Sue Detwiler from OSM stepping in here. I just got a text that Chair Tony Christianson had to leave to take care of a community issue. And so usually Rhonda Pitka would be second in line to act as a temporary board Chair. She is not here today. So I'm going to ask Ken Lord and - unless I hear something from another board member. I'm going to ask Ken Lord if it's okay if I just run through the steps to get through this Wildlife Special Action at this point.

And then when we get to the actual board action where the board makes a motion to take an action, if we stop and see if Tony is back online. And if Tony is not back online then my suggestion would be we - the board takes a vote to select a temporary acting Chair. I don't know, Ken, is that within the scope of board procedures?

Ken Lord: It is Sue. That would be fine.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Thank you. So unless I hear something from the other board members, I'll just go down our list of steps here for this Wildlife Special Action. We've just heard the analysis from the lead author, so I believe the next step would be opportunity for board questions of the author. Not hearing any questions from the board for Brian, so the next step would be Regional Advisory Council recommendations.

Nissa Pilcher: This is Nissa Pilcher, Council Coordinator for the Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory Council. I'll be presenting the council's justification - or comment for the Special Action Request. The Seward Peninsula Advisory Council supported WSA 22-01. The council considered this a housekeeping request and recognized that the overharvest of Musk ox population would be really easy. They felt administering the permit by random drawing, to be the most equitable manner for distribution, and would help protect the Musk ox population. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you, Nissa. And do we have any comments from Northwest Arctic Regional Council, Brooke McDavid?

Brooke McDavid: Yes. This is Brooke McDavid, the Northwest Arctic Council Coordinator. And the Northwest Arctic Council supported WSA 22-01. The council considered this a housekeeping request, and concurs with administering the hunt in the same way it has been in the past. They also noted that Musk ox are really good eating for subsistence. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Thank you, Brooke. Moving to North Slope. Do we have Gordon Brower or Eva on, for the Regional Council recommendation?

Eva Patton: Thank you, Sue. This is Eva Patton, Council Coordinator for the North Slope Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. And the North Slope only took action on the Special Action B addressing Unit 23, which will be coming up next. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Thank you, Eva.

Lisa Grediagin: Sorry to interrupt, Sue, this is Lisa. But we're presenting them both together. So I'm sorry for any confusion there, Eva. But yes, WSA 22-01, the analyses are separated out, but the intention is for the board, you know, to act on them together. Thank you.

Eva Patton: Okay, great. Thank you. In that case, both North Slope and the Northwest Subsistence Regional Advisory Council have recommendations on WSA 22-01(b). And again, for the record, Eva Patton, Council Coordinator for the North Slope Subsistence Regional Advisory Council, making the council recommendations on behalf of Chair Gordon Brower.

And the North Slope RAC supports WSA 22-01 and the council considered distributing permits through a random drawing, to be more inclusive and fair than a registration permit hunt, which favors those living closer to the permitting office. Again, the council thought drawing permits would be a more fair and equitable way to administer this hunt. Thank you, Mr. Chair, Madam Chair.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. So if that's my mistake there, thank you for that, Lisa. So I believe we need to go to WSA 22-01(b), back to the - back to Brian for that staff analysis.

Lisa Grediagin: Yes, this is Lisa. I'm sorry. I got a little distracted there. Brian, could you clarify - I thought you presented them together.

Brian Ubelaker: Yes. Excuse me. Yes, Lisa. Brian Ubelaker. I did present A and B together. Yes. Information for 421(a) was regarding Seward Peninsula Musk ox, 22-01(b) was for the Northern 23K (Thompson) Musk ox. But yes, information was presented together for 22-01 in general. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. So sorry about that confusion. So I guess if that's the case then I just want to make sure that all three regional councils have said everything they'd all commented they would like to, on both of those proposals. Is that correct, Nissa and Brooke?

Nissa Pilcher: That is correct. This is Nissa Pilcher for the record. That is correct for Seward Peninsula.

Brooke McDavid: For the record this is Brooke McDavid, and yes, that is also correct for Northwest Arctic.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Okay, thank you. Then we can move onto Alaska Department of Fish & Game comments.

Ben Mulligan: Hello. This is Ben Mulligan. I'll just do A and B together. The Alaska Department of Fish & Game did not officially take a position on the special action viewing. It has a housekeeping measure, but I will say that when discussing this with the region, our wildlife biologist there felt that for the health of the Musk ox population there, the draw hunt was the way to go. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you, Ben. Next is Interagency Staff Committee comments.

Robbin LaVine: Thank you, Madam Chair, this is Robbin LaVine. And for Wildlife Special Action 22-01, the Interagency Staff Committee provided the standard comment. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. And board discussion. Actually I think at this point I would feel most comfortable if we stopped here and make sure Tony has not joined yet. Tony, are you on, Tony Christianson? Sounds like not. So I would put it to the

board to select a temporary Chair. And Ken Lord, I'm not sure if there is a special procedure that the board needs to go through.

Charlie Brower: Ma'am?

Sue Detwiler: Yes.

Charlie Brower: I would nominate Gene from BIA, to be temporary our Chair. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Is there a second.

Gene Peltola: That's - this is BIA. I may have to step out shortly for a brief period, and I wouldn't want to cause additional disruption. So what I was wondering if Dave would be willing to, even though he may have a potential conflict coming up. So I'd hope to have it open for discussion.

David Schmid: Yes. This is Dave with Forest Service. And I'd be happy to fill in that role here if the board members were okay, until the - I think one of our next agenda item 9 I will be making the motion there, and would prefer someone else to cover that. So it might be better to look for another board member here, to take us to the end of the meeting, if need be.

Sue Detwiler: So Ken does the maker of the original motion need to withdraw the motion to have Gene step in, or is this something that can be done a little bit more informally like a consensus of the board members?

Ken Lord: We're in uncharted waters here, Sue. I think any - yes, I think you can move ahead and if someone objects then please speak up.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. So it sounds like we just - we need a board member to step in. Let's see, then next - well this agenda item will be voted on, and then we have another agenda item after that. As Dave said, that Dave is going to be involved with.

David Schmid: So Sue, I might offer a path here. Let's maybe work through this. I'd be happy to sit in as pro temp, or whatever, until we get through number 8 agenda item, and then maybe take a break and see if our Chair, Mr. Christianson, is able to come back. And if not, then more formally appoint another board member at that time.

Sue Detwiler: Does that sound good to the rest of the board members?

Gene Peltola: I'm fine, BIA.

Charlie Brower: I'm fine, public member.

Sue Detwiler: Any objections?

Jill Klein: No objections from Fish & Wildlife.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. So it sounds like it's back to you, then Dave, and we're at the board discussion on Wildlife Special Action 22-01 followed by board action.

David Schmid: Thank you, Sue. So the board, we are as Sue stated, at board discussion here on WSA 22-01. And again, we took those together as 1(a) and 1(b). I'd open it for any discussion. Hearing no discussion, I would entertain a motion at this point.

Sarah Creachbaum: Mr. Chair, National Park Service.

David Schmid: Go ahead, Park Service. Thank you.

Sarah Creachbaum: Thanks. I move to approve Temporary Wildlife Special Action WSA 22-01(a) and WSA 22-01(b). And if I get a second I'll explain why I intend to vote in support of my motion.

Gene Peltola: BIA, seconds.

Sarah Creachbaum: Thank you. Approval of WSA 22-01(a) and WSA 22-01(b), will not affect the subsistence use of Musk ox and game management Unit 22 and 23. It is an administrative change to how federal permits are distributed. Allowing for a federal draw hunt will ensure that harvest remains within sustainable levels, and responds to both changing hunt and her condition. It will further allow for more equitable distribution of permits, excuse me, to federally qualified subsistence users through the use of a random drawing, and will allow for a limited harvest the population can sustain.

Standardizing language in the delegation of authority letters, will provide clarity to in season managers and will allow for effective and flexible hunt administration. And changing the in season manager for Musk ox hunt in GMU 23 to Southwest, Southwest (unintelligible) land status in the hunt area. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

David Schmid: Yes. Thank you. Any other questions for Park Service? Hearing none, would anyone like to call for the question?

Charlie Brower: Question.

David Schmid: Thank you, Charlie. Question has been called. Sue, could you take a roll call vote here? Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Yes. National Park Service, Sarah Creachbaum?

Sarah Creachbaum: National Park Service supports the motion.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Jill Klein on behalf of Jill Klein, Fish & Wildlife Service?

Jill Klein: Fish & Wildlife Service supports the motion.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Gene Peltola, BIA?

Gene Peltola: BIA supports.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Tom Heinlein, BLM?

Thomas Heinlein: Bureau of Land Management supports.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Dave Schmid, Forest Service?

David Schmid: The Forest Service supports with the justification provided by the Park Service.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Public Member Charlie Brower?

Charlie Brower: Support.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. And I will just check and see if Chair Christianson came on.  
Okay. So the motion passes six with two absent.

David Schmid: Thank you, Sue. And again, I would recommend that we break until the bottom of the hour, 10:30, and at which time if we come back and Chair Christianson is with us, we will turn that back to him. And if not, we'll look for another board member to step into that role that we will still have a quorum I believe, and can finish the agenda. So, let's take a break until 10:30. Thank you.

Okay. Welcome back folks here, this is Dave Schmid filling in briefly as the Chair. Sue, could you take another roll and make sure that we have at least a public member on, before we move forward here at 11:00?

Sue Detwiler: Yes. We'll do that. Starting with National Park Service, Sarah Creachbaum?

Sarah Creachbaum: Hi Sue, I'm here.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Bureau of Land Management, Tom Heinlein?

Thomas Heinlein: Hi, Sue. I'm present.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Fish & Wildlife Service, Sara Boario or Jill Klein? We'll come back to them. Dave Schmid, I know you're on. Gene Peltola?

Gene Peltola: BIA is on.

Sue Detwiler: And Charlie Brower, Public Member? Okay. We'll go back to Fish & Wildlife Service, Sara Boario, Jill Klein? They may be having a hard time getting into - onto a speaking line. And we currently have National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, Forest Service, and Bureau of Indian Affairs. And we heard Charlie Brower on the line just a couple of minutes ago, so he may be

on mute his phone. And Sara Boario from Fish & Wildlife Service was - still waiting to hear from them.

David Schmid: Yes. I see Sara's on, but apparently not in the speaking mode. I just received a chat there, Sue. If the operator can get her into the speaking room.

Sue Detwiler: Yes. Yes. Robbin, or Lisa, I imagine you're helping out with that.

Robbin LaVine: We're working with the operator now. Thank you.

Coordinator: Sara's line is open.

Sue Detwiler: Hi, Sara. This is Sue Detwiler. We're doing roll call. Are you on? Can you confirm that you're on?

Sara Boario: I am on. Can you hear me?

Sue Detwiler: Yes.

Sara Boario: Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: We're just doing roll call, and I'm going to see if Charlie Brower has gotten into the speaking room yet.

Charlie Brower: Yes, I have. Just, my phone is funny right now.

Sue Detwiler: Great. Okay. Thank you very much, Charlie. And Chair Anthony Christianson? Not on. So we do have six members, Mr. Chair, Acting Chair.

David Schmid: Okay. I'm - thank you, Sue. And we do have Public Member Charlie Brower on, which I know we weren't comfortable moving forward with at least one public member, and we do have a quorum. At this time though I think our next agenda item that we were going to take up, was number 9, which is the Fisheries Proposal 21-10 Lower Copper River Area Salmon that was deferred and coming back to the board.

And since I will be involved in the - making the motion, at this time unless there's any other objection, I would like to pass the gavel over to BIA, Gene Peltola. But please speak up anyone, if you have an issue with that. If not, I will turn it over to Gene.

Gene Peltola: All right. Hearing none, no objection, thank you, Dave. I appreciate it. So as Dave mentioned, we're on agenda item 9, FP 21-10 Lower Copper River Area Salmon. Sue, could you tell us what we have for action, the action process on this proposal?

Sue Detwiler: Yes. So the action items that we have listed on our - for this agenda, would be an introduction of this agenda item that would be done by Scott Ayers, our Fisheries Supervisor. We have an updated analysis of this proposal; we have a summary of Regional Advisory Council meeting points from when the two Regional Advisory Councils met on this, to present that summary. And that would be an opportunity for the council coordinators and the chairs of the two councils, to provide their summary and also be available for additional discussion.

And then after the summary of Regional Advisory Council chair comments the board would go into discussion and finally take action. And what is not currently on this agenda, is a public comment period. It would be up to the discretion of the board as to whether they wanted to add an additional public

comment item. And if that were to be added, it would probably come after the updated - presentation of the updated analysis.

Gene Peltola: Okay, Sue, thank you. And I'm all in favor of inserting the comment period up right after the updated analysis. Does anybody not agree with that step? Okay. Hearing none, Sue why don't you go ahead and put the comment period right after updated analysis? And then from there we'll move onto - turning it over to Scott and proceeding with the analysis. Go ahead, Scott.

Scott Ayers: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the board. Again, this is Scott Ayers, the Fisheries Division Lead at OSM. We're going to switch things up a bit here and talk about a Fisheries topic. Specifically Im here to speak with you about deferred Fisheries Proposal FP 21-10, which requested a new Federal Subsistence Fishery for salmon in the Lower Copper River adjacent to the Copper River Highway. And then also why it's back in front of you again.

Fisheries Proposal FP 21-10 requests the Federal Subsistence Board implement a salmon subsistence fishery in the Lower Copper River adjacent to the Copper River Highway, with a harvest limit of 15 salmon other than pink salmon, for the first two members of a household, then ten salmon for additional household members. It would limit Chinook salmon harvest to five per household.

Allowable gear types would be dip net, rod and reel, spear, or (gas). The proposal was submitted by Jesse Carter and (Robert Jewell) of Cordova. FP 21-10 was presented at the Subsistence Regional Advisory Councils at their fall 2020 meetings. The Southcentral Council provided a recommendation in support of the proposal with the OSM modification that required a 48-hour reporting requirement. The Eastern Interior Council provided a comment in opposition to the proposal.

