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OPERATOR: Are you ready to start?

MS. LAVINE: Hi, this is Robbin LaVine and in a moment we will open the meeting and take roll call. We, at this point in time, would request that Sue initiate the meeting. Sue, are you on the line?

MS. DETWILER: Yes, Robbin. Thank you. This is Sue Detwiler. I'm on the line and I think, Operator, we can open the call so everybody can listen in. So that would be the speakers room as well as those folks in the listen only mode.

OPERATOR: It's okay if I give opening scripting to let them know the call.....

MS. DETWILER: Yes.

OPERATOR: .....is being recorded, correct?

MS. DETWILER: Yes.

OPERATOR: And then I can let them know how to cue up for the public comment section?

MS. DETWILER: Yes.

OPERATOR: Okay. Thank you, dear. I'll get you guys started. Please stand by.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

OPERATOR: Welcome and thank you for standing by. I would like to inform all participants that today's call is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. If you would like to make a comment during the public comment sessions of today's call, please press star followed by 1. Please make sure your phone is unmuted and record your name clearly when prompted. I would now like to turn our call over to Ms. Sue Detwiler. Thank you, ma'am, you may begin.
MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Operator.

Just confirming that we have -- nobody's in the waiting room. Everybody is able to listen to this call now who has called in?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hi, Sue.

Anthony Christianson is here.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. Thank you. I just wanted to confirm that we have -- everybody who has called in is able to listen to this -- listen in on the beginnings of the meeting here. I think the operator just did that.

The next thing I want to make sure is to confirm with Tina, the Court Reporter, that you have started recording now.

REPORTER: Yes, Sue, I'm recording.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, great. Thank you. Mr. Chair, I will go ahead and start with the roll call and see who we have. Starting with National Park Service we have Sarah Creachbaum.

MS. CREACHBAUM: Good afternoon. I'm present. Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

BLM. Do we have Mr. Thomas Heinlein.

MR. HEINLEIN: You sure do. Good afternoon.

MS. DETWILER: Good afternoon.

Fish and Wildlife Service, Sara Boario.

MS. BOARIO: Good afternoon, Sue, and everyone. I'm here.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Forest Service, David Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: Good afternoon, Sue. Dave is on.
MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

BIA, Gene Peltola.

(No comments)

MS. DETWILER: Public Member Rhonda Pitka. I heard you earlier. Are you still on?

MS. PITKA: Hi, I'm here. This is Rhonda.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Rhonda.

Public Member Charlie Brower. I heard you earlier. Are you still on?

(No response)

MS. DETWILER: I just heard you, Mr. Chair. If it's okay with you, I'll continue going down our roll call to see who the other key folks are who are on starting with legal counsel, Department of Interior, Regional Solicitor's Office, Ken Lord and Mike Routhier.

MR. LORD: Ken Lord is here. Mike will not be joining us I don't believe.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Ken.

USDA Office of General Council, Jim Ustasiewski.

(No response)

MS. DETWILER: Moving to Liaison to the Board, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game Ben Mulligan and Mark Burch.

MR. BURCH: Hello. This is Mark Burch with the Department of Fish and Game. Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Mark.

Regional Advisory Council Chairs. Starting with Region 1, Southeast Regional Council, Don Hernandez. Are you on?
MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, I am.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Region 2, Southcentral. I understand Chair Greg Encelewski is not on, but Gloria Stickwan, the Vice Chair will be on. Are you on, Gloria?

MS. STICKWAN: Yes, I am. Good afternoon.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Region 3, Kodiak Aleutians, Della Trumble.

(No response)

MS. DETWILER: Region 4, Bristol Bay, Nanci Morris Lyons.

(No response)

MS. DETWILER: Region 5, Ray Oney, Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta.

MS. PATTON: Good afternoon, Sue, and members of the Board. The Y-K Delta RAC Chair Raymond Oney had planned to participate this afternoon. However, all the phone lines are currently down in the community of Alakanuk, so hoping he will be able to join us later if the phones get reconnected this afternoon.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Eva.

Region 6, Western Interior, Jack Reakoff.

MR. REAKOFF: I'm here, Sue. Good afternoon.

MS. DETWILER: Good afternoon.

Region 7, Seward Peninsula, Louis Green.

MS. PILCHER: Mr. Chairman, Ms. Sue,
this is Nissa Pilcher, Council Coordinator for the Seward Peninsula Council Chair. Mr. Green is currently unable to call in.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. Thank you.

Region 8, Northwest Arctic, Thomas Baker.

(No response)

MS. DETWILER: Region 9, Eastern Interior, Sue Entsminger.

(No response)

MS. DETWILER: Region 10, North Slope, Gordon Brower. Heard you earlier. Are you still on?

MR. G. BROWER: Good afternoon. Gordon Brower, Regional Advisory Chair for North Slope is on.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Moving to Department of Interior, Field Special Assistant for Alaska, Sarah Taylor, are you on?

(No response)

MS. DETWILER: Sounds like not. Moving back up to the Board members, did we get Gene Peltola from BIA? Have you joined?

(No response)

MS. DETWILER: Or Charlie Brower, public member.

MR. C. BROWER: Here.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Charlie. So Mr. Chair we currently have seven out of eight of the Board members.

MS. MORRIS LYONS: This is Nanci. My phone is cutting in and out, so I think I missed when you called my name, but I am on.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. Thank you. So, Mr. Chair, we do have a quorum, so I'll hand it off to
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue. Appreciate that. I'd like to welcome everyone here. This is Anthony Christianson, Board Chair, to the Federal public meeting of April 12th. We'll just go ahead and again welcome everyone to this meeting. Thank the Staff for all that it takes to get ready for this and look forward to a productive meeting.

Orville, are you on at this time.

MR. LIND: Yes, Mr. Chair. Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes. As I welcome, Orville, I was hoping that we could do an invocation today and I'd call upon you, Orville, if you can go ahead and bless the meeting today and then we'll move forward with the agenda as presented.

MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am honored to do so. Everybody, if we can just take a moment, please join me in giving thanks.

(Invocation)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Amen. Thank you for that blessing, Orville. We'll go ahead and move on now that we've established a quorum. Sue, I believe we need to do a roll call at this time.

MS. DETWILER: Yes, we can do that and I believe we have some more people who have joined including possibly Gene Peltola from BIA. So let me just go through the Board roll call one more time.