Board action on this proposal at your January 2021 meeting, was to defer. Your justification was that the proposal resulted in a disagreement between Regional Advisory Councils, some tribal communities, and other federally qualified subsistence users. He noted that the deferral would give the Southcentral and Eastern Interior Council time to meet and work toward a compromise that can be supported by those affected.

On March 16, 2022, the Southcentral and Eastern Interior Councils met jointly, to take up this deferred proposal. The chairs of both councils ran the meeting jointly. Board member Creachbaum, and board member Schmid were present, and welcomed the group. Board member Schmid also provided a clarification on expectations letting the group know that it was okay for the councils to disagree, and that they were not required to compromise as part of this process.

Council members for the presentation of the updated proposal analysis and were provided an overview of all materials that were sent to the councils for their consideration. Following this, each council member provided statements on the topic at hand, touching on reasons for support or opposition, ideas for potential modification, and comments on process. When that was completed each council voted on a comment to the board.

The meeting ended with closing comments. A transcript of that meeting is available on the OSM Web site by going to Regions, choosing Southcentral or Eastern Interior, and then clicking on meeting transcripts. As I close here, you'll receive an overview of the updated proposal analysis. A summary of the main points from the joint Southcentral and Eastern Interior council meeting will then be provided by the council coordinators.

The council chairs are here to speak to any questions that you may have. And then you can proceed to your discussion, deliberation, and action. And obviously, we've now added a public comment section in there as well. Thank you for your time. And please let me know if you have any questions.

Gene Peltola: Thank you, Scott. I appreciate it. Any questions for Scott, before we proceed? Okay. Hearing none, Sue, next item.

Sue Detwiler: Yes. I believe we were going to go into the staff analysis. Scott, was that going to be (Stormi) and Milo?

Scott Ayers: Yes. That's correct.

Gene Peltola: Okay. Please proceed, Scott with the analysis.

(Stormi Hott): All right. Thank you. Good morning. This is (Stormi Hott) with Chugach National Forest. Thank you, Sue. And thanks, Scott, for that background and good morning, Mr. Acting Chair and members of the board. Again, my name is (Stormi Hott), Chugach National Forest. I'll be presenting an updated analysis for FP 21-10. This updated analysis is available in the supplemental meeting materials. Proposal FP 21-10 submitted by Jesse Carter and (Robert Jewell) of Cordova, Alaska, request that the Federal Subsistence Board implement a salmon subsistence fishery in the Lower Copper River adjacent to the Copper River Highway.

Harvest limits would not be additive to the current existing federal subsistence permit for the Prince William Sound area, or the state subsistence fishing permit in the Copper River District. Currently, federally qualified subsistence users in the Cordova area, primarily fulfill their subsistence needs under a State of Alaska subsistence salmon fishing permit.

Participation in the state subsistence gill net fishery within the marine waters of the Copper River District, requires use of a saltwater capable boat and fishing during commercial openers or fishing during Saturday periods, which can be a substantial barrier for local harvesters. The proponents' rationale for submitting this proposal, is to improve the access to Copper River salmon by providing residents a road accessible harvest area.

The proposed Lower Copper River area includes that portion of the Copper River from a boundary one half mile upstream of the Copper River Highway, to a boundary extending one half mile downstream of the Copper River Highway, from the west bank of the river near highway mile 27, also known as Flag Point, to the east bank of the river near mile 38.

Allowable gear would be dip nets, rod and reel, spear and (gas), with harvest limits for a household of one person, 15 salmon other than pink; five cutthroat trout with over two over 20 inches; and no more than five Chinook salmon per household. For a household of two would be 30 salmon other than pink salmon, plus an additional ten salmon for each additional person in the household over 2; five cutthroat trout with only two over 20 inches for each household member, with a maximum household limit of 30 cutthroat trout may be taken, with no more than five Chinook salmon per household.

I'll go through a little bit of regulatory history. This starts on page 10 of the analysis. The existing federal subsistence fishing permit within the Copper River Delta, Prince William Sound area, this is (FFPW010) which was established in 2004, allows for the harvest of fish in fresh water year-round, except in the Lower Copper River and its tributaries which are closed to federal subsistence harvest of salmon by regulation. And excluding (Eak) Lake and its tributaries which are closed to fishing for salmon.

The federal subsistence permit limits the harvest of salmon to 15 fish for a household of one, 30 fish for a household of two, and ten salmon for each additional person in that household. The federal and state subsistence permit harvest limits may not be added. There is no limit on the number of Chinook salmon that may be taken within the total salmon limit on this permit, because there are few, if any, Chinook salmon returning to the fresh waters open to subsistence harvest in this area.

Historically, there have been several board actions on proposals submitted for the harvest of salmon in the Copper River downstream of the 52-mile or also known as the Million Dollar Bridge. In 2007 Proposal FP 07-14 was submitted requesting that the Copper River waters downstream of the Million Dollar Bridge, be open to federal subsistence harvest of salmon using dip nets and rod and reel with bait, for the months of May, June, and July.

The board rejected this despite noting in their decision justification that at the time there were no biological concerns. At that time, the Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council felt that other opportunities for harvesting salmon for subsistence already existed in the Cordova and Prince William Sound, both in marine waters with a gill net and in fresh waters with a dip net.

In the 2018 Fisheries proposal cycle, Proposal FP 19-14, submitted by the Native Village of (Eak), proposed to extend the current federal subsistence salmon fishery to waters of the Lower Copper River, beginning one half mile downstream of the road crossing at the Copper River Highway, mile 27. And extending upstream to the Million Dollar Bridge, using dip net, and rod and reel. The Native Village of (Eak) withdrew Proposal FP 19-14 during the first day of the 2018 council meeting.

In April 2020 a request was submitted to the board to open a federal subsistence dip net season for salmon in the Lower Copper River. This was Fishery Special Action Request, FSA 20-04, to offset related health and safety issues associated with the existing means of harvesting Copper River salmon in the state Copper River District Fishery.

This issue generated large amounts of public interest with 38 written comments supporting and ten opposed to the measure. The proposal was considered by a special session of the board, and not adopted. One concern shared by some community members, was the establishment of the Federal Subsistence Fishery would lead to the development of a state personal use fishery, resulting in crowding and over-harvest in the lower Copper River.

This could occur with or without the adoption of a federal subsistence proposal. And for reference, a state person use fishery was not proposed after the federal fishery for fresh waters of the Copper River Delta, was established in 2004.

Biological background is on page 17 of the analysis. The state Upper Copper River SEG, is 360,000 to 750,000 sockeye salmon. Since 1998 escapements have met or exceeded the minimum threshold of the SEG range for sockeye salmon in the Copper River. Copper River Chinook salmon failed to reach a sustainable escapement goal of 24,000 fish in 2010, 2014, 2016, and 2020. There's a summary of the Upper Copper River sockeye and Chinook total run escapement on table 2 page 18 in the analysis.

And note that the numbers in that table are for Upper Copper River wild stock only, so it wouldn't include Delta stocks or (Gulkana) hatchery stocks. Coho, chum, and pink salmon are not expected to be significantly impacted by this

proposal, though some incidental harvest may occur. Additionally, there are populations of unknown size of rainbow trout that migrate up the Copper River. These are steel head. Current federal subsistence management regulations require the immediate release of rainbow trout unharmed, unless taken incidentally in a fish wheel.

Moving to current events, this is page 14 of the analysis - poor runs of Copper River sockeye salmon in 2008 and 2020 promoted concerns with total sockeye salmon run size of less than a million each of those years. Sockeye salmon sustainable escapement goals were met in both years. But the 2018 commercial harvest of just over 40,000 sockeye salmon in the Copper River District, was the second lowest in the last 100 years.

And the 2020 commercial harvest of about 102,000 sockeye salmon was well below the ten-year average of over a million sockeye salmon. In river person use and sport fisheries were restricted in both years, and state subsistence fisheries were restricted in 2018, including the first ever closure of the Glennallen subdistrict subsistence fishery.

In 2021 cumulative passage of 750,000 fish passed the (Myles) Lake sonar, indicate in river management objectives in SEG were met for sockeye salmon. Commercial harvest of about 400,000 sockeye salmon in 2021 was considerably below the ten-year average of 1.25 million fish. The 2021 commercial harvest of 7000 Chinook salmon was below the ten-year average of 13,000 fish.

For Chinook salmon the Native Village of (Eak)'s preliminary 2021 estimate of in river abundance was 21,656 Chinook salmon. That's below the 24,000 fish escapement goal. Culture and traditional practices, page 19 of the analysis - the population of Cordova has been relatively stable over the last decade,

with a population of 2239 in 2010, and 2316 in 2020. Commercial fishing and subsistence activities are considered central to the culture of the community.

In 2014, the ADF&G conducted comprehensive subsistence surveys of resources harvested by the residents of Cordova. The surveys found that sockeye salmon were used and harvested by Cordova households more than any other salmon - percent of households, followed by Coho salmon at 71% of households, and Chinook salmon at 63%.

The most commonly used gear type for harvesting salmon was removal from the commercial catch, also known as home pack, followed by sport use rod and reel which composed 38% of the total salmon harvested by weight. Access to sockeye salmon in fresh water near Cordova is limited. And in 2014 only 10% of the harvest of sockeye was by rod and reel.

The federal subsistence and state rod and reel fisheries are especially important to Cordova residents because they're accessible by road. These fisheries focus on fall coho salmon primarily in the heavily used (Ibec) Creek, (Alliganik) (flu), and the (Eak) River. A little harvest history here - I'll quickly summarize the harvest of the existing sub and PU subsistence and PU fisheries in the Copper River. Just kind of moving from smallest to largest. And this information is summarized in figure 2 on page 19 and figure 3 on page 21 of the analysis.

The ten-year average annual salmon harvest by fishery, are for the federal subsistence harvest in the Copper River Delta, Prince William Sound area. Again, this is primarily (Ibec) Creek, (Eak) River, and (Alliganik) (flu), averaged 486 salmon total, approximately 80% of which were Coho salmon. No Chinook salmon have been reported as harvest under the Copper River

Delta, Prince William Sound area, federal subsistence permit since its inception.

State subsistence permit holders in the Copper River District, this is the Copper River flat skill net fishery, averaged 3674 sockeye salmon and 530 Chinook salmon. Federal subsistence harvest for the Upper Copper River District, this includes Chitina and Glennallen subdistrict combined, averaged 21,011 sockeye salmon and 809 Chinook salmon. State subsistence dip net permit holders in the Upper Copper River District, this is the Glennallen subdistrict, averaged 60,348 sockeye salmon, and 2500 Chinook salmon. During this time, dip nets composed about 70% of the state (Gulkana) subsistence permits issued.

And then finally, the Chitina subdistrict persona use fishery, averaged harvest of 142,000 sockeye salmon, and about 1200 Chinook salmon. Effects of this proposal - if adopted this proposal would create access under a new federal subsistence permit for the Lower Copper River area to include waters of the Lower Copper River as described previously. It would provide additional subsistence opportunities for federally qualified subsistence users living in the Prince William Sound area, especially those in the community of Cordova.

This new harvest opportunity may generate some level of new interest that has potential of expanding the number of users and associated harvest. But it would also shift some of the harvest effort from the state subsistence fishery in the Copper River District and the Federal Subsistence Fishery in the fresh waters of the Copper River Delta to the Lower Copper River. The total salmon harvest limit permitted per household would not change.

The proposed regulatory change would be expected to have minimal biological effects on fish stocks. The projected harvest would be the smallest

of any user group in the Copper River system, estimated at about 2000 sockeye salmon and 300 Chinook salmon annually. And for context, with other fisheries, you can take a look at figures 4 and 5 on pages 27 and 28 of the analysis.

This estimate is based on the annual state subsistence skill net harvest in the Copper River District taking into account the smaller pool of qualified users and reduced efficiency of allowable gear types. And that's essentially dip net compared to a drift gill net. It's not anticipated that the harvest from the proposed Lower Copper River area would affect subsistence personal use or sport harvest in the Upper Copper River District.

The superintendent of Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve is the board-delegated in season manager for subsistence fisheries within the federal waters of the Copper River Drainage, while the board delegated authority in all other non-Copper River waters within the Prince William Sound area to the Cordova district range of the Chugach National Forest.

If approved, this fishery would need to be administered under a non-stackable federal permit separate from the existing permit, FFP W01, which is issued by the Forest Service. Both federal permits would be available from the Forest Service Office in Cordova. Wrapping up here, what the OSM conclusion, support FP 21-10 with modifications, to include a requirement to report take of salmon to area managers, within 48-hours of harvest.

And finally, the justification - harvest and escapement information indicate that sufficient salmon are present to allow a Federal Subsistence Fishery in the Lower Copper River without creating biological concern. The proposal provides an opportunity for federally qualified subsistence users of Cordova

that do not have access to a saltwater capable boat, and drift gill net gear to harvest sockeye salmon and Chinook salmon in the Lower Copper River.

Projected harvest is anticipated to be very small in comparison with other user groups. And concern of (harvesting) prior to salmon being counted at (Myles) Lake sonar site, can be addressed with a proposed modification of a reporting requirement to area managers within 48-hours of harvest.

Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the board. That concludes my summary of staff analysis. I would be happy to take any questions.

Gene Peltola: Thank you. I appreciate that analysis. Any questions for our staff on the analysis? Okay. Hearing non, Sue I think this is where we insert any comments. Is that correct?

Sue Detwiler: Yes.

Gene Peltola: Will you please work with the operator to open up the lines for any comments from the public?

Coordinator: Thank you. As a reminder, to ask a question or comment, please press star 1.

Gene Peltola: Operator have you seen anybody hit star 1 wanting to be heard?

Coordinator: Yes, sir. We have two in the queue. Just a moment.

Gene Peltola: Okay. Thank you.