Sarah Creachbaum, Park Service.

MS. CREACHBAUM: Good afternoon. I'm present.

MS. DETWILER: BLM. Thomas Heinlein.

MR. HEINLEIN: Good afternoon. I'm present.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Fish and Wildlife Service, Sara Boario.
MS. BOARIO: I'm here, Sue. Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: BIA, Gene Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: Roger, roger, 10-4. I assume we have a speaking line now. Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: Hi, I'm here.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Public Member Charlie Brower.

MR. C. BROWER: I'm here.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Chair Anthony Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, I'm here.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you. All eight Board members are present and accounted for, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right. Thank you, Sue, for that and just making sure we're all up to snuff there. So with this I'll go ahead and ask Sue if she can go ahead and provide us with an overview of the agenda. So I'll turn the floor back over to you, Sue. Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

For those folks who are listening I just want to mention that the Board's agenda and informational materials are all on the Federal Subsistence Board website at www.doi.gov/subsistence/board. With that, moving to the overview of the agenda.

Item 1, call to order and welcome. I believe we've gotten through that now. We're now on item 2, which is review and adopt the agenda. I'll just mention that this would be one of the times when any Board member wishes to remove an item from the consensus agenda could do so.

Moving on to the overview of the agenda
item 3, Federal Subsistence Board information sharing. That's an informational item.

Agenda item 4, Regional Advisory Council Chairs discuss topics of concern with the Board. This would be an opportunity for any Chairs who want to remove an item from the consensus agenda. This would be the opportunity to ask the Board to do that.

Moving to item 5 on the agenda is public comment period on non-agenda items. This public comments period will be available at the beginning of every day of the Board meeting this week.

Old business is agenda item 6. This was a placeholder on the agenda for any old business that the Board may wish to add as the Board is adopting the agenda.

Agenda item 7 is review and action on the 2022-2024 subparts C and D proposals and closure reviews. This is an action item and it will be divided into two sections. The consensus agenda and then the non-consensus agenda.

Following the review of the subpart C and D proposals and closure reviews we would move to agenda item 8, which is Wildlife Special Action WSA22-01 pertaining to Units 22 and 23 muskox. This is an action item.

Agenda item 9 is also an action item. It is deferred Fisheries Proposal FP21-10 Lower Copper River area salmon.

Agenda item 10 is a schedule of upcoming Board meetings.

Agenda item 11 is an overview of Federal Subsistence Management Program correspondence procedure.

Agenda item 12 is other business. Any other business the Board wishes to discuss.

Finally agenda item 13 adjournment.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that, Sue. Again, if there is any member of the Board who would like to move an item from the consensus agenda they can do so now. If we're all okay with the way the agenda looks, at this time I'd entertain a Board member to make a motion to adopt the agenda as presented.

MR. C. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

MR. C. BROWER: I move to approve the agenda as presented.

MS. CREACHBAUM: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

MS. CREACHBAUM: Excuse me. This is Sarah Creachbaum and I would like to request that four proposals be removed from the consensus agenda, please. That would be Wildlife Proposal 22-40, Wildlife Proposal 22-46, Wildlife Proposal 22-50 and Wildlife Proposal 22-56.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. So we have on the floor right now a motion to accept the agenda as presented and we have a motion to remove four items from the consensus agenda. So we're looking for a second to the first motion or we can make a -- rescind that motion, Charlie.

MR. C. BROWER: Well, we need a second to make sure that, you know, these are in order to be pulled out of the consensus agenda.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, that's what I'm saying. For order of business we have two different orders. Charlie made the first motion to accept the agenda as presented.

MR. C. BROWER: If you want me to rescind my motion, I will. I so do.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. For order here, Sue, do we need to do this by motion because we did offer to remove from consensus agenda and then we made it part of the motion here. So I think that's confusing the Board here as far as the process that we're going through. Sue, could I get clarification here.

MS. DETWILER: It sounded like Board Member Creachbaum -- I'm not sure if she made a motion or not. It probably would be easiest or most expeditious to just make a motion to that effect. Make a motion to amend the agenda.

MR. LORD: Mr. Chair, this is Ken.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead, Ken. Thank you.

MR. LORD: The Board meeting guidelines say that any Board member can remove an item from the consensus agenda. So I don't believe a motion or a vote is necessary.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, that was my point there too, Ken. Thank you for the clarification. So if we can just remove those from the consensus agenda per the request, then we can go back to the original motion of accepting it as amended.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA. Could we get those proposal numbers again requested to be pulled from the consensus agenda and the titles.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes. Can we have those restated for the record, please.


Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Okay. Appreciate that. Now the floor is open for a motion with the agenda with the changes that we just heard, pulling those four proposals from the agenda. Now the floor is open for a motion to accept the agenda.
as amended.

MR. C. BROWER: I so move, Mr. Chair.
Charlie Brower, Public Member.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Charlie. Motion on the floor. I need a second.

MR. SCHMID: This is the Forest Service. I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Dave. A motion has been made and seconded. Any discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the question.

MR. PELTOLA: Question. BIA.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Opposed same sign.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion carries unanimously to accept the agenda as presented by staff. Thank you very much. We'll go on to the Regional Advisory Council Chair and discussion, topics of concern with the Board.

MS. DETWILER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, I'm jumping over something here. I'm skipping too fast here. Federal Board information sharing. Sorry, guys. I'm so excited to get to business I forgot the fun part of our job is to get ourselves updated, share some information.

At this time I'll open up the floor for round robin of Board members to provide updates and...
info. So I, myself, would like to welcome everyone
here to the meeting and look forward to a productive
few days of going over all of the agenda items we have
here. A welcome back to the Federal Subsistence Board.

With that I'll go ahead and open up the
floor to any Board members who would like to provide
updates or info. You have the floor.

Thank you.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

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

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Good afternoon, everybody. Appreciate your
participation and presence here at the Federal
Subsistence Board meeting for April 12th to 15th.

A couple things I'd like to report on.
One is that the series of consultations over the
Federal Subsistence Program which were held by the
Department of Interior early on this winter, those are
currently being summarized. The Bureau of Indian
Affairs Subsistence Staff is diligently working in
conjunction with Indian Affairs Staff and DOI Staff to
get those summarized. They'll be forwarded on to the
Secretary here later on for her consideration.

Secondly, we have a lot of visitation
within Alaska and Alaska Region. Here coming up first
we have DAS-M, which is Deputy Assistant Secretary for
Management Jason Freihage from Indian Affairs is in
Alaska this week to visit -- doing his rounds visiting
with tribes and tribal organizations.

Next week, as most are aware, we have
the Secretary visit and then the following week we have
Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs Bryan Newland
visiting the state. We'll be starting in Southeast and
working our way to Southcentral westward and then
Northwest Alaska and then finish up in Interior.

That's all I wanted to pass on for now.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Gene. Welcome. Any other Board members have anything to share. The floor is open.

MS. BOARIO: Mr. Chair. This is Sara Boario with Fish and Wildlife Service. I just wanted to add on to Director Peltola's comments. Next week, as part of Secretary Newland's visit to Alaska, Fish and Wildlife Service Director Martha Williams will also be in the state and looking forward to welcoming them both.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other Board members would like to share. The floor is open.

MR. HEINLEIN: Mr. Chair, BLM.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hello, BLM.

You have the floor.

MR. HEINLEIN: Thank you. Thomas Heinlein, the Acting Alaska State Director for BLM. Just to add on to BIA, Fish and Wildlife Service, Park Service, we are also eagerly awaiting the Secretary visit next week. Our BLM Director Tracy Stone-Manning will also be in state for several days next week. End of report.

Thank you.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chair, Forest Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor, Dave.

MR. SCHMID: Thanks, Tony. Welcome. I wish we could all be together in person here, but hopefully this might be the last big meeting we do virtually here for a while if things continue to improve. But I'll keep up with my friends from Interior here.

We've also been hosting a number of folks. Our Under Secretaries in Department of Agriculture in both Natural Resources and Environment as well as Rural Development. They were here in Southeast Alaska a week before last to announce our SASS, which was the Southeast Alaska Sustainability Strategy.
It was some directed funding by the Secretary, $25 million, here to help build capacity and work with the communities here in Southeast Alaska. I would share that about half of that or more will be going to tribal and indigenous groups here in Southeast moving forward.

So I just wanted to share that. That was good news along with a lot of the other infrastructure funding and programs that will be implementing here in both Southcentral and Southeast Alaska through the Forest Service in the upcoming months.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Dave. I'm always excited when I hear money.

MS. CREACHBAUM: Mr. Chair, this is Sarah Creachbaum with the National Park Service.

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

MS. CREACHBAUM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good afternoon, everyone. It's a pleasure to be here. I have a couple of exciting new staffing updates to provide everyone.

First, Grant Hilderbrand has been promoted to the Associate Regional Director for Resources in the Alaska Region and Mark Dowdle, who is a 22-year veteran of the Park Service, has been selected as the new Superintendent of Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve and Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve.

We're excited that Ray McPadden, who was recently of Yellowstone National Park, has accepted the position of Superintendent of the Western Arctic National Parklands. Last, but certainly not least, Eva Patton will be assuming the position of Subsistence Program Manager for the NPS Alaska Region and we'll welcome Eva to our offices around the 8th of May.

Thank you.
Sarah. Any other Board members.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right. Hearing none. I appreciate all the Board updates and welcome the Federal Board and look forward to a productive couple of days of meetings. Now we'll go ahead and call on the OSM staffing updates. Sue, you have the floor with the Staff.

MS. DETWILER: Yes. I'm very happy to announce we have some additional Staff I'd like to introduce. Starting with the Counsel Coordination Division we have three Staff members who all three of them will come from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. They have a lot of experience.

We have Nissa Bates Pilcher. She worked for Fish and Game for many years as a regulatory program assistant for Board Support Section and doing seal research and fishery project management. She also is experienced at coordinating up to 30 State Advisory Committees at a time and facilitating up to 60 Advisory Committee meetings in one season. So Nissa will be the Council Coordinator for Western Interior Alaska and Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory Council.

We also have new in the Council Coordination Division Leigh Honig. She worked for the Division of Wildlife Conservation for 10 years as a hunt administrator supervising the Region 4 Information Center and assisting with the Board of Game process. Leigh will be the Council Coordinator for the Bristol Bay and Kodiak Aleutians Councils.

Finally, added to our Council Coordination is Brooke McDavid. She worked for the Division of Subsistence as a Subsistence Resource Specialist designing and executing subsistence research projects in partnership with rural communities primarily in Interior and Y-K Delta Regions. She will be the Council Coordinator for the Eastern Interior and Northwest Arctic Councils.

In the Anthropology Division we welcome Jason Roberts. He has a PhD in environmental anthropology and comes to OSM from the BIA in Montana where he was a forester. He has experience working
with rural communities throughout much of the U.S. and Pacific Islands. In OSM he'll be focusing on the Southcentral and Kodiak Aleutians Region.

Also coming back to the Anthropology Division is Liz Williams. Previously she worked for organizations throughout Alaska, including having worked with OSM for six years. Now that she's back she'll be focusing on the Eastern and Western Interior Regions.

Finally, in the Fisheries Division we welcome Kevin Foley. He comes from our Fish and Wildlife Service Ecological Services Office. He completed his detail with OSM this last fall helping out with the FRMP cycle and he'll be working on fisheries issues in the Kuskokwim River area.

Justin Koller, he comes to us from the Forest Service in Sitka. He's been a Zone Fish and Wildlife biologist working in conjunction with OSM for a number of years on both fisheries and wildlife. He will be working on fisheries issues in Southcentral Alaska and Kodiak and Aleutian Islands areas.

So we're very happy to have new staff.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue. I appreciate that we have all those new people on board to help us take care of our job here. So welcome aboard all the Staff and look forward to working with you guys.

With that we'll go ahead and move on to 4, Regional Advisory Council Chairs discuss topics of concern with the Board. We'll go ahead and provide an opportunity at this time for each Council Chair. We'll go ahead and call upon each one in order. So we'll start with Southeast. That's just how it's listed here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. Good afternoon. This is Don Hernandez. I'm the Chair of the Southeast Regional Advisory Council. I'm speaking to you from my home in Point Baker, which is on the Prince of Wales Island. Chairman Christianson is a neighbor to the north on Prince of Wales Island.
Let's see. Over the past year our Council has been quite busy. We have 11 wildlife proposals that you will be deliberating on at this meeting. They cover elk, moose, deer, goat and wolves.