Coordinator: First question or comment comes from (Karen). Your line is open.

Karen Linnell: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the record, my name is Karen Linnell, Executive Director for Ahtna Tribal Resource Commission. We represent seven tribes along the Copper River. And I'd like to - from the head waters down to Chitina, I'd like to say that I object to the addition of the written comments. That only allows for the comments that were submitted late last year, for the on time comments. There has been no other public opportunity for input through this review and deferment with either the Southcentral or Eastern Interior RACs.

There was no advertisement or allowance for (Atric) or anybody else to provide written comments. It's only those that were late for last year. And so I object to the addition of that. It provides an unfair advantage to those comments solicited by the US Fish and - US Forest Service staff last year.

The one thing that I would like to really state though, is right now we're in a decline, and we've been struggling to meet management objectives of 24,000 Chinook goal. At the last Board of Fish meeting the staff informed us that they were changing their management objective from 24,000 Chinook to a range of 21,000 to 31,000 Chinook.

They created this range at a lower level, I believe, so that they would not have to declare a species of concern. Because they - four of the last five years they hadn't met their objective. So that's one of our concerns. The other concern is the Copper River residents north - from Chitina, do not have another river to go to for salmon. They don't have the ocean to go to for salmon, this is our only source, while the residents of Cordova have two other rivers to go to and the ocean.

So at what point does providing for everybody's subsistence needs negate our upriver subsistence needs? We have nowhere else to go. And that to me, is

choosing one group over the other. While they have plenty of opportunity elsewhere, you know, once something happens to this river we have nothing. We have nowhere to go. And, you know, heaven forbid I have to go to the (unintelligible) inlet to go get fish, and take from other people's regions like (unintelligible) and the folks from Ninilchik.

I know they're overwhelmed with folks coming into their area to take fish from their back door. I don't want to be one of those people going to somebody else's backyard to harvest. I do have to say, two years ago fishing was so poor we shut our wheels down. I got 66 salmon in over a month, and it used to be I'd get 66 in a day, and shut my wheel down to work on them. In that one month I shut my wheel down.

The department staff would say that I didn't put in the effort. But I was taught to not take when it's not there to take. I was taught to conserve. I was taught that when I was in abundance to shut down as well, because you want to let some go by. Right now the way management is happening when they have "record numbers going by the sonar", they liberalize what is allowed for - by personal use fisheries.

Well, they don't liberalize anything for subsistence users. When they liberalize it we end up with more folks coming to dip nets. And I have to say at - when dip netting in the personal use fishery first started there were only 3000 dip netters. And right now it goes anywhere from 7000 to 9000 dip netters come in.

And it used to be that when there was high water they wouldn't fish. The high water - the water is high, dip netting is poor. But now they're dip netting from boats and targeting those areas where the fish hole up during high water. So

used to be that when the high water would start to drop we'd start to catch fish in our fish wheels. We're not getting that anymore.

And so for me and my fish wheel is near the head waters in (Chuskachina). The only one farther than mine is (Katie Jones)'s family camp. There are a few up there at (Slana), that - and - at (Katie Jones)'s camp, which is why we have federal fisheries in the first place in the Copper River, all the way down. And that's my family.

My home starts there and goes all the way to Chitina because I was married to Chitina people. So to be able to provide for everyone in between - our neighbors, all those federally qualified between Chitina and (Slana), is important and is our goal. Not to limit anybody else's subsistence opportunities, but they have way more subsistence opportunities down there than we do on the Copper River.

And just again, I just want to say that I do object to the addition of those written comments. It provides an unfair advantage and skew. I do appreciate the Eastern Interior RAC and Southcentral RAC getting together again. Although we weren't able to talk to them, it's my understanding that the Southcentral RAC voted again, and that they voted it down, from my understanding. And that's I think what Gloria said, it was by one vote. But I do appreciate you folks taking this up again. And I thank you for your time.

Gene Peltola: Thank you, Karen. Does anybody have any questions or comment from the board for Karen? Okay. Hearing none, Operator, could we go to the second person that was on the line, for a comment?

Coordinator: Next person is (Robert). Your line is open.

Gene Peltola: Thank you, Operator.

(Robert Jewell): Hi. Hi. My name is (Robert Jewell). I'm one of the co-sponsors for this. I appreciate what the prior caller said. But what they - people up north don't understand is you need to have access to the fish. And if you don't have a boat, a commercial boat to go out and get them, it's very dangerous. People go out there in those little skiffs and I mean just by the grace of god they make it back sometimes. All we're asking is for access to the same amount of fish.

When you heard the report we're not really going to be taking any more fish than we already are. And what it comes down to me is Im really wondering why special interest groups are getting priority over rural Alaska residents. We live in a rural community that does not have road access like all the northern areas, that can go to the Copper River at Chitina and get their fish.

The two extra streams that the reds come in on are clear streams that you cannot dip net. So - and everybody knows reds don't bite on line and lure. So our only trick is to try to do dip nets with them, and you spook them away. We made this proposal federal so that only Cordovans would use it. We don't want everyone coming here to use it; we just want Cordovan. There are a lot of folks here that could use this, because living in a true rural community that doesn't - that's not on the road access, are bills are skyrocketing.

And to have extra healthy fish would be a benefit. And as stated in the meeting last year, we're fighting over less than 2% of the fish. And why we're not prioritizing subsistence users, I'm baffled. Thank you for your time. Have a great day.

Gene Peltola: Thank you. I appreciate those comments. Does anybody on the board have any questions for our last presenter? Okay. Hearing none, Operator, do we have anybody else in the queue who'd like to provide a comment?

Coordinator: Yes, sir. The next person is Donna. Your line is open.

Donna Wilson: Hello. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing us to speak. For 40 years we have lived at the head waters of the Chitina River. We've been there a long time. And we used to go to various places up and down the river and watch copious numbers of salmon spawn. Now we see very few if any. Those spaces and spots where they spawned are gone. They're just empty. The water is just there, clear and just sitting there. And this is of great concern to me.

I understand what the Cordovans are expressing, that they only have those three or four places, and it's hard. Well, it is really hard for us anymore. We don't have any fish. We just don't have any fish. And this is one river in the Upper Copper, not even all of them. And the fishermen are coming in a number...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Wait a minute, Donna. Donna, hold on. So if everybody could take a second, and please look at your line, star 6 to mute, because somebody is talking over Donna right now. I'd appreciate that. Star 6 or mute. Okay, Donna. Go ahead.

Donna Wilson: Okay, thank you. All of us up here only have the Copper. That's it. We can't go to a slew or a creek or another place and find the salmon. We've just got this up here. I would hope that you don't open it more. They say that many fish wouldn't be caught, but where does that number come from? I've been asking around. Where does that number come from?

The guy - the man from Cordova that just spoke, said lots of folks could use this one. What do those numbers mean? What does that mean? They say it would be 2000. Where does that come from? What if it's easy to do up there and everybody chooses to go up there? I don't know. It's so scary, because it's such a small resource for all of us. And those of us at the upper reaches don't have another option.

So we work hard to get our fish, and sometimes that's just what it takes. It takes hard work and sometimes some people have to maybe ask for help or ask for others to help them. And that's what I have to say. Thank you.

Gene Peltola: Thank you, Donna. I appreciate it. Any board members have any questions for Donna? And Donna, I do apologize on behalf of the program, for the brief period when you were spoke over by someone. We do apologize for that.

Donna Wilson: Yes. Thank you. I lost my bearing. I hope I didn't sound really stupid.

Gene Peltola: No. No. Not at all. I do appreciate your time and...

Donna Wilson: Okay. Thank you.

Gene Peltola: ...I appreciate your comments.

Donna Wilson: Okay. Thank you.

Gene Peltola: Hearing no questions for Donna, Operator do we have anybody else in the queue?

Coordinator: Yes. The next person we have is Jesse. Your line is open.

Jesse Carter: Hello. Can you hear me?

Gene Peltola: Yes, we can, Jesse.

Jesse Carter: Thank you. So, thank you for this opportunity again, to speak on the proposal. I guess I'll just start off with a brief on, you know, how we came here. I used to - I've been in Cordova for 33 years. And I was involved in every fishery around Cordova. I was an owner/operator of the Copper River Flats drift net. And this subject has come up quite a bit. But we used to be a booming town.

We used to have herring fisheries, you know, we're subsidized some of the community, you know, people with more income. But we've lost a lot of time. It's gotten tougher to live in Cordova. Expenses, cost of living and everything, has gone way up. I've been involved in food drives to Cordova and there is a population that is in need with a little extra support, to help them through the winter.

So that's kind of the basis, you know, on the proposal. We run it around, we found enormous amount of support, you know, for the proposal. And coming from, you know, being a fisherman and married into a fishing family who basically are living off the Copper River, I had to think this through from my perspective, because I don't want to damage our fishery, our residence and had to weigh out the need. So my approach coming from my perspective, into this, is just going to go forward and pull out at any reason that would come up that would say why we do not need this fishery, and I found the opposite.

This fishery would help people. It would give a little boost to help them through the winter time because there are people that could really use it. We have family members that are two families that are stacked up in trailers at

times. You know? It's tough to live in Cordova. We need this extra support. And one thing I want to touch on is throughout these meetings that I've been involved in, they keep saying we have all this access and all this fish, and that's baloney.

If you look at the report that was just put out, you can see clearly that the commercial fishermen which is what you call (home pack), catch the majority of the fish, because they have these \$100,000 vessels, they have the gear, the hydraulics, and they've got the safety. And not only the safety, they have the experience of going out on the flats to fish. And for the people who do have skiffs and go out there and fish, subsistence have to compete with commercial fishermen.

So and it's not an easy thing to do. I want to go back to the (Eak) River and the (Alliganik). These rivers are very slow moving, they're clear. I've tried dip netting it several times and you cannot dip net those rivers. You cannot get sockeye in there unless you get lucky, or unless a boat goes by and they spook the fish into your net. And we all know that the reds you cannot spook or herd fish. So you would be forced to fish illegally in the river, unless you have a perfect ideal condition where the water happens to be murky and it's flooding.

So those rivers are not accessible for us to catch any kind of a (home pack) for reds. We do have (Seward), that we can catch in rod and reel. That one's - and that's mostly based on the (Eak) and the (Ibek) Rivers. Let's push a lot of stress on that, you know, with all the sport fishermen coming in. There was an opportunity for someone to come down. We were going to show them, you know, the rivers, the access issues we have, take them around to some people, and let them talk to them why they needed it.

And they came in. We had no contact, no communication. They cherry-picked and went back to the board and made statements like, you know, this person is against it or this group is against it. And I don't think that's fair. That's not fair to our community. It's not fair to the people that need it. And Im sorry that that happened that way, but it's just not fair to us. They catch as cumulative. That means that we're not catching anymore. Are you with me?

Gene Peltola: We can...

Woman: We hear you.

Gene Peltola: ...still hear you.

Jesse Carter: Can you hear me?

Woman: Yes.

Gene Peltola: Yes, we do.

Woman: Please hold Jesse.

Jesse Carter: Okay. I hear a busy sound.

Woman: Please hold on while the operator identifies the - there you go. Oh. Please hold on while the operator identifies the line.

Jesse Carter: Okay.

Woman: Operator, please let us know when we can proceed.

Man: You can proceed.

Jesse Carter: Okay. Am I - can you hear me?

Gene Peltola: Yes.

Jesse Carter: Okay. Sorry about that. But I just wanted to, you know, Cordova has a need. Basically that's what I'm getting at. We keep coming back that there's no access. And I mean that we have all of these rivers and there's access. And unless you've been here trying it, you'll see that you have to have a skiff. You have to have a skiff so you can access, you know, the flats. You go up there and subsistence fish with your state permit to get reds.

I'm sorry. So I don't think it's fair for the, you know, special interest groups to come in and say all of these things that are like half-truths. You know? Like one of the boards here, they say there was a unanimous vote. No. Well, that was only 1/5 of the Native voters that voted that down. And I heard it was spearheaded by certain individuals. Because I followed up on that from the last meeting when they made that statement, and I found several Native members that were for it. They didn't vote, but there was only 1/8 that did, and most of them were fishermen, which is another special interest.

So I just would like for the facts to at least be straight if we're going to try to figure out how - what is fair with these subsistence fish. Instead of making it political. Because that's not fair to us. And then the impact on this fishery, as you see, is going to be very minute. It's all cumulative. And most of the fisherman that bring the pack in are commercial fishermen anyway.

I just ask that when you guys go to vote that we are a subsistence community and there are families who need this fish. And they do not have access to catch

these fish on the (Eak) River and the (Alliganik). So I appreciate your time and thank you for all the work that you've done.

Gene Peltola: Thank you, Jesse. And on behalf of the board I do apologize for that brief interruption when we had some background noise. That was not intended, and we do apologize for that. So board members, do you have any questions for Jesse, or comments?

Sue Detwiler: Mr. Chair, this is Sue Detwiler. While they're thinking of their comments, would it be possible to get Jesse's last name for our records?

Jesse Carter: Yes. Am I still open?

Gene Peltola: Yes, you are, Jesse. Please proceed.

Jesse Carter: Yes. Jesse Carter.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you.

Jesse Carter: And one last thing I'd like to mention. You know, the corporation here has put together a program. I think it's wonderful. But the program is where they have a hired skipper, and they take their members out on the flats with the gill net and a commercial boat, to help them get their subsistence state fish. And I think that's important. Because if that doesn't speak louder than words on what kind of an access issue that we have, you know, that just says it. You know, we don't have an access issue. I mean we do have an access issue where you have to have a vessel. So I just wanted to add that last point in. Thank you.

Gene Peltola: Thank you, Jesse. And one more time, do we have any - any board members have any questions or comments for Jesse? Hearing none, Operator do you have anybody else in the queue?

Coordinator: Yes, sir. Another reminder, to give a question or a comment, please press star 1. The next one in queue is (Barbara). Your line is open.