Our Council also submitted five proposals to the Alaska Board of Fish. One of them was not heard. It was a halibut proposal. They declined to take it up, but we have four proposals to the Board of Fish. Our Council spent quite a bit of time in the last several meetings discussing items before the Board of Fish. We submitted written comments on 19 of those proposals for Southeast and Yakutat finfish and shellfish.

Our Vice Chair Cathy Needham attended the Board of Fish meeting in Anchorage and she provided comments on our proposals and also participated in the committee of the whole process where she was able to engage with members of various user groups to talk about management of various fisheries in Southeast Alaska.

During the last year our Council also started a working group composed of various members of the Council. We are meeting as a group to discuss indigenous co-management. We had participation from other various groups in Southeast Alaska. We had the Tlingit and Haida Central Council participate as well as other tribal groups participating as well as other environmental groups.

Also the Women's Earth and Climate Action Network participated in that. The goal is to discuss indigenous management and co-management of resources in our region. That effort will continue. We hope to be able to have a policy statement regarding indigenous co-management written up at our next fall meeting to present to the Board for your consideration and information.

Other items. The Southeast RAC will be ready with it's annual report. We have raised concerns about transboundary river mining and potential impacts to subsistence resources. We've expressed a need for a clear information sharing policy between agencies concerning how do Federal agencies as well as State and other entities share information with each other. We feel it's important that Council members receive
information germain to our decisions in a timely fashion.

Council would also like to know specific guidelines, policies and opportunities for public testimony and public comments. We've also heard concerns about a developing industry here in Southeast Alaska. The mariculture industry involving the permitting of kelp farming various bays and how some of these kelp farms could impact subsistence activities in affected areas.

We've also asked that analysis content for proposals should incorporate local observations and cumulative exceptions for the Council to be fully informed before they make recommendations on proposals.

Our Council has continued to support the 2001 Alaska Roadless Rule and the Council submitted a comment letter regarding the repeal of the 2020 Alaska Roadless Rule during the recent open public comment period.

The Council would also like the Board to know that it's received testimony in the last year about some of these topics. Federally qualified users are not getting their subsistence needs met. I would say the biggest concerns deal mostly with deer and sockeye harvesting.

Also concerned about significant impacts to subsistence fisheries resources because of State regulations. One group here in Southeast Alaska has filed for extraterritorial jurisdiction in the Sitka Sound area and other areas around Southeast they're talking about options such as protect and secure their food sources.

As I mentioned before, we're discussing the advantages of indigenous co-management in Southeast Alaska. We also want to mention that on the topic of deer I, as the Council Chair, have been working with a group of local users for Unit 2, which is Prince of Wales Island where I and Chairman Christianson live. There's a lot of concerns about deer harvesting on Prince of Wales, Unit 2.

There has been kind of a joint user group put together and our objective is to hold a deer
summit, we're referring to it, sometime next fall to
kind of discuss all the issues related to deer
harvesting on Prince of Wales. Just get a lot of
diverse people together and talk about the situation
and share information and see if any kind of a
consensus can be drawn as to what's needed to increase
the deer harvest on Prince of Wales Island, Unit 2.

I'd also like to note that the Council
has been generally pretty frustrated and has taken note
of how difficult and challenging it's been to have our
Council meetings, especially the regulatory meetings,
happening virtually.

Dave Schmid mentioned we hope we'll be
able to return to in-person meetings starting our fall
cycle. I think the work of the Council has been
somewhat impaired in this process. I just really don't
feel that we're really operating in a really efficient
manner. It's been very difficult.

Finally on my report I'd like to note
that the Council made a recommendation on Wildlife
Proposal 22-06, which was a proposal to establish a
quota and place restriction on moose harvest limit in
Unit 3. We revisited that proposal at our winter
meeting and based on discussion and testimony at that
meeting the Council revised its recommendation to the
Board and changed its position to oppose the proposal.
We initially supported it and now we're opposing it.

This was based part on clarifying
testimony from the president of the Organized Village
of Kake. We voiced opposition to Wildlife Proposal
22-06 and the Council expressed concern over the
unintended consequences of creating potentially more
competition for Kake residents rather than what we had
intended was providing them with more opportunity.

So the Council has recognized also
there are potential conservation concerns with this
hunt and we did not want harvest to exceed
sustainability. So in our discussion the Council
discussed other ways to provide more meaningful
opportunity for Kake residents, but we didn't come up
with anything that was within the scope of this
proposal.

Because of that we are requesting that
Wildlife Proposal 22-06 be removed from the
non-consensus agenda and to now place it on the
consensus agenda seeing as how our revised
recommendation is in line with all the other
recommendations on this proposal.

That concludes my report.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Don.

Appreciate that report. Just for my process here, Sue,
before I do open the floor for questions for Don from
the Board, the last question there, the Council RAC
Chairs do have the ability to move from the consensus
to the non-consensus. So has this one been moved
already, Sue?

MS. DETWILER: We haven't moved it and
I, again, would defer to Ken on this, but I believe
it's the Board that actually has to make the motion to
move an agenda item.

MR. LORD: Okay, that is correct, Mr.
Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes. I'm just
making sure for an order of process here. So we do
have a request here by the RAC of Southeast to move
this from the non-consensus to the consensus agenda.
So at this time before moving forward I would ask if
the Board can entertain that motion at this time.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chair, Forest Service.

MR. C. BROWER: I so move, Mr. Chair.

Public Member Brower.

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

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. Were you
making a motion? I heard Dave as well.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chair. This is Dave.
I think we may have lost Charlie there. We were on top
of each other. I apologize.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We were opening
the floor for a motion to entertain Don's request to
move this 22-06 to the consensus agenda.

MR. SCHMID: Yes, Mr. Chair. This is
Dave Schmid of the Forest Service. I would move to
move WP22-06 to the consensus agenda in light of
Chairman Hernandez's recommendation there that the
Council had changed their position.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We have a
motion on the floor and we did lose Charlie. I think
Charlie was going to make the motion.

MR. C. BROWER: I'm back now.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, Charlie.
Were you making a motion there? Did you want to second
that one, Charlie?

MR. C. BROWER: I'll second it. Thank
you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, thank you
for that. So we have a second. Any discussion on the
floor about 22-06.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. Hearing
none we'll go ahead and call for the question.