Barbara Cellarius: Mr. Chair, my name is Barbara Cellarius, and I am the Cultural Anthropologist for Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve, and I guess I should stop and make sure that you can hear me.

Gene Peltola: Yes. I can hear you on this end.

Barbara Cellarius: Thank you. So Im going to be presenting the comments for the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission. These aren't my comments. They're from the commission. And so at its fall 2020 meeting the commission took up this proposal. And the commission unanimously opposed the proposal. Creation of a new fishery on the Copper River will have the potential to affect Upper Copper River fisheries.

This was a low year for both Chinook and sockeye salmon runs. And SRC members have heard reports that - about people not getting enough salmon. Residents of Cordova have other opportunities to harvest salmon. Whereas Upper Copper River residents rely solely on Upper Copper River fisheries.

The written public comment included in the proposal analysis indicated opposition from several long term residents of Cordova, along with the Native Village of (Eak), with no comments from Cordova in support of the proposal. In the absence of local support there is no reason for the SRC to support the proposal. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would just add that the SRC did provide a comment to the joint RAC at their meeting, or a comment at their spring - the SRC voted at their spring '22 meeting to make a comment to the RAC at the joint meeting. And they also opposed the proposal unanimously in that comment. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Gene Peltola: Thank you, Barbara. Do any board members have any questions for Barbara? Okay. Hearing none, Operator do we have anybody else in the queue? And just for timing purposes, I'm not sure if we have anybody else in the queue or how many we have, but we'll probably continue to take comments up until the top of the hour so we can proceed with consideration of the proposal.  
Operator?

Coordinator: Yes. Again, as a reminder, to give a question or comment, press star 1. The next person in the queue is Jim. Your line is open.

Jim Simon: Hello? Did you say Jim? Jim Simon?

Coordinator: Yes, sir.

Gene Peltola: Yes. Jim, go ahead.

Jim Simon: Oh. Thank you very much. For the record, my name is Jim Simon. I'm a consultant with Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission. But I'm taking off that hat and just speaking as a former federally qualified user from the Upper Copper River. I grew up in the Nelchina Area. My father was Herb Simon, and my mother (Jackie Meakan).

And I just want to say that I - this is a complicated issue I think, for the Federal Subsistence Board. And I appreciate the challenges that you have in

listening to the various testimonies. You know, when I was a kid we traded with Ahtna, friends and neighbors, in order to get most of our salmon, although I have helped - been on my family's fish wheel in the past and been a dip net users in the Chitina subdistrict.

The numbers of fish that are available in the Glennallen subdistrict today, compared to when I was a kid in the '80s, is just so dramatically different. It's very concerning at the thought of opening up an additional fishery. I've only been to Cordova a couple of times, but for - at this last Board of Fish meeting in Cordova in December wasn't the last time I visited there, and it was great. You know, people are very friendly. And one guy actually went out with one of our - my co-workers and caught a Winter King which we shared and ate during a break from the board meeting.

And it was really wonderful, you know, that another gentleman from Cordova shared with another co-worker, you know, a box of fish that I helped carry to the airport. And, you know, it's really great that Cordovan residents share with those of us from the Upper Copper.

And I guess I'm under - I maybe don't fully understand the access issues that others have spoken to, but I see in the - from page 23 of the 2020 Prince William Sound Annual Management Report that it says and I quote, "The Federal Subsistence Salmon Fishery in the western portion of the Copper River Delta is administered by the US Forest Service. In 2005 the federal government began issuing permits allowing subsistence harvest on federal lands in Prince William Sound and the Lower Copper River area. Legal gear types are dip net, rod and reel, and spear. In 2020 an estimated total of 101 federal permits were issued, but only 47 permits were fished, with an estimated harvest of 98 sockeye and 416 coho."

So it seems like in some respects these opportunities are provided, maybe not in the specific place that this proposal speaks to, but I am also concerned like others, about how establishing this fishery could have additional detrimental effects on the subsistence fisheries upriver. And I just don't think this is the right time. And it seems that there are opportunities that are really not being taken advantage of, with less than half of the issued federal permits, subsistence fishing permits being fished. So with that, thank you very much.

Gene Peltola: Thank you, Jim. Do any board members have any questions for - or comments for Jim? Hearing none from others, actually I have one if you wouldn't mind, Jim. When you were mentioning about the Glennallen subdistrict you used the descriptor different. Can you elaborate on what you meant by different?

Jim Simon: What's different is just the inability to share with like my family that used to happen in the '80s. Because even though I still get fish from my friends with fish wheels, it's almost like I feel guilty even receiving any of those fish because they're getting so few fish for their own needs. And, you know, and that's what made me wonder. You know, here I was an outsider coming into Cordova and yet people were very quickly sharing with us. But then to hear other Cordova residents, you know, it begs the question as to how much sharing is actually happening within the community.

You know, because generally when you look at rural Alaskan communities across the state from my previous work for the state's subsistence division, 30% of the households and these are largely Alaska Native communities, 30% of the households harvest 70% of the resources consumed, used by that community.

And so I wonder what's happening in Cordova that there are supposedly all of these people who don't have any access to salmon. And it seems peculiar from

my standpoint, and my, you know, 50 years of history of sharing in the Upper Copper River area and then from the Glennallen subdistrict point of view, where I was raised. I hope that answers your question, Mr. Peltola.

Gene Peltola: Thank you. I appreciate it. Any other questions or comments for Mr. Simon? Okay. Hearing none, Operator, we're approaching the top of the hour. I'll take comments from one more individual if we have anybody in the queue.

Coordinator: Okay. The last question or comment comes from (Bruce). Your line is open.

(Bruce Urban):

Gene Peltola: Go ahead, (Bruce), if you're with us. Hello? Operator, can you ensure that his line is open or remind him about the mute button?

Coordinator: (Bruce)'s line is open. (Bruce), are you there? He's not saying anything. I don't know if he's muted on his end, but his line is open here.

Gene Peltola: Okay. And it's star 6, correct?

Coordinator: Yes, sir. We can hear you.

Gene Peltola: Is that you, (Bruce)?

(Bruce Urban): Hi. Sorry about that. This is (Bruce). You can hear me okay?

Gene Peltola: Yes. Go ahead, (Bruce).

(Bruce Urban): Okay. Sorry. I was hitting all kinds of buttons, offline, the airplane or something. But thank you, Chair, members of the board. Thank you, for this

opportunity to comment today. My name is (Bruce Urban). I'm a (unintelligible) Tribal member. And, you know, just starting off I'd like to oppose FP 21-10, and I'd just like to reiterate and echo Karen and Jim and, you know, some of the concerns of the (eight) track.

And, you know, as an Upper (unintelligible) we have CNT for the Upper Copper River. And, you know, I'm just really concerned about the low return and I respect what Jesse and (Robert) were saying earlier. You know, it's really sad that, you know, the system where they live is really broken right now and they don't have that opportunity when they should. But, you know, what we're seeing up here is that we're not seeing the salmon return.

And I sure as heck don't want to see it end up like the Yukon River. I don't want (unintelligible) to end up being like Canada where they're not able to fish at all. I heard a story from one of my grappers and I have Ahtna roots through (unintelligible). One of my grappers grew up there and his little brother at (Katie John). And, you know, one of my grappers he said that they used to get, you know, up to 200 salmon a day. That's how good the numbers used to be back in the day.

I don't think that they see that any more today. And I don't want to see the Copper River end up like the Yukon, because our Yukon relatives are really suffering right now. They weren't able to fish last year. I don't want to see that happen to the Copper River. Those low numbers, I see it, I hear it. All the tribes along the Copper River letting you all know about it. They don't feel like how they used to when they were kids.

Their numbers are going down and that's what they're trying to say. That's why they're fighting so hard right now to not let this happen. You know, sure maybe if the population was good, of the salmon. But we're just not seeing

that right now. You know, these salmon are - they're more than food security; they're our identity. We're fighting for our relatives right now.

So I don't think it's sustainable at this point in time. And respectfully, you know, I'll have to oppose it. And I see it every year. I see so many people go into Chitina. It's just flooded. There are a lot of people who are there, they monetize it; they turn it into the cash economy. And it's impacting our salmon. I see the Kenai River and all the people that fled there. When I first went there - I don't even go there anymore, there are so many people there and they charge so much money just to stay for a night.

You know, you pay in 12-hour periods. You have to pay for parking; pay for camping; pay for this and that. You have to be rich to go fish in Kenai. And then there are thousands of people right there at the mouth. That's another reason, you know, I'm very cautious about this proposal. You know, there needs to be a better system in place for the people in Cordova. They shouldn't have to fight with the - we shouldn't have to fight with them. We all survive. And we all depend on the salmon. And the numbers right now are very low.

And I really don't want it to crash like the Yukon. I just want to say thank you. Thank you again, for letting me testify today and providing this opportunity. And I appreciate you all. And I thank you for all your hard work (unintelligible).

Gene Peltola: Thank you, (Bruce). I appreciate you providing time to provide comments to the board. Board members do you have any questions or comments for (Bruce)? Okay. Hearing none, then we'll close out the public comments section of consideration for FP 21-10 Lower Copper River area salmon. Before we go into the summary of the Regional Advisory Council meetings, our main point, Sue I was wondering if you could give a brief summary to the

board for our benefit, about when and where these meetings took - Regional Advisory Council meetings took place. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Yes. I would have to defer to the council coordinators on that. They are more up to speed on the details than I am. If you don't mind, Mr. Chair.

Gene Peltola: Oh, no problem at all. I just wanted the board to be presented the dates and times when the Regional Advisory Councils did take this up post deferral, by the Federal Board.

Sue Detwiler: So I think yes, so the council coordinators, DeAnna Perry and Brooke McDavid I believe, they will be summarizing the main points of the council joint meeting. And then the council chairs or their eating, are available for any additional discussion.

Gene Peltola: Okay. We'll go ahead and proceed with that presentation by the council coordinators. In addition, if they (unintelligible) please include the date and location when the RACs convened. Thank you much. Go ahead. Proceed.

DeAnna Perry: Hello, Mr. Peltola, Acting Chair, and members of the board, this is DeAnna Perry, Council Coordinator for the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council. I'll be providing you with information regarding actions by the Southcentral Council. And then Brooke McDavid, the Council Coordinator for Eastern Interior, will follow with information regarding actions by the Eastern Interior Council. Before I start - everyone can hear me okay?

Gene Peltola: I can hear you fine on this end.

DeAnna Perry: Thank you. I will have to get back to you on the exact dates. I do not have those right in front of me since this came prepared to give - of this year went -

Central Alaska Council changed their position on the Fisheries Proposal from support to opposition, to express the position (unintelligible) Alaska Council voted motion to provide a comment in support of Fisheries Proposal FP 21-10 with new OSM modification. The result of the vote was six votes in opposition and five in support.

Two Southcentral council members were absent and could not participate in the vote. However, they did provide written statements in support of the proposal. This board was provided with a link to the transcript of the FP 21-10 joint meeting between Southcentral and Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Councils so that they could read all council members' comments in their entirety. Council members spent a significant amount of time preparing and participating in this meeting. And it was important to both councils that this board read their individual comments.

As a reminder, the Southcentral council members' comments begin on page 71 of that joint meeting transcript. And Eastern Interior council members' comments begin on page 60. In the interest of time I'll remind you of some of the common themes expressed by Southcentral council members. The following points were made in opposition of the proposal.

There is already ample opportunity for subsistence salmon fishing in the Cordova area. Upper River residents only have the Copper River to fish on for salmon. The pandemic has passed and the same concerns for social distancing don't apply as when this proposal was introduced. And if someone doesn't have a boat they can once again go with someone who does. People take care of each other. If someone doesn't have a boat to get the fish they need, someone who will share salmon with them, and allow them to fish with them.

Salmon gets shared widely and passed out in Cordova. Native Village of (Eak) is a great example of proxy subsistence community fishing under state rules. There is no history of anyone dip netting in the Lower Copper River, so a new fishery would not be providing for (subsistence) use. It is not a good idea to open a new fishery and increase opportunity when runs are declining, even if projected harvest would be small. Runs of both Chinook and sockeye salmon are returning smaller and weaker fish.

The stat lowered escapement goals and still run sizes have only been at the lower end of management objectives. Subsistence salmon needs in the upper river are not being met. This proposal will affect 23 communities who fish upriver from where the proposed fishery would occur. Pursuant to data provided by the Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission in two of the 15 years from the (Kona) up to (unintelligible) and in seven out of 15 years, from (unintelligible) to the (Kona), amounts necessary for subsistence have not been met.

Fishing would occur below sonar before proper assessment of run size could occur. The part of the river where this fishery is proposed would be difficult for anyone without a boat to access. So this will not increase opportunity for people without boats. There are concerns that incidental catch will impact the stocks of salmon. Opening new areas to make it easier to fish is not warranted and a decline in fishery. And the current fisheries have too much use already.

Again, those were the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council comments in opposition. But again, I would ask everyone to look at the transcript for all of those comments in their entirety. The Southcentral Alaska Council members made the following points in support of the proposal.

There is support for this proposal from many local residents and entities. Adding a new fishing opportunity will not have an impact on escapement or upriver harvest, as harvest will be tiny compared to the other subsistence, personal use, and commercial fisheries take. Not all community members can participate in the state subsistence fishery. This will give subsistence users who cannot afford a boat, gas, or gill net, a chance to catch some salmon.

Will help people harvest subsistence salmon for their families. And they especially help younger folks and elders. This fishery isn't taking away from the other fisheries or other opportunities for people to fish elsewhere. It just provides another place to harvest under a federal subsistence fishery. King Salmon incidentally, caught in dip nets, can be easily released so this fishery will not impact that species. Dip netting in other areas of Southcentral such as those shared between the communities of Hope, Cooper, and Ninilchik, have been successful without negatively impacting the resource.

There was a lot of opposition for a Ninilchik gill net, fear of decimating the fishery and harming King Salmon. However, this has not had a negative impact, and has provided close to 4000 fish for their community. During low runs managers will be able to reduce or shut down this opportunity just like the other fisheries.