MR. PELTOLA: Question. BIA.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Gene. We'll move on now. The question has been
called. All in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Opposed same
sign.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion carries
unanimous. Thank you for that, Don. Any questions for
the Board? That motion carried unanimously to move
that on the agenda. I now open up the floor for any
(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right. Thank you. We'll move on now to Southcentral RAC Chair.

MS. STICKWAN: Good afternoon. This is Gloria Stickwan, Vice Chair for Southcentral Region Advisory Council, filling in for Greg Encelewski.

Over the past year this Council made recommendations on 35 proposals with all the subparts.

(MS. STICKWAN: The Council found the combination proposals together was quite challenging to consider all at once, especially if the proposals dealt with different units or different species but were presented for Council action in a combined manner.

Southcentral supported the request by Catherine Martin for an individual C&T determination for salmon in the Batzulnetas area. The Council put together a Prince William Sound fish workgroup to explore options for the Federal Subsistence Board.....

(REPORTER: Excuse me. Excuse me. Can everybody take a minute and mute your phone. Somebody is talking over Gloria.

(REPORTER: Hello. Everybody take a moment and mute your line. Somebody is having another conversation over Gloria right now. Gloria, go ahead.

MS. STICKWAN: The Council put together a Prince William Sound fish workgroup to explore options for opportunities for the Federal subsistence users to harvest in the Prince William Sound. We wrote...
a letter to the Board of Fisheries containing comments on 11 state proposals. Among the items that Southcentral will be raising to the Board in its annual report are concerns about the procedures and processes of making C&T determinations.

The Councils would like to see information and substantial evidence in an analysis to make well supported recommendations. Since it is anticipated as a significant amount of C&T proposals will come in the future, it is important that the process of addressing C&T determinations be reviewed.

Various areas in the regions reported low numbers of sockeye and chinook salmon and there were concerns about the minimum escapement goals that would not be met. The Council would like to know if the subsistence use amounts as used by the state would be a viable and productive way to move towards stronger Federal management.

Subsistence users are experiencing conflicts with other users for fish and shellfish in the Prince William Sound. Under State regulations the allowable catch of these resources is limited and because of competing commercial and sport interests subsistence users are not able to meet their subsistence harvest needs. Council would like to see dual jurisdiction for these resources if possible to provide a meaningful opportunity for subsistence users of these resources.

Research into the impacts of climate change and the specific effects it has on fish and wildlife is crucial. The funding of the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Project is vital and should continue to provide for monitoring of fish stocks.

Finally, the Council feels very strongly about a few issues I would like to close with. FP21-10. The deferred process for FP21-10 was very confusing. The Council had been asked to consider this proposal again with several new Council members in hopes that they may change their support of this proposal.

The Board should realize that this was a big personal commitment from every Council member to prepare and attend an additional meeting. Asking the
Southcentral and Eastern Councils to come up with a compromise or consensus made many Council members feel pressured to have to agree.

This Council would request that the Board consider the impact and undue burden that a deferred proposal back to the Council creates for each and every Council member and that in future the Board performs its duty as the decision-making body of this program instead of referring proposals back to the Regional Advisory Council for further action or consideration.

Virtual meetings. The Council along with other Councils has conducted its meeting virtually for the last couple years. Between technical challenges, like the dropped phone lines and the distraction of background noises and the inability to hear clearly, the Councils feel that they are at a huge disadvantage in trying to conduct its business. Especially since almost half of the Council is new and we have started using virtual meetings because of Covid-19. It is far more important than ever to start holding meetings in person as soon as possible.

That concludes my report.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Gloria. Any questions from the Board for Gloria.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Was there a request in there for anything to be moved on the agenda? I was trying to keep track and make sure I get a hold of everything, Sue.

MS. DETWILER: No, I didn't hear anything on that.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. Thank you. I'm just making sure. Thank you, Gloria. No questions from the Board for Gloria. We'll move on to Kodiak/Aleutians.

MS. TRUMBLE: Can you hear me?
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes. You have the floor.

MS. TRUMBLE: Oh, okay. Thank you. This is Della Trumble. The Kodiak/Aleutians met in the fall and made recommendations on six of the proposals at the fall meeting. Issues identified the last year of the Council's annual report included the need for increased staffing at both the Kodiak and Izembek and hopefully a lot of those positions will get filled. We know there's been problems with getting them filled.

Concern over the Council vacancies. We've individually as Council members had to make calls out to people within the region that we thought had either been involved before or we thought might be interested. I'm not sure if they got any applications in, but we're hoping to be a little bit more proactive to get some of these seats filled.

The Covid-19 affecting food security disruption supply chain is still a concern. The Council is appreciative of the support for the crayfish invasive species research. This has been a big problem for Kodiak, the Buskin. We'd like to see Federal funds for FRMP extradition project at some point in time.

We really appreciate the support on the Unimak caribou and sea otter issues. We all know that caribou coming back on Unimak and that in itself is a blessing that we're able to start look at harvesting.

Around the region observations shared is the Kodiak Buskin salmon run this past summer. Low chinook and chum salmon returns. Fish in Buskin Lake are a concern and they continue to be a concern. The road system open for spring harvest of birds. One bison was actually harvested in the fall for the first time in Old Harbor and it's quite the impressive program they've got put together in Old Harbor with the bison.

The deer population was expressed it still needs to recover and there were concerns over charters and too many sport hunters hunting deer. The Emperor geese and other shorebirds appear -- populations appear to be higher. King crab populations are declining due to warm weather temperatures. The for otter has closed, which is causing a bottleneck for
locals harvesting sea otter hides.

Adak did have a good salmon return in
Lake Andy and the fish plant is currently closed, which
is affecting the local economy. And locals are
concerned over the caribou population not being able to
harvest off road as they had in previous years.
However, much appreciation was expressed in getting the
group together to be able to come up with some
management protocol for the caribou on Adak.

Unalaska, the sea otter population is
increasing and is affecting the king crab populations
negatively. They did have a good halibut season.

King Cove, Cold Bay, user conflicts
between subsistence and sports users. We're working
around those. I know with me, with the King Cove
Corporation, we work with various guides and hunters to
try to work with everybody in this arena.