If fishing needs to be limited, personal and commercial use should be limited first. Subsistence users take a small piece of the pie and should not have to fight over that small piece. It would help ensure opportunities provided for all federally qualified subsistence users and it is our duty as RAC members to provide a priority for all federally qualified rural subsistence users. Again, these were points gleaned from the transcript from Southcentral, in support of the proposal.

Additionally, during that joint meeting, Southcentral council members suggested the following modifications to the proposal if the board were to adopt FP 21-10. Although they did not vote on these proposed modifications as a council, items brought up were to require the release of King Salmon, only allow dip nets, no spears or gas; no guiding in the subsistence fishery; and prohibit dip netting from boats.

And finally, there were additional comments stated by council members regarding the board's decision to defer this proposal and the request that both councils meet to develop a compromised or consensus position. Some of those points that they wanted to share with the board - this whole process has been very confusing to the council members.

We were told to compromise and then we were told we don't need to. We were told we can't vote on his modified proposal again, but now we're voting. We can't make a new recommendation, only a comment. This joint meeting is a public meeting, but no public comments are allowed. This whole process has gone awry of ANILCA. When a new fishery was proposed in Kenai, OSM allowed a local working group to discuss the new fishery, and the council thinks they should have been allowed to do the same on this proposal.

The council members felt that it was not right for the board to point two councils against each other. Additionally, they felt it was not appropriate to defer this issue for input from the Eastern Interior Council since the fishery would occur in the Southcentral region. The council members were not sure why this was sent back to them since they already voted on it. The new council members, almost half of each council, did not hear the public testimony that was received when Fisheries Proposal 21-10 was originally taken up by both councils in the fall of 2020.

Mr. Acting Chair, members of the board, that concludes some of the main points made by the members of Southcentral Council at the joint meeting which happened on March 16, 2022. That was a meeting with Eastern Interior Council. Again, I hope that you've all had a chance to review all of the council comments from the transcript on this matter.

I'll now turn it over to Brooke McDavid, to share specific information on Eastern Interior's actions at the joint meeting. And then afterward, Vice Chair of Southcentral RAC, Gloria Stickwan, and the Chair of Eastern Interior RAC, Sue Entsminger, are standing by to answer questions and provide additional feedback as well as myself, and Ms. McDavid.

And Mr. Acting Chair, it looks as though staff has helped me out with the meeting dates. The Southcentral RAC took up the proposal the first time at the fall 2020 meeting and that was October 7th and 8th. And I would have to get back to you on the rest of the dates. I don't have that at my fingertips, Mr. Peltola, Acting Chair. Thank you.

Gene Peltola: Thank you, DeAnna. Go ahead, Brooke.

Brooke McDavid: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, members of the board, for the record my name is Brooke McDavid. And I am the coordinator for the Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council. Just to provide a little bit of history, the Eastern Interior Advisory Council originally took this up - took up this proposal during our fall 2020 meeting, which was held October 14th and 15th via teleconference. And then the board ended up deferring the proposal at their 2021 meeting in a return to the council's - the councils tried to meet jointly in fall of 2021, but were unable to because of scheduling.

And so they ended up meeting jointly at the March 16, 2022 meeting also held via teleconference. So at that joint meeting on March 16th with the Southcentral Advisory Council, the Eastern Interior Council continued to oppose Fisheries Proposal FP 21-10. To express their position, the Eastern Interior Council voted on a motion to provide a comment in support of the proposal with the new OSM modification.

The result of a roll call vote was six votes in opposition, and 0 in support, with four members absent. At this joint meeting members of the Eastern Interior Advisory Council made several points about the proposal, and I will provide a summary of those main points now. So again, these are points made in opposition to the proposal during the meeting.

There are major conservation concerns for Copper River salmon and a new fishery should not be created when run sizes are declining, and there is difficulty meeting escapement goals. Alaska Department of Fish and Game lowered the escapement goal so that it looks like Copper River runs are doing okay. But management strategies are not working if escapement goals had to be lowered.

It is irresponsible to create a new fishery given all the changes in the marine environment where salmon rear. Cautious management is paramount due to the unknown impacts of climate change on Copper River salmon stocks. Fish are getting smaller in the Copper River. Because smaller females have less eggs, more fish need to reach the spawning ground to ensure the viability of these runs into the future.

Creating more opportunity in the lower river will put upper river subsistence fishers at a further disadvantage. Fishers in the Cordova region have tremendous opportunity to harvest multiple high quality salmon and other

species, while fishing in the upper river is very limited. Food insecurity is a concern in the interior region, and additional harvest downriver could exacerbate this.

There has been a decline in the ability of residents who live throughout the Copper River area, to meet their subsistence needs in recent years. Dip netting on the Copper River is not a customary and traditional fishery for Cordovans. Not having a boat is not a reason to start a new fishery. Council members were concerned that this sets a precedent and that new fisheries could be established every time someone says their subsistence needs aren't being met.

Council members were also concerned that some fishers in Cordova might be abusing subsistence opportunities and selling some subsistence caught salmon. Managers need to learn from the salmon declines on the Yukon River and the severe impacts that has had on Yukon River subsistence users. It would be sad to see the same thing happen on the Copper River.

The Copper River is already experiencing increased numbers of users and that increase is already stressing the resource. Mr. Chair, that concludes this summary of the main points made at the joint meeting in opposition of FP 21-10 by members of the Eastern Interior Council. There were no comments from the Eastern Interior Council members in support of FP 21-10 at that meeting.

Even though the council was in opposition to the proposal, during discussion some council members did suggest two potential modifications if the proposal were to be adopted by the board. Number one, prohibit guide services in this new fishery; and number two, prohibit dip netting by boat. These modifications were just brought up during the discussion, and the council did not vote on these modifications.

In addition to comments about the proposal itself, the Eastern Interior Council members also provided comments about the board's decision to defer FP 21-10 and the request that both councils meet to develop a compromise. Some of those points that members made were as follows - it has been too long between when Fisheries Proposal FP 21-10 was originally reviewed by the council, and now the joint meeting can be deciding on it again.

The council has had three meetings since we originally took this up. And after so much time elapsed this is not really fair for our members to have to be discussing it again. There are four new members who were not present for the original deliberation and recommendation, and who have not previously been presented information on this proposal. It is unfair for the board to request the two councils meet and try to compromise.

Additionally, some members felt under pressure by the board to come up with additional comments. Mr. Chair and members of the board, that concludes the summary of some of the main points provided by members of the Eastern Interior Council at the March 16, 2022 joint meeting with the Southcentral Council to discuss deferred Fisheries Proposal FP 21-10.

As DeAnna previously mentioned, the full transcripts are available for the full comments. I will now turn it over to Southcentral Council Vice Chair, Gloria Stickwan, and the Eastern Interior Council Chair, Sue Entsminger, who may wish to provide additional comments.

Gene Peltola: Thank you, Gloria and Sue. Please proceed.

Gloria Stickwan: This is Gloria Stickwan. Earlier this morning I heard about no one met with people in Cordova from up here. There was a Board of Fish meeting. My understanding was they did meet with residents in the Cordova about fishing.

I did not go down there so I don't really know. But the - I do know that they met with people down there. They had dinner with them. From people from up this way, (unintelligible) people. And Fisheries Proposal was talked about. And I can't tell you who - I know they met with residents though.

And I just want to say again, that, you know, all the RAC - Southcentral members that fish on the Copper River are all opposed to this fishery, and Eastern Interior as well. And again, (Eak) (unintelligible) was saying, said no to this proposed fishery. I was told to say the only thing that the RAC has said that I had to respond to that comment made this morning.

I think all the points were made. I hope you'll consider the - and give deference to the RAC. After meeting two times on this proposal a decision was made by both RACs. Thank you.

Gene Peltola: Thank you, Gloria. Sue, do you have any additional comments from the Eastern Interior?

Sue Entsminger: Yes. Thank you. You can hear me?

Gene Peltola: Five by five.

Sue Entsminger: Okay. This is Sue Entsminger, Eastern Interior Chair. Yes, that was a good summary of all of the comments and I want to talk a little bit - this kind of reminds me of the Yukon River, because I've been on this council 21 years, and boy what - this is the beginning stages of what has happened on the Yukon River, to the point where they're not even being able to fish chums either, kings or chums, even for subsistence.

So we need to be really, really careful when we look at these proposals. And I want to talk a little bit about the process and I - to the board members, there were three members not present at this - our meeting, because they were at other meetings, that couldn't attend. And at any rate, Greg and I, the Chair of the Southcentral RAC, were called by DeAnna, and we started talking about what to do with coming up with a compromise.

And I know Greg - I said Greg, you probably won't agree on this one, and because of the Yukon River, and we, the Eastern Interior, have - it's a crossover proposal because the Copper River, we have a CNT, the southern unit for the Unit 12 people have a CNT for the river, and we put our wheels in or get fish from the (unintelligible) area. And at any rate, Greg and I were talking and we both felt a little bit concerned that it was brought back to us for the concern.

And we talked about it several times. As you know, it was delayed several times and every time I talked to Greg we felt like it put a lot on us, and I think a better process for us as a council, this might be a real learning experience for staff, would be to have recognized that okay, we didn't - we were looking at the same proposal; we were not looking at any new information. And it's a controversial issue over upriver and downriver.

And this would be better met if there was a working group. I suggested that at first to Greg, when we talked. We talked several times before this meeting actually happened. And we don't think he was in favor of a working group at first. But once we had the joint meeting I heard him say it a couple of times that a working group, and given more information and allowing public testimony, would have been a better way to have addressed this.

And I think in the future, it was really wrong not to have public testimony at the meeting and then have public testimony at this meeting. So it just - it's a little bit perplexed and confusing and I'm concerned about the process. So I think it's very important to have more opportunity for the public to get involved and maybe talk about specifics about proposals that we might agree on could have happened.

We're volunteers. I have to remind you all, we're volunteers and work that you guys do to help us is really important. And that's the only thing I have to add is just concern about the process.

Gene Peltola: Okay. Thank you, Sue. And I'd just like to provide a comment from this end, is that providing public testimony is the discretion of the Chair. But since I did hear some complaint that we had not provided those that is the reason why I opted to allow the opportunity for now with the board's consideration. With that being said, we have heard from the analyst, we've heard from Brooke, we've heard from Vice Chair (unintelligible), Chair Eastern Interior. Does the board have any questions or comments for any of the four individuals involved in that presentation? If so, please go ahead and ask directly.

David Schmid: Yes. Mr. Chair, this is Dave. Just a point of clarification if I could help, maybe going back to DeAnna's comment and others I heard on the vote, as well. I know that - and the vote during the joint RAC meetings. I know there were a number of folks absent from the Eastern Interior, and there were a couple as well, that were absent that submitted a written comment there, DeAnna, in terms of the Southcentral RAC's vote. Could you clarify that? Because they said that they voted against it, but I know that the Chair, Greg, spoke a bit at the very end of the meeting and folks started falling off the phone fairly quickly.

But how did that end, if you could clarify that, in terms of a vote for the Southcentral?

DeAnna Perry: Thank you, Member Schmid. Through the Chair, this is DeAnna Perry, Coordinator for the Southcentral Council. We did have two Southcentral council members who were unable to attend any part of the meeting. In lieu of that attendance, they did provide written statements in support of the motion. However, because they were absent they could not participate in the vote.

And Mr. Peltola, Acting Chair, I do have the information that you requested earlier. Again, the issue came before the Southcentral Council on October 7-8, their fall 2020 meeting. The board deferred this action in its meeting, January 26-29, 2021. After that plans were made to have a joint meeting with Eastern Interior, and we had targeted the week of October 11, 2021. But as you know, fall is our regulatory meeting.

And as we got closer and we found out how many proposals that both Southcentral and Eastern Interior would have on their agenda, with the approval of the chairs, we deferred that to the winter meeting where we thought there would be more time. However, we couldn't have more than two RAC meetings in one week. So both councils picked one day, March 16th, to have their joint meeting.

And that's what Ms. McDavid and myself have summarized. So thank you, Mr. Acting Chair, for allowing me to put that on the record.

Gene Peltola: Thank you. I appreciate the effort. Are there any other questions from board members, or the group?

Sue Entsminger: Mr. Chair this is Sue, the Eastern Interior RAC Chair.

Gene Peltola: Go ahead, Sue.

Sue Entsminger: Yes. I just wanted to let David Schmid know that - I think that's who was - about the members absent at our meeting. We had taken this up at our own meeting, not the joint meeting. And it was a 0/7 vote against it. And a lot of our members are for - that are new, and I don't think the people on the Yukon River would be voting for it. But I'm just summarizing. I just wanted to let you know that.

Gene Peltola: Thank you, Sue. Any further questions for Gloria, Sue, DeAnna, or Brooke? Hearing no others, Sue the next item on the list is board discussion. Correct?

Sue Detwiler: Yes. That's correct.

Gene Peltola: Okay. We'll proceed. The board - any board members have any further concerns, comments, questions you'd like answered, addressed to any parties involved at this point?

David Schmid: Yes, Mr. Chair?

Gene Peltola: Go ahead, Dave.

David Schmid: Yes. Not to drag this out any further, but there were other - let see here, I didn't know if the ISC had any more comments. Were that part of it, or are we ready for board deliberation?

Gene Peltola: I defer to Sue on the process in regard to consideration for 21-10.

((Crosstalk))

Sue Detwiler: To my knowledge, the ISC did not take this up.

David Schmid: Okay.

Sue Detwiler: But I would defer to Robbin on that.

Robbin LaVine: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Through the Chair, the ISC did provide a recommendation on the original proposal. And the board was presented with the original Regional Advisory Council recommendations and comments, the results of tribal consultation, the results or the comments from the state liaison, and the comments from the ISC at that time.