Other than that I think there was just
some comments on the proposals, but for the most part I
think everything looks real good.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We appreciate
that presentation. We'll move on -- no questions for
Kodiak/Aleutian. We'll move on to Bristol Bay.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
This is Nanci Lyon, the Chair of Bristol Bay RAC. This
was last year for our wildlife cycle for this Council
and we made recommendations for eight proposals at our
fall meeting.

We really appreciate you pulling our
one proposal that we had agreed with, 2-40, and I look
forward to informing the rest of the Board on why we're
requesting that be pulled. We put a lot of time and
energy into this proposal and it has since been taken
up by the Board of Game and passed by the Board of Game
in a different form than what it had been presented in.
So I appreciate you guys hearing us and making sure that -- we want to make sure we get it right before we ask for passage of it.

We also made recommendations for maintaining status quo on two of our wildlife closures just because we're not seeing the increases we hoped to see. We identified some important issues over the past year and they include things such as staffing for ourselves as well.

We're struggling out here with Federal agencies not having enough staff to even do reports for us to work with so that we have knowledge in what science is telling us that they're seeing available for our game and it makes it hard for us to make decisions.

We're also having trouble filling up our board seats as well and just my board members and myself have pledged to approach at least three people in our communities to see if we can gain more interest in filling our board member seats. We're hopeful that that will bring us some more representation on our board from across our region.

We are concerned about chinook salmon declines that we're seeing on both sides of the bay out here. Both the Dillingham side and the Bristol Bay side have struggled with lower numbers. Even as concerning to most of us are also the size composition of our runs. We're seeing much smaller fish returning and not a lot of our really big fish that we've enjoyed for so many years in our smokehouses.

Those are things that we're hoping -- that we'd like the Board to advocate on on behalf of the Bristol Bay subsistence communities for more research and long-term solutions at higher management levels so hopefully we can get some changes.

One of our primary areas of concern is the Chignik area, who has been struggling for longer than the rest of us and we just really feel for our neighbors down south and hope that we can get some research done down there and some solid answers defined so that we can get food back in their freezer for them in the winter to -- we know they've been missing it.

We're also concerned about quickly
growing bear populations in our area. We've had -- you know, there's always good news and bad news. For us our sockeye populations are booming and expanding more rapidly than anybody ever imagined. With that is a growing bear population, which increases the predation badly on our moose and caribou herds. It's going to take a toll in the long run and we'd just ask that the Board is aware of that. There may be need for regulatory changes because of it in the very near future.

We still are concerned with wanting to know more about the shorebird die-off we're seeing around Lake Iliamna and other areas of Bristol Bay. We know research is being done and we hope to have some information on that in the future that I can share with the Council at hopefully maybe even our fall meeting or perhaps our next spring meeting.

We've also wanted to follow up with our frustration in the past and I'm sure in the future with the Board's procedure when regulations are in conflict with ANILCA. We really feel very strongly about this problem and would like to see a resolution and know moving forward that ANILCA is being followed in the way it was meant to be followed.

And just other real brief comments about the region from shared views of our board members. Other than the low chinook populations that we struggled with this year, the good news was that we had been struggling with low ptarmigan populations and they seem to be rebounding now in the Iliamna, Naknek and Dillingham areas. Down south still seems to be a little bit sparse, but at least they seem to be popping back a little bit better than what we've had.

The other thing too -- and I heard some of these issues from Southeast in the Iliamna area they're struggling with some trespass issues on private lands and tribal allotments. It's become more of an issue. People get boats and the means to -- and planes and the means to get to these places and it creates land use issues.

We experienced a super cold winter this year. I'm anxious to see what that will bring for us in our future. Overall we appreciate the opportunity to report to the Board and I'd be happy to answer any
questions anybody has.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

Appreciate that presentation. Any questions of Bristol Bay.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right.

Thank you for that presentation. We'll call on Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta.

MS. PATTON: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair and Members of the Board. This is Eva Patton, Council Coordinator for the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Subsistence Regional Advisory Council.

Unfortunately our Y-K Delta RAC Chair Raymond Oney of Alakanuk is not able to call in this afternoon. All the phone lines, land lines, cell phone and internet are currently down in Alakanuk at this time. Hoping he might be able to join us later this afternoon.

I did want to submit a request from the Y-K Delta RAC to remove these proposals. Wildlife Proposal 22-41 from the consensus agenda to the non-consensus agenda. The Council would like to have further discussion on conservation strategy for the Mulchatna Caribou Herd. That was a request again to remove WP2-41 from the consensus agenda to the non-consensus agenda.

The Council has in their annual report many of the topics the Chair had wished to address to the Board and also several letters come into the Federal Subsistence Board too addressing the Council's concerns regarding catastrophic low chinook and chum salmon returns. If the Chair doesn't have an opportunity to join this afternoon, those letters and reports will be coming to the Board soon.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Eva.

At this time I would ask if the Board members can make that motion to remove that as the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Regional Advisory Council has recommended. The floor is open.
MS. PITKA: This is Rhonda Pitka.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor, Rhonda.

MS. PITKA: I move that WP22-41 be moved from the consensus to the non-consensus agenda. Thank you.

MR. SCHMID: Forest Service will second.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Dave. The motion has been made and seconded. Any further discussion.

MR. LORD: Mr. Chair. Again, this is Ken. Again, there's no vote needed on this. Any Board member can remove an item from the consensus agenda.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, okay. We just need to go through -- the Board needs to say yes. We'll pull that. Okay. Thanks, Ken. So after this we'll just move forward with the rest of the Regional Advisory Councils and just have the Board put that in the consensus with the Regional Advisory Council recommendations.

Is there any opposition to this motion as presented.

(No opposition)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none. The motion carries unanimous to pull that and move it. For order of business we'll follow Ken's process of this as long as the Regional Advisory Council Chair recommends that we'll get the Board to concur with that and move forward. Thank you all. We'll move on to Western Interior.

MR. REAKOFF: This is Jack Reakoff, Western Interior Council Chair. I'm in my home in Wiseman in the Central Brooks Range. The Western Interior Regional Council had 13 Federal wildlife proposals that we made recommendations on. We had nine State proposals that we made recommendations to the State Board of Game.
The Council drafted a letter to the
North Pacific Fisheries Management Council on hatchery production concerns. We've had phenomenally bad chum salmon and chinook salmon returns into the Kuskokwim and Yukon River Drainages and our Council is really concerned about static release of hatchery fish. The last chum salmon releases in Alaska, Washington and Oregon and other Pacific Rim, so we'd like the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council to address that. We'd also like to send one of our members to the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council meeting in June.

We reviewed and approved a joint Council letter to go to the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council with the other affected Councils, Eastern Interior, Y-K Delta and Seward Pen, as the need for reduce salmon bycatch in the trawl fishery. There's no cap on the chum salmon and the bycatch cap for chinook is too high.

Issues identified over the past year for this Council's annual report included the need for more effort to rebuild the Yukon-Kuskokwim chum and chinook stocks. Concerns about bycatch of chum salmon in the Area M District. There was a very high harvest of chum salmon. The suppressed stocks of Yukon and Kuskokwim should be taken into consideration by the State and Federal managers.

Concerns about other impacts to other species being increasingly harvested for subsistence instead of salmon includes sheefish, whitefish and moose. People in our region are having to shift to other resources and we also have concerns about some of these other like moose populations.

We would like tribal representation on the FRMP process, Technical Review Committee, State violations of ANILCA, late during the Federal closure on the Kuskokwim River and June 28th of 2021 when the State opened fishing on the Kuskokwim River against the will of the Kuskokwim River Salmon Management Working Group and the Kuskokwim InterTribal Fish Commission and the Federal closure. The Council feels that the in-season manager, if it makes a closure, that should be applied to the State closures also.

Concern about the BLM issuing guides use permits for Dall sheep in the Central Brooks Range
despite the extremely low Dall sheep population and the subsistence priority. There's no survey data until the summer of 2021. As this Council has been saying for many years, the deep snows and so forth have decimated these sheep populations. The allocations of commercial guides needs to be vastly reduced by the BLM.

So the Board is requesting us to speak directly to the agency of the land managers and we're making those recommendations to the land managers, BLM.

The Western Interior Council members shared some observations. They're concerned about food security and there was an overwhelming concern of many members, including myself, with the collapse of the salmon run on the Yukon-Kuskokwim Drainages.

Our communities have had to move towards taking more whitefish, including sheefish. We have expressed concerns about the long-term effects on blackfish population should this continue. So we need to be paying close attention to those freshwater stocks with any kind of additional commercial or sport harvest.

Tied to this concern many Council members, many Council members refer to how many brown bears were moving around and more prevalent on the landscape because they're seeking an alternate food source. Like our subsistence people, the brown bears aren't able to get the food they need from salmon, so they're taking more moose and other animals, including black bears. We had several people in our region talking about how the black bear population is being stressed by the brown bear population.

Another concern is the climate change and heavy snowfalls that have occurred in the last 10 years. It's highly affecting these ungulate populations. 2012-13 there was rain on snow in the Central Brooks Range with a very late spring. 2018-19 we had 146 inches of snow where I live here with rain on snow in October. I've never seen it rain an inch of snow into the snow pack in October after a freeze-up.

Then in March of 2019 we have again really deep snow pack and then we had rain on snow in March. Break-up doesn't come here until early May to mid-May timeframe. So these animals were in deep snow,
crusted snow so hard that sheep could not chip through
all that ice. 2019 again early snowpack in
mid-September, rain on snow in October. These are
unprecedented things. These are not heard of in our
120 year oral history where I live here.

Then we have rain on snow in April
again about a month before the break-up. These are
decimating impacts these weather events are having on
the moose, Dall sheep and caribou populations. The
Central Arctic Caribou population in 2012-13 when they
finally surveyed they found a 66 percent decline in the
Central Arctic Caribou Herd because of those late
springs and rain on snow events.

There's also increasing wolf predation
upon these ungulate species, moose, Dall sheep,
caribou, because when there's deep snow wolves are on
top. They eat better, their fecundity goes way up and
they take more resource. So we also have a high wolf
population coinciding with these declines.

Recent Council action. The Council was
advised at its last meeting that there were two Special
Action Requests pending. One was the Wildlife Special
Action Request 21-01. The Council heard information on
this deferred Special Action. They chose to defer that
to the home Council, as you knew when you met on that
proposal.

Fisheries Special Action Request 22-01,
02, 03, 04 Council provided a formal recommendation
supporting these identical requests with a request to
extend the species affected from chinook and summer
chum to the fall chum and fall chum to include coho as
well.

The Council also received an update on
Wildlife Special Action 21-03 at our fall meeting. The
Council chose to submit a Special Action Request on
Dall sheep in Units 24A and 26B west of the
Sagavanirktok to be closed to all users for the '22 to
2024 wildlife regulatory cycles due to the population
and harvest concerns.

The sheep population cannot support any
harvest, subsistence or non-subsistence harvest because
there's no recruitments into the population. When I
look at the sheep population, there's no quarter,
there's no half, there's no three-quarter curl rams.
There's only very, very few of those cohorts and
there's only six and seven year old rams, which are
going to be eminent of being full curl and will be
killed in the next two years.

This Council feels strongly that
there's a need for full closure. You'll be reviewing
that Special Action Request after the public comments,
hearings and so forth, but that's what this Council
feels strongly needs to happen especially here in the
Central Brooks Range with road access and non-guide use
areas on BLM lands, restrictive guide use areas and no
restrictions on the amount of harvest.

When they surveyed sheep in the summer
of (audio dropout) all adult rams, all full curl rams
that were seen were taken in the harvest or wounded in
the harvest. So the bottom line is we're very
concerned about (audio dropout). We're super concerned
about the salmon resources in Yukon. We're super
concerned about the Dall sheep.

Our moose population is also down.
When they surveyed Kanuti there were two yearling bulls
per 100 cows. That means there was only four yearling
moose per 100 cow moose that are recruited. So we're
looking at a declining moose population also with
additional predation.

Thank you, Mr. Chair and the Federal
Subsistence Board.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Jack. Appreciate that. Any questions for Jack from
the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right.
Hearing none. Thank you, Jack, for that observation
and appreciate you calling in today. Sue, I moved away
from my agenda. Can you call the next region up,
please.

MS. DETWILER: Yes. That would be
Seward Peninsula.

MS. BATES PILCHER: Mr. Chairman.
Louis Green, Seward Peninsula Council Chair sends his apology. He will not be able to join the meeting today due to a family medical emergency. This is Nissa Pilcher, Council Coordinator for the Seward Pen RAC. I will let you know if he will be able to join in tomorrow or any time later this week. Also Tom Gray, Seward Peninsula Vice Chair is also not currently available to join. In their absence I will be the Council representative during the meeting until one can participate.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Appreciate that. Next, Sue.