And I believe you may find the ISC comments from the very first time this proposal was presented to the board, on let's see what page is that, on page 35 of the analysis that is part of the supplemental materials, on their Web site. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Gene Peltola: Thank you much. I appreciate it. So Dave, I think we're at the point, if the board does not have any further discussion, we'll open the motion on the action, the proposal. Any other questions or comments, or discussion from board members? Hearing none, we're open for a motion for action on the item.

David Schmid: Okay, Mr. Chair, Forest Service.

Gene Peltola: Go ahead, Dave.

David Schmid: Mr. Chair, I move to adopt WP 21-10 in support of the original Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council recommendation to implement a salmon season fishery in the Lower Copper River adjacent to the

Copper River Highway with a harvest limit of 15 salmon, other than pink salmon, for the first two members of the household, and 10 salmon for additional household members, and an annual harvest limit of five Chinook salmon per household, with the OSM modification to require a 48-hour reporting period, and additional modifications to include - I have three of them - fishing by dip net or rod and reel only; second one is to delay the start of the season to June 1st; and the third would be to prohibit dip netting from boats.

Following a second, I will explain why I intend to support my motion in support of the original Southcentral RAC's recommendation, including the OSM's modification as well as the three additional proposed modifications that I just presented.

Charlie Brower: Second by Public Member Brower.

Gene Peltola: We have a second. Please proceed.

David Schmid: Thank you, Charlie. First of all, and most importantly, I truly want to express how much I empathize with the federally qualified rural residents of the Upper Copper River including Ahtna and members of the Eastern Interior Subsistence Regional Advisory Council, over concerns about the declining salmon runs on the Copper. The Upper Copper has seen significant growth and you heard that from across the board, in the state personal use fishery, which has included the increased use of boats as dip netting platforms, as well as commercial guiding.

From 2010 to 2019 the average annual harvest has been over 140,000 sockeye salmon in the Chitina subdistrict state personal use fishery. During the same time, commercial harvests have averaged over 1.3 million sockeye salmon

annually. Declining Chinook salmon runs have been a concern to all users across the State of Alaska for over a decade, including those on the Upper and Lower Copper.

It is truly unfortunate to see two federally qualified user groups at odds with each other when over 90% of the Copper River sockeye and 96% of the Chinook salmon harvested between 2010 and 2019 were by non-federally qualified user groups while federally qualified subsistence users took only 3% and 4%, respectively.

It's difficult for me to see how such a disparate harvest between non-federally qualified and federally qualified users translates into a subsistence priority to federally qualified users that rely on Copper River salmon for subsistence.

I've heard from others today that have mentioned that there are three streams or two streams primarily in the Cordova area with federal subsistence seasons for salmon, Eyack and Ibeck. And as you heard, and I won't repeat, from public testimony, due to low stream gradient and clear water dip netting for salmon on the two streams is very challenging, if not impossible, most of the time.

Again, the total harvest from those federal fisheries was small from 2010 to 2019. I think you heard before the average harvest on these streams combined was only 102 sockeye and 481 coho. And it's notable that most of these are caught on rod and reel.

It's clear to me that these streams which represent the entirety of the existing federal subsistence opportunity in Cordova do not provide adequate access or opportunity to constitute a reasonable federal subsistence priority. Simply put

it leaves a significant portion of the Cordova community without a means to obtain federal subsistence salmon.

And next the proposed federal subsistence fishery would provide a first opportunity for federally qualified rural users that don't have access to marine waters to obtain Copper River salmon coming out of winter when the need for subsistence fish is greatest.

Finally, the probable harvest from the proposed subsistence dip net fishery on the Lower Copper is very low and anticipated to be at a maximum of 2,000 sockeye salmon annually. This is less than 1/10th of 1%, 0.8% of the total average annual Copper River sockeye salmon run and less than 1%, .63%, of the total annual Copper River Chinook salmon run. Such low harvest levels are likely to have a significant impact on the overall in-river salmon abundance relative to other existing fisheries.

In summary conservation management actions over low salmon abundance should target where the vast majority of harvest occurs, primarily in the state commercial fishery and marine waters and state personal use fisheries in the Upper Copper River drainage.

While the joint council meetings did not result in any compromise that was supported, several constructive suggestions were made by members from each council, which I've taken into consideration and incorporated into our modification proposal.

With the addition of these modifications to the proposed regulation, many of the concerns expressed about overharvest should be alleviated.

Thank you. Mr. Chair.

Gene Peltola: Thank you, Dave. We'll go into Board deliberation. So one thing I would like to comment about is that we've heard from both the Southcentral and Eastern Interior and feeling like they were put on the spot. At least from BIA's perspective that was never the intention. The deference provided to Regional Advisory Council is very significant and we did have a split opinion.

At least from BIA's perspective, that's what I looked for going back through the Regional Advisory Councils. It was not intended to put him on the spot, put him in a bad light whatsoever. There is great significance of the position of (unintelligible) with regard to the Board.

And there are certain things - there are only certain circumstances when the Board can counter a Regional Advisory Council decision with regard to take. Those are very limited.

So that's the significance of the Regional Advisory Council input. I apologize. And I'm sorry to hear that the Regional Advisory Councils weren't as happy as they could have been. But that is the significant role that the Regional Advisory Councils play.

A question that maybe - before we get the call for question I could ask (unintelligible) if they could address this for the Board's benefit as well as the delegation of authority to this special fishery if the Board is asked. Where does that lie is the first question for maybe Scott?

Scott Aires: Mr. Chair, this is Scott Ayers for the record.

Gene Peltola: Thank you, Scott. Go ahead.

Scott Ayres: The delegated authority for managing the Copper River lies with the National Park Service with the superintendent of Wrangall-St. Elias I believe.

Gene Peltola: In that delegation, Scott, does it stipulate methods, means and bags or harvest levels?

Scott Ayres: I don't have the delegation pulled up right now, but all of the fisheries delegations are the same allowing for emergency special actions only. I can look that up in just one moment, Mr. Chair.

Gene Peltola: Thank you. Please bear with us for a slight pause here.

Dave Schmid: Mr. Chair, while we're waiting, Dave Schmid.

Gene Peltola: Go ahead, Dave.

Dave Schmid: Yes. I too, and I should have begun earlier here extending my apologies to the RACs that the intent as Gene shared was not to pit one against the other RAC or to try and find some forced compromise. And I know that that's how that was interpreted.

And I apologize if some of the language I used earlier or on the record contributed to that. I did try to make that clear when we started when welcoming folks together to the meeting that, you know, not compromising or not changing positions was perfectly acceptable. And I do apologize for that.

I think if anything, it contributed to a hardening of original positions and maybe some stronger feelings. So my deepest regrets if I did contribute. That was certainly not the intent. I was hoping that the RACs could hear from each other and maybe at least understand each other's position a little bit closer.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Gene Peltola: Thank you, Dave. And your comments do address what I consider the backbone of the Federal Subsistence Program and this involvement in the outcomes from our Regional Advisory Councils. Thank you, Dave.

Scott Ayers: Mr. Chair, this is Scott. I'm ready.

Gene Peltola: Go ahead, Scott.

Scott Ayers: I pulled up the letter of delegation and specifically I'm looking at the scope of delegation and it permits the in-season manager to open or close federal subsistence fishing periods or areas provided under the codified regulations.

It also permits them to specify methods and means, to specify permit requirements and to set harvest and possession limits for federal subsistence fisheries.

It also permits them to close and reopen federal public waters to non-subsistence fishing but does not permit them to specify method and means, permit requirements or harvest in possession limits for state managed fisheries. That delegation may only be exercised when it's necessary to conserve healthy populations of fish or to ensure the continuation of subsistence uses.

All other proposed changes to codified regulations such as customary traditional use determinations or request for special actions greater than 60 days shall be directed to the Board. Please let me know clarifies things, Mr. Chair.

Gene Peltola: Thank you, Scott. I do appreciate that. One other point I would like to raise is, and then I'll go see if any other Board members have any comments or concerns before we call for the question.

But I'd like to reiterate a portion of the statement Dave made when he was justifying his motion is that once again the Federal Subsistence Program is placed in a scenario to argue over a significant minority of the run. It constitutes anywhere from less than 1% to 2% of the run.

The overall impact of the fishery federally qualified use outside the potential direct action of the Federal Subsistence Board and our federal regulations harvest have a minimal impact on the overall run size return as a whole. I just wanted to reiterate that which Dave mentioned.

With that being said, do the other the Federal Subsistence Board members have any questions or comments?

Sarah Creachbaum: Mr. Chair, NPS.

Gene Peltola: Go ahead.

Sarah Creachbaum: Mr. Chair, I move to amend the motion to authorize the Lower Copper River fisheries on a temporary basis for a three-year period beginning in 2022. If I get a second, I'll explain the justification for supporting my amendment.

Sara Boario: Second.

Gene Peltola: I have a second. Go ahead, Sarah.

Sarah Creachbaum: Thank you. The intent of my amendment is to authorize the federal subsistence fisheries on the Lower Copper River on a trial basis.

I acknowledge the introduction of this federal subsistence fisheries is consistent with the intent ANILCA and as such is a federal priority.

This said it comes at a difficult time with the Secretary of Commerce recently declaring disasters in the Copper River salmon fisheries in 2018 and 2020. Additionally the Chinook salmon runs have been at historic lows in recent years and sockeye salmon runs have been weak.

The introduction of a new fishery at this time should be done with great caution, have a deliberate approach and allow for those that manage the fisheries of the Copper River in the State of Alaska and Wrangall-St. Elias National Park and Preserve the opportunity to test the fishery for three years to best learn how the new activity integrates into current systems of commercial and in-river management before finalizing the regulations.

This pilot approach is the responsible and professional action required of public servants employing the precautionary principle to management of fish and wildlife while best meeting the needs of the resources and the people who depend on them.

It is also appropriate to allow our partner in conservation of Copper River salmon, the State of Alaska, the opportunity to evaluate and adapt to a new fishery, while minimizing any potential impacts to participants in existing federal subsistence fisheries up river, many of whom already have difficulty in meeting their needs.

For these reasons I intend to support my amendment to establish the Lower Copper River fishery on a temporary basis only with an exception of evaluation and revision in three years' time. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Gene Peltola: Thank you, Sarah. Any discussion or comments about the amendment?

Scott Ayers: Mr. Chair, this is Scott Ayers with OSM. I have a question.

Gene Peltola: Go ahead, Scott.

Scott Ayers: Sorry. I was listening in to the amendment and I just wanted to make sure that I had captured accurately that this would make this a temporary three-year fishery and the starting year would be 2022?

Sarah Creachbaum: That's correct.

Scott Ayers: Thank you.

Gene Peltola: Any other questions or comments before we proceed? Hearing none, then I'd like to make one comment. I'm not necessarily a fan of sunset clauses. But I think if the Board was to take an action to establish a fishery that there are ample in-season and regulatory measures to serve the same purpose, would just require due diligence and paying attention to the fishery being season management.

Anybody else have any questions or comments? Hearing none, I would support call for question.

Rhonda Pitka: I'm sorry. This is Rhonda Pitka.

Gene Peltola: Go ahead, Rhonda.

Rhonda Pitka: Hi. No, I just wanted to let you know that I was online finally.

Gene Peltola: Okay, Rhonda...

Rhonda Pitka: I came as soon as my meeting finally ended.

Gene Peltola: We are discussing WP21-10, the Lower Copper River area salmon. We've gone through the agenda intro by the Fisheries office. We received an updated analysis. We received from the summary from Regional Advisory Council joint meetings with Southcentral Eastern Interior in addition to comments from the two chairs.

We took about 45 minutes of additional public comment. We had a motion made by National Forest Service and then we had an amendment made by the National Park Service. And for Rhonda's benefit, Sue, can you please ask staff to read the original motion then the amendment.

Sue Detwiler: Yes. So the original motion was to adopt Fisheries Proposal 21-10 as modified by OSM and as further modified by the Forest Service to allow fishing only by dip net and rod and reel, delay the start of the fishery to June 1 and prohibit dip netting by boat.

And the amendment that is now under consideration is to make this a temporary three-year fishery starting in 2022.

Tina: Excuse me. This is Tina, the court reporter. Could I just clarify who made the second on the amendment? Because I only heard a woman's voice but no name. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: The second on the motion to amend was made by Rhonda Pitka, I believe.

Tina: Rhonda, is that correct?

Rhonda Pitka: No, I did not make that. I'm sorry. I wasn't - my line was still muted.

Tina: That's what I thought. Okay.

Sara Boario: Sue, the Fish and Wildlife Service seconded.

Tina: Thank you. Thank you very much.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you.

Gene Peltola: Rhonda, a procedural question for me. Since normally you fill in in the absence of the chair, would you like to take over this time or would you like me to follow through with the completion of FP21-10 then have you take over after that?

Rhonda Pitka: I'd like you to follow through with completion. Thank you.

Gene Peltola: Okay. Thank you, Rhonda. So we've updated Rhonda. She's online now. We do appreciate your presence, Rhonda. So at this point we've had a motion. We have an amendment to the motions so we can look for and call for the question to vote on the amendment.

Dave Schmid: Question on the amendment.

Gene Peltola: We had two people speak over each other.

Charlie Brower: I just had a question on the amendment if I may before...

Gene Peltola: Yes. Go ahead, Charlie.

Charlie Brower: Yes. I have a concern with the trial run for three years. What is the outcome of this free run trial?

Gene Peltola: So, Sue, if you could elaborate if I get it wrong. If the Board was to adopt this with the amendment, the regulation would be put in place for a three-year period starting 2022 and would potentially expire after that.

Sue Detwiler: Yes. That's my understanding. But I also would like to ask Theo Matuskowitz if he's online. He's our regulatory specialist if he would like anything further than that he can provide that information.

Gene Peltola: And, Theo, if you're on board, can you provide inputs for the Board's consideration, please?

Theo Matuskowitz: Yes, Mr. Chair. This is Theo Matuskowitz for the record. What Sue said is basically correct. This regulation would expire at the end of the season of 2024. And unless, someone took an action to submit a proposal to continue this action, it would just expire and be removed from the regulations.

Let me know if you have any further questions. Thank you.

Gene Peltola: Thank you, Theo. I appreciate that clarification.

Sarah Creachbaum: Mr. Chair, National Park Service.

Gene Peltola: Go ahead, Sarah.

Sarah Creachbaum: Just for a point of clarification, the three-year time period would be made with an expectation of evaluation and revision in three years' time. Thank you.

Gene Peltola: So I have a question then, the evaluation revision, based on your motion you made, would you intend the regulation to be permanent, the Board revisit, re-evaluate and take potential action three years out?

Sarah Creachbaum: Yes, Mr. Chair.

Gene Peltola: So based on that clarification, I would have a question for legal counsel at the solicitor's office, Ken? Would the Board be able to revisit existing regulation that is on the books for re-evaluation or consideration three years out without a particular proposal being made to the Board for consideration?

Ken Lord: Gene, I actually had the same question. I was about to text that to Theo so we could discuss it. So if you could give us a minute offline, we'll figure that out for you.

Gene Peltola: Thank you. So at this time I proposed let's give a 12 to 13 minute break and come back at 15 minutes past the hour. Hopefully we'll have clarification from SOL. Thank you, Ken. We'll talk to everybody shortly.

Sue Detwiler: And I will go back and do a roll call here to make sure we have a quorum of Board members back on the call. Starting with National Park Service, Sarah Creachbaum?

Sarah Creachbaum: Hi, Sue. I'm present.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Tom Heinlein, BLM?

Thomas Heinlein: Hi, Sue. I'm present.

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

Sara Boario: I am here. Thanks, Sue.

Sue Detwiler: Forest Service, Dave Schmid.

Dave Schmid: I'm here, Sue. Thanks.

Sue Detwiler: Thanks, Dave. BIA, Gene Peltola?

Gene Peltola: BIA is back.

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

Rhonda Pitka: Hi. I'm online.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Public member Charlie Brower? Chair Anthony Christianson?  
Robbin or someone on the call, can you check with the operator and see if  
public member Brower is trying to get in.

Coordinator: This is the operator. If you're on the line, please press star 0. If you're on the  
line, please press star 0. No one has signaled at this time. Mr. Chair, we have  
Rhonda Pitka, public member Rhonda Pitka and then the five agency Board  
members online. I'm trying to get Mr. Brower, who was just recently online  
and Anthony Christianson.

Gene Peltola: So why don't we give it a couple more minutes and try to get Charlie online? We have at least Rhonda here if we are in a position where we end up proceeding although I would like to have both involved in the final decision on this proposal if can be so let's give him a couple more minutes.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you.

Gene Peltola: And members of the public, we do apologize. We are giving a couple more minutes here to see if we can get one more of our public members back online. If we don't hear from anybody here shortly, then we'll proceed.

Operator, have we had any success in getting the public member brought back on board?

Coordinator: At this time, I still do not see Mr. Brower.

Gene Peltola: Okay. Unless there's objection from any of the Board members, I propose we proceed. Okay. Hearing no objections, Theo and Ken, can you please enlighten the Board what you've discussed, please.

Theo Matuskowitz: Yes, Mr. Chair. Again this is Theo Matuskowitz for the record. First, I'll point out that this is something new that the Board hasn't done before. However I feel fairly confident the Office of the Federal Register would allow this.

We could use terminology along the lines of, you know, this regulation expires on X X, you know, end of season 2024 unless reviewed or renewed by action of the Board. So I think that would be safe to use and would be accepted by the Federal Register.

And I'll also point out since we're talking about a three-year period here also that would not preclude anyone from submitting a regular proposal to revise, change, you know, whatever this regulation. But as of what we're attempting to do - what you're attempting to do now, yes, I believe we can do that if we word it a certain way.

And I'll work with the Federal Register to get this through. Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you.

Gene Peltola: Yes, Theo. This is Gene. One follow-up after your explanation there. Would there need to be a specific - what would it take for the Board to invoke an expiration or extension if we were going to review the effectiveness of this after the three-year period? So procedurally what would have to be presented to the Board outside of another proposal to take action as proposed?

Theo Matuskowitz: So since it would be in the regulation that, you know, we're referring to, you know, some action being renewed by the Board, it's in the record that at the expiration date if the board wants to vote to continue it, if the board wants to vote to, you know, make it permanent and drop, you know, the timeline, you can do that because we're saying it this certain way in the actual regulation.

So if it's basically, you know, in 2024, the Board can act on this if they so desire and make whatever changes they want or if they decide - if you decide to do nothing, it will expire.

Gene Peltola: Okay, Theo. Thank you. Anybody else have any questions for Theo and/or Ken from the Board? Any questions or comments?

I'd like to provide one. I do appreciate the effort that Ken and Theo put into it. I'm still a bit uncomfortable with the verbiage or terminology which has been utilized as that I've heard should, may be able to, will work with as opposed to a definitive yes or no. For those reasons, I'm leaning toward not supporting this amendment.

Any other questions or comments from the other Board members? Hearing none, we are entertaining a call for question and a vote on the amendment.

Dave Schmid: A question and I believe Charlie has joined. He's trying to call in now.

Gene Peltola: Okay. We have a question. Operator, can you confirm whether Public Member Charlie Brower is on or not.

Coordinator: Mr. Brower, if you are on the line, please press star 0. Again, if you're on the line, please press star 0. At this time, I don't see where anyone has called in with the host passcode. Just a moment.

Sue Detwiler: Mr. Chair, while we're waiting for Charlie to join, may I just read the wording that we have now for the amendment to make sure that it's what the Board is wanting to vote on?

Gene Peltola: Please do so with the concurrence of motion maker.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. So the amendment that the Board will be voting on is an amendment to the prior motion to adopt with modifications. This amendment would make it a temporary fishing season starting in 2022 to expire following the 2024 season unless renewed by action of the federal subsistence Board.

I'm just looking for concurrence with the motion maker and seconder that that is - and I guess the attorneys, to make sure that is the wording of the amendment that the Board should be voting on.

Theo Matuskowitz: Mr. Chair, this is Theo Matuskowitz. May I address this issue, please?

Gene Peltola: Go ahead, Theo.

Theo Matuskowitz: Yes. I think we would have a problem using the word temporary. These are in the CFR. They are permanent regulations. So that very well could become a sticking point to try and get this published.

I think it would be best if we remove temporary and just say to make, you know, this regulation effective starting in 2022 and to expire following the 2024 season unless renewed by action of the Federal Subsistence Board.

The temporary part I feel would be questioned because it probably referred to our special action regulations and say, well, why don't you address it this way because, you know, the CFR are permanent regulations.

So that would be my only recommendation. Thank you.

Gene Peltola: Thank you, Theo, for the clarification. So, Sue...

Sue Detwiler: Yes, re-read it? As modified by Theo...

Gene Peltola: Excuse me?

Sue Detwiler: I'm sorry. I interrupted. I was going to offer to reread it with the modification by Theo.

Gene Peltola: Well actually I was checking with Sue to see what her motion actually was, if she could review her motion and be willing to read it such that since we did have a second, we had a call for a question. If she used the term temporary, then I'd say with concurrence to the motion maker and the second before we continue deliberation and potential vote that we strike that from her motion or amendment I should say. So, Sue, did you use the term temporary?

Sarah Creachbaum: You're asking for Sarah.

Gene Peltola: Yes, Sarah Creachbaum, yes.

Sarah Creachbaum: National Park Service.

Gene Peltola: Yes. Sorry about that.

Sarah Creachbaum: Oh, that's okay. We did not use the word temporary.

Man: We can take it out. We did, but we can take it out.

Sarah Creachbaum: Oh I see. I'm sorry we did apparently, but we're prepared to remove that.

Gene Peltola: So with the verbiage temporary in the original amendment in order to facilitate the concerns expressed by our regulation specialist with input from the solicitor's office and with the concurrence of the second, would - Sarah Creachbaum would you be willing to strike the term temporary?

Sarah Creachbaum: Yes.

Gene Peltola: Second on that motion I believe was Sara Boario. Sue, could you confirm who the second was on the amendment for us, please so I can get a concurrence from the second?

Sue Detwiler: I believe it was Sara Boario or Jill Klein maybe sitting in for her at the moment.

Gene Peltola: Jill or Sara, are you online?

Sara Boario: Yes.

Gene Peltola: Do you confirm striking the term temporary?

Sara Boario: Yes.

Gene Peltola: Thank you very much. So we have clarification on the motion. Temporary is not utilized based on advice from regulations and solicitor office input. The question has been called, is that correct, Sue?

Sue Detwiler: Actually I don't remember who called for the question if they did.

Davd Schmid: This is Dave. I did call for the question, Forest Service.

Gene Peltola: Okay. Thank you, Dave. Sue, could you please proceed with the roll call vote on the amendment?

Sue Detwiler: Yes. Starting with the maker of the motion, Sarah Creachbaum, National Park Service?

Sarah Creachbaum: National Park Service supports.

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: The Bureau of Indian Affairs votes to oppose. This is too complex of issues to be trying something for the first time with the significance of subsistence on the Cooper River. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Bureau of Land Management, Tom Heinlein?

Chris McKee: Sue, this is Chris McKee. I'm standing in for Tom, He had to step away for another meeting briefly. So I'll be acting in his stead. BLM supports.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Thank you. Dave Schmid, Forest Service?

Davd Schmid: Forest Service oppose.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Public member Rhonda Pitka?

Rhonda Pitka: I oppose the amendment.

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

Charlie Brower: Oppose.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Chair Anthony Christianson, did you come on. So it looks like the motion fails, three yays and four no's.

Gene Peltola: Okay. Thank you, Sue. That brings us back to the original motion as presented by National Forest Service. Any other discussion, if not we would be ready to entertain the call for question.

Charlie Brower: Question.

Gene Peltola: The question has been called. And, Sue, can you please conduct the roll call vote to the Board members?

Sue Detwiler: Okay. So for clarification, the original motion was to adopt FP21-10 with modifications as recommended by OSM with further modification by Forest Service to allow fishing only by dip net and rod and reel, delay the start of the fishery to June 1 and prohibit dip netting by boat.

And starting with the Forest Service?

Dave Schmid: Yes, Forest Service. I support the motion with the justification I provided earlier.

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

Sarah Creachbaum: The National Park Service supports.

Sue Detwiler: Sara Boario, Fish and Wildlife Service?

Sara Boario: Service supports.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Gene Peltola, BIA?

Gene Peltola: Bureau of Indian Affairs has asked that as Acting Chair that you come to us at the end of the roll call vote.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. BLM, Thomas Heinlein.

Thomas Heinlein: BLM supports.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Public member, Rhonda Pitka.

Rhonda Pitka: Hello. Can you hear me?

Sue Detwiler: Yes. Yes, Rhonda.

Rhonda Pitka: Okay, great. I oppose. I oppose FP21-10. (Unintelligible) opposes the proposal because of a potential conservation concern and depletion of really important fishery research resource. And they detailed a lot of concerns on Page 34 of the Board book. Thank you.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you. Public Member Charlie Brower.

Charlie Brower: Oppose.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Chair Anthony Christianson if he's come on. Finally back to you, Mr. Peltola.

Gene Peltola: Stand by. Conferring with staff. BIA has been very torn on this issue although when I spoke to (unintelligible) of the Regional Advisory Councils and their input, the last Board presented to us is two Regional Advisory Councils in opposition. So BIA votes to oppose in support of the Advisory Councils.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. Thank you. So the vote is four in favor of the motion to adopt and three opposed. The motion passes.

Gene Peltola: Okay. That completes FP21-10. I appreciate everybody's patience. I know it was a little unorthodox, but we try to get some input in. We tried to get legal advice so the Board could take the appropriate action. With that being said, I would like to, if she's willing to take it, pass on pro tem duties to public member Rhonda Pitka.

Rhonda Pitka: Yes, absolutely. It looks like...

Gene Peltola: Thank you, Rhonda.

Rhonda Pitka: Thank you very much, Mr. Peltola, for your handling of the meeting. I just landed in Seattle at about 1:00 p.m. so my service was very spotty for a while.

So right now we're at the schedule about upcoming Board meetings.

Sue Detwiler: Yes, Madam Chair. We just have two more agenda items, schedule of upcoming Board meetings and the last item is Federal Subsistence Management Program correspondence procedures.

And I would note for Item 11, correspondence procedures, the original requester for that agenda item was the Chair Tony Christianson, who requested this item be on the agenda. And he is not present as far as I know and it's not a time sensitive issue.

The Board could at its pleasure defer it to the next meeting or continue on with this agenda item at this meeting. I'm prepared to go either way on that. I'm the presenter on that. And actually I kind of got ahead of you, Madam

Chair. I apologize, you were ready to launch into schedule of upcoming Board meetings.

Rhonda Pitka: Yes. Thank you. So the schedule of our Board meetings, I believe that's yes Robbin LaVine?

Robbin LaVine: Yes, thank you, Madam Chair. This is Robin.

Rhonda Pitka: Go ahead.

Robbin LaVine: And I first would like to confirm the 2022 summer work session. Earlier in the year, we conducted a Doodle poll and seven of the eight board members confirmed availability for July 26 and 27.

I want on the record to confirm that a quorum of the Board would be available on those dates. And I would note that this is a very difficult time for board members and staff alike. Staff in particular are constrained by deadlines, reviews and preparing all of the work and meeting materials for the Regional Advisory Councils.

Printing of those council book materials would begin August 3. So just letting you know again that it's very hard to schedule these things with so many busy people.

Thank you, Madam Chair. And I'm, you know, ready to entertain discussion on the dates of July 26 and 27.

Gene Peltola: Madam Chair, BIA.

Rhonda Pitka: Go ahead, BIA.

Gene Peltola: Thank you, Madam Chair. Robbin, I do appreciate the comments about being busy as well as the leadership of our DOI agencies. We're busy as well.

Just so people are aware, I did respond to the Doodle poll. Those are the only dates that I or BIA could participate in the summer work session. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Rhonda Pitka: Thank you. And, yes, so I responded to the poll. And those were the only dates that would work for me. But really with the lack of (unintelligible) in the interior right now I think the calendar is pretty clear.

So did anybody else have any comments on the date?

Sara Boario: Madam Chair, Fish and Wildlife Service? My apologies to the Board and to the staff. Those dates do not work for me. And, Sue, it sounds like if what you need is a quorum. You may well have it so.

Rhonda Pitka: Fish and Wildlife Service, will your alternate be available at that time?

Sara Boario: Yes. My alternate will be available.

Rhonda Pitka: Thank you. Does anybody else have any comments on the work session dates, whether or not they work? If not, I'm not sure what action is required here. Is it a vote?

Robbin LaVine: No. Madam Chair, no formal action is required unless we are selecting and confirming a final date for the winter public meeting. I just wanted to confirm and it sounds like aside from Board Member Boario, we do have a quorum for the July 26 and 27 and in addition an alternate is available.

Thank you, Madam Chair. We will begin planning that meeting. It is a work session. We will be addressing the annual reports for the Regional Advisory Councils and reviewing Board replies.

Additionally the Board is required to have an executive session to review Council member nominations. And we're very hopeful that we'll be able to hold this meeting in person, but I, of course, defer to my superiors on that. We can all be hopeful and I am hopeful. So thank you, Madam Chair. We'll begin work on that.

The next item that I'll bring to your attention.

Rhonda Pitka: Thank you. I just have one more question. So do we know a date where we will know if we will be in-person or not? When we can confirm that we will or will not be in person?

Sue Detwiler: Madam Chair, this is Sue. And I have not heard of any firm deadlines. I think it's kind of a moving target depending on how the pandemic goes. You know, yes, that's all we know. The numbers are trending in a positive direction and we're going to be planning to have the upcoming meeting in July and following meetings in person but things could change.

Rhonda Pitka: Okay. I was mostly just asking for planning purposes for myself to planning for travel.

Gene Peltola: BIA?

Rhonda Pitka: Go ahead, BIA.

Gene Peltola: Thank you, Madam Chair. BIA has been operating under the no personal attendance at gatherings greater than 50. I heard rumors that that was lifted when I inquired early on this week so that would be something that OSM could and should look into.

Based on the experience that we've had, I think we're well overdue with regard to continuity and be effectively pulling up a Board meeting to have - proceeding between now and the fall all in person. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Rhonda Pitka: Thank you for that (unintelligible). I appreciate it. Okay. Now we are on B, 2023 winter public meeting. Go Robbin LaVine.

Robbin LaVine: Thank you madam chair. I would like to bring to your notice that we will be scheduling the fish and shellfish regulatory meeting, that is a public meeting. It's usually a three-day meeting. And we are identifying the last week of January, you know, the first couple of days of February or the days of February 7 through 9 for that meeting.

So if anyone has a preference, you can speak now. Otherwise if you request, I will send out a Doodle poll soon to confirm regulatory meetings, especially if we are to have them in person, require a lot of logistical work in advance.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

Rhonda Pitka: Thank you. I appreciate that. Does anybody have any comments on those days for the winter public meeting?

Gene Peltola: Madam Chair, BIA. A Doodle poll would probably help. Conferring with staff February 7 through 9 fits BIA's agenda.

Rhonda Pitka: Okay. Does anybody else have any comments or would we all prefer to have a Doodle poll?

Robbin LaVine: Madam Chair, I'll prepare a Doodle poll for the Board and your staff.

Rhonda Pitka: Thank you so much. I appreciate that. So with the knowledge that it's those dates and that's maybe a Doodle poll. Thank you very much.

Now we're at Federal Subsistence Management Program correspondence procedures. Go ahead, Sue. You were saying something about this earlier.

Sue Detwiler: Sorry. I was just trying to get off mute here. This agenda item was requested by two Board members, one of whom was Tony Christensen. It's an informational item to go over what the OSM correspondence procedures are after the Board takes an action.

So I am prepared to give that overview now unless the Board would rather wait until Tony is back to also engage in the discussion and hear the overview.

Rhona Pitka: You can just go ahead and give the overview and then we'll brief him after.

Sue Detwiler: Okay. So I will go over the information I had prepared. And so a couple of Board members have requested an overview from OSM on our correspondence procedures, including how we process Board decisions after they're made and on our procedures for outgoing correspondence.

Federal subsistence regulations assign Fish and Wildlife Service with responsibility for providing administrative support to the Board. Within Fish and Wildlife Service, the Office of Subsistence Management or OSM is a program that carries out this administrative support.

OSM prepares the outgoing correspondence and other documents needed to implement Board decisions and carry out other direction from the Board. We also prepare correspondence drafted by the Regional Advisory Councils such as their reports to the Board, their comments on proposals that are under consideration by the Alaska Board of Game and Board of Fisheries, letters to other agencies and Tribes and so on.

Fish and Wildlife Service and USDA Forest Service co-manage the Federal Subsistence Management Program. So OSM works closely with the Forest Service in preparing regulatory and policy documents.

The Forest Service's Regional Advisory Council Coordinator also works closely with OSM in preparing correspondence and other documents coming from the Regional Advisory Council.

The Regional Advisory Council documents - the council coordinators draft the documents such as the council's annual reports to the Board. These documents are reviewed in OSM and we help with editing for clarity and formatting. And we put the documents on letterhead. OSM does not change the messaging or content of RAC correspondence.

After OSM has finalized the letter, it goes back to the Regional Advisory Council coordinator and to the council chair for their final review and signature. OSM then mails the correspondence to the recipient and the parties indicated on the cc list. So that's for Regional Advisory Council documents.

So turning to documents for the Board, OSM also prepares documents for the Board that implement actions the Board has taken. Board actions include regulatory actions such as the Subpart C and D regulations, which are the

harvest regulations, such as seasons, harvest limits, methods and means as well as the customary and traditional use determinations.

The Board also makes recommendations to the Secretary of Interior and Agriculture on revisions to Subparts A and B of the regulations, which includes general provisions of program structure.

Other non-regulatory actions the Board takes are recommendations to the Secretary of Interior and Agriculture such as for nominations to the Regional Advisory Councils as well general correspondence to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. So OSM drafts Board correspondence for those actions as well.

For correspondence coming from the Board, such as Board decisions or letters, OSM drafts the correspondence, often in consultation with the regional solicitor's office and sends the draft to the Board chair for his review and approval.

After the Board chair approves the document, OSM applies his signature to the document and we forward it to the next steps in the process, which are our internal agency processes.

So for regulatory actions requiring a Federal Register Notice, OSM works with the regional solicitor's office, Forest Service staff and Fish and Wildlife Service headquarters and Department of Interior to prepare the Federal Register Notice.

And the Federal Register package includes not just the Federal Register Notice but all additional informational material that are required by Fish and Wildlife Service and Department of Interior for all Federal Register Notices

For any other Board letter or other documents that would go to the Secretaries of Interior or Agriculture and for any issues that may be controversial or rise to the attention of the Fish and Wildlife Service director or headquarters' office, Fish and Wildlife Service has internal review processes that must be completed before the documents can be finalized and transmitted.

The purpose of these reviews is to ensure that Fish and Wildlife Service regional and national leadership are fully knowledgeable of federal subsistence management issues that may require the attention of the Fish and Wildlife Service director.

So for the regional review process for leadership here in Alaska, OSM prepares a package that includes the Board documents, such as the letter or memo from the Board or the nominations package for the Regional Advisory Councils. It would also include a note to reviewers that briefly describes the document, a briefing paper with more detailed information on the documents, possibly a communications plan and any other necessary supporting documents.

And so that package goes out - it also includes the regional surname sheet showing who in the region has reviewed and signed off on the package. And so OSM prepares that package and then we route it within the region to our external affairs office.

And from there it goes to the Regional Executive Secretary in our in the regional office, Deputy Regional director and then finally the regional director for review and approval of the package before it goes to Fish and Wildlife Service headquarters' office.

At the headquarters' office, they have their review process as well. It's reviewed by upper level managers before it goes to the Fish and Wildlife Service director. And once the Fish and Wildlife Service director is completely apprised of the issue, then the package goes is forwarded to final recipients, such as the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture.

So that is the process. And just a couple of other comments. The Fish and Wildlife Service regional and headquarters' review processes may not modify the decision made by the Board, but they may edit other information in the package.

And this regional review process also is used for developing briefing materials for the Fish and Wildlife Service director when she briefs headquarters' staff and Department of Interior on federal subsistence management issues.

So that is the overview of OSM correspondence procedures for Board actions. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Rhonda Pitka: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. I've lost internet connectivity on my laptop. So does anybody have any questions for Sue right now?

Gene Peltola: Madam Chair, BIA. I don't have any questions, but I have some comments.

Rhonda Pitka: Oh, please. Go ahead.

Gene Peltola: Thank you, Madam Chair. So going through the process, I was one of the Board members who asked this to be presented to the Federal Subsistence Board for a look-see. My concern has been and continues to be that 50 CFR 110(b)(9) stipulates that Fish and Wildlife Service will provide administrative services to the Office of Subsistence Management.

Although if you look at the process, which is put in place for a correspondence and the outcomes of Board meetings, I think it is too burdensome, too much of a burden. It is designed to be agency-specific as opposed to a Federal Subsistence Program position. So we have - we try to - so to - review process must be completed before a doctor basically finalize and transmit.

The purpose for those reviews is ensure that the Fish & Wildlife's regional and national leadership are fully knowledgeable of Federal Subsistence Management issues - has been a required action on the Fish & Wildlife Service director.

I agree that that is a significant role for any agency within the Federal Subsistence Program, including the national leadership, although that is why each of the bureaus has a ISC member to prepare those internal briefs for our particular membership.

And I think there's - this is - one, takes way too long; and two, too much oversight; three, has the potential to be allowed for passage of a agency-specific position rather than the Federal Subsistence Program position.

And once the draft is made by OSM I think I have no problem - by it - be reviewed by external affairs staff. But it's - also should be run by the Forest Service to recognize their role in the program, and then put out to the public or the final destination after that minimal review.

And it is - I think we get to the point where we'd have a lot quicker correspondence to the public, which they deserve. I think there'd be more of a programmatic position forwarded on.

And with that being said, Madam Chair, for board's consideration I'd like to recommend that multiple board members come together to establish a correspondence and committee to establish procedures and policies for the Federal Subsistence Program for OSM to follow. Thank you Madam Chair.

Woman: All right. Thank you, Member Peltola. Was that a motion?

Gene Peltola: It can be made a motion. Correct. Yes.

Woman: Oh, perfect. Please make that a motion. Oh, sorry.

Gene Peltola: So move as stipulated.

Woman: Thank you very much, Member Peltola. I appreciate that. Is there a second for this motion? Did I get cut off again?

Woman: No, we hear you.

Gene Peltola: I hear you fine.

Woman: Okay, so there's a motion on the floor to form a committee to -- what was it -- discuss the public comment writing process. Is that correct?

Gene Peltola: Yes, for them to establish a committee to establish correspondence procedures for the Federal Subsistence Program to be implemented by the Office of Subsistence Management.

Woman: Madam Chair, are we still looking for a second? This is the Fish & Wildlife Service.

Woman: Yes.

Woman: I will second it and I'm happy to work with a subcommittee on looking at this. This is my - coming to the end of my first month in this seat and definitely want to make sure that we're all on the same page with this.

I'm happy to see in whose notes that doesn't appear that anything has - decisions have not been modified, but I am happy to be part of a team to look at the larger process. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Woman: Thank you very much for that - volunteering the second. Sue, I'm not sure what the process would be right now. Would that be a roll call or just - and I will...

Sue Detwiler: I - well, well deferring to (Ken) on this, but my gut reaction would be ask for - we have a motion and then a second and ask for any comment and if (Tony) were here, depending on the comment it - whether there were comments or not or any sense that anybody would disagree, then he would go for a formal roll call vote.

But if it sounds like it's an item that everybody would agree to, he would just do a voice vote.

Woman: Oh, perfect. Okay. Does anybody have any comments on the motion that's been seconded?

Gene Peltola: I appreciate this. This would be - I appreciate the second by the Fish & Wildlife Service who had volunteered the BIA board seat to participate in an endeavor as well.

Woman: Thank you. I hear two volunteers so that sounds to me like overwhelming support. So can I get a voice on this one? So if you support say aye. If you don't support then I'll ask for that after. Okay. All in favor say aye.

Gene Peltola: Aye.

Group: Aye.

Woman: Okay. All opposed say nay. Oh, great. The motion passed. Okay, thank you Sue.

Sue Detwiler: Thank you.

Woman: I believe that that is all of our board agenda items. Was there any other business? Sue, the next one.

Sue Detwiler: Oh. Oh. I - there was no - the board did not add any other business to this item so...

Woman: Oh, perfect.

Sue Detwiler: ...unless somebody else has something now.

Woman: Okay. Well, hearing none, it's been a really great meeting. I thank Mr. Peltola for taking over in my absence this morning. I apologize for that. I was on a plane to Seattle and very shortly I'll be on a plane to Denver. So...

((Crosstalk))

Sue Detwiler: Motion to adjourn someone?

Woman: ...to adjourn.

Woman: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Can somebody please...

Gene Peltola: Motion to adjourn...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...make a motion to adjourn? Thank you BIA.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Can I get a second to that motion?

Charles Brower: Second.

Woman: Thank you, Charlie Brower. Okay, all in favor of adjourning the meeting say aye.

Group: Aye.

Gene Peltola: Happy Easter everyone.

Woman: Oh, Happy Easter. Happy Good Friday. Okay, goodbye.

((Crosstalk))

Sue Detwiler: Thank you.

Charles Brower: Bye-bye.

END