MS. DETWILER: Northwest Arctic.

MR. BAKER: Thank you, Sue, Mr. Chair and the Board. This is Thomas Baker, Chair of the Northwest Arctic RAC. Just for myself, thank you for the opportunity to address the Board today. I may not be able to call in the rest of this week or even after this report. Thank you again for the opportunity.

Northwest Arctic Regional Advisory Council appreciates this opportunity. Again, one of the big things that we've had going on in the last couple years with our RAC is the lack of success in harvesting caribou in Unit 23 by Federally qualified subsistence users due to changes in caribou migration patterns and the associated effects of guides and transporters and climate change on the Western Arctic Caribou Herd.

With the recent action and approval of the Modified WSA21-01A and B, I'd like to extend the utmost gratitude from the RAC and the people of Unit 23 that have been affected by this issue for a number of years. People are ecstatic and already are expecting -- having a better expectation of the hunting season to come this year and next year. Thank you again to the Board for the action taken on that deferred Wildlife Special Action Request.

Also a need for arctic grayling and salmon research in Unit 23. Arctic grayling is a very important subsistence fish resource; however, it's been many years since any studies were conducted on grayling in the Northwest Arctic Region. The Council requests that this be pursued as a research priority for funding.
under the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program.

Similarly, salmon is an extremely important subsistence fish resource and the Council would like to receive updated reports on status of salmon populations in the region. Ongoing subsistence salmon monitoring programs are important.

There’s a request for updated reports on population change in moose and beaver. The Council is very concerned about the decline in the moose population. As we all know, moose is a critical subsistence resource for communities especially in times that caribou are scarce. The Council requests ongoing monitoring and population surveys for moose in Unit 23 and regular reports of Council meetings.

Conversely, the beaver populations are rapidly increasing and expanding. We've discussed this several times over our last few meetings and hoping to get more reports and more understanding of the extent of this beaver expansion, discuss interaction with other subsistence resources and ensure that the subsistence opportunity for the hunting and trapping of beaver be expanded as the population grows.

There’s a request for RAC representatives to attend other organizations' meetings, such as the Ambler Mine Access Road, some Subsistence Advisory Council meetings, the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group meetings. We've also had some requests for engagement with elder support and subsistence programs conducted here in Game Unit 23 between such as the Maniilaq Association and the tribes that we have in all of our villages.

The Council hears Regional reports of people having difficulty getting food and store shelves are empty. Support getting healthy subsistence foods is more important now than ever. The Maniilaq Association has an elder food program wherein hunters can go out and say I'm going to be providing food for these individuals off this list and can get subsidized food stuff, ammunition, oil, gas for subsistence activities.

This is one of the things that our Council has really appreciated and wanted to bring to the attention of other regions and organizations that
if there's any way to help subsidize and support
communal subsistence activities, it would be greatly
appreciated.

I'll echo I'm sure everyone else that
will be on this call that the Northwest Arctic RAC has
had its share of frustrations, members not being able
to call in, being able to call in but not being able to
unmute themselves and everything with the current
status of the pandemic and having to have everything
over distance. Hopefully we can all begin to have our
meetings in person again.

If there are any questions for myself
and the Northwest Arctic RAC, I would be happy to
answer them now, but that is what I have.

Thank you, Mr. Chair and the Board.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

Appreciate the report today. Any questions from the
Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right.

Thank you. Sue, call on next.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

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

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. If
I could, I was wondering if I could go back to Western
Interior and Jack for a moment. I debated asking the
question, so I apologize for my tardiness in the
question forum. One of the comments he made was about
Dall sheep. I've heard that from a couple other people
over the Brooks Range, in specific the Central Brooks.

So, Jack, with regard to the Central
Brooks, are any of those areas covered by a Federal
concessionaire special use permits? And, two, if they
are, have you or anybody else reached out to the
managing -- land manage agencies to potentially discuss
reduction and authorization under those permits?
Because if we could handle things at a local level, it
may preclude future things coming to the Board's
attention.

Thank you. I appreciate your patience, Mr. Chair.

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chair. Was that a question for me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, that was for you, Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: Yes, the Western Interior Regional Advisory Council wrote to the Regional Director regarding the high allocation to the guides that are on BLM land. They basically have relatively high allocation. Some guides have allocations that entail the entire population of adult males.

There are literally hundreds of hunters that travel the Dalton Highway. There are lots of people that hunt off the road. The harvest reporting does not capture how many people actually hunt there because they may shoot at an animal and not get it, may wound it, but it's not recorded in the harvest reporting system. They may hunt this area, may go to a different area and take a sheep in another unit.

So there are literally hundreds of hunters hunting here and among all the hunting guides, so there's a lot of guides on the non-Federal Wildlife Refuges and the Park Preserve. There are Park Preserve and Wildlife Refuge guide use areas. Those have limited one guide. They have allocations of how many sheep they can take. There's basically unlimited amounts of guides can put in for some of these areas and then there's lots of additional hunting pressure at the top of that.

The problem is that the populations of sheep are so low the State is making the assumption that they have recruitment. They do not have composition data. They do not have the slightest idea how close to the edge of the cliff we are on decimating the rest of the adult rams.

So this proposal, the Special Wildlife Action proposal regarding Dall sheep closure for the next two years is in response. It's a conservation proposal. There's all kinds of data that shows that if
you wipe out all the adult rams and shift the breeding
to small young rams, you will have reproductive
failure. So that's the reason the Council took those
actions before you.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Mr. Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Jack. I
appreciate your elaboration.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Jack, for that. Okay, Sue, moving on to the next one.

MS. DETWILER: Next up is Eastern
Interior.

MS. ENSTMINGER: Yes, this is Sue
Entsminger. Do you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the
floor, Sue. Thank you.

MS. ENSTMINGER: Thank you. I'm the
Chair of the Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council
and I'm in my home too at Mentasta Pass. We got a -6
this morning and it's already up to +40, so looking
outdoors it's hard to want to be inside.

We still have a lot of snow to melt and
it's still very cold. In the nights it's been below
zero six nights out of the last 11. I wanted to say
the Eastern Interior encompasses 12, 20 and 25.
There's a river system, which is more remote in the
area, and then the road system. Each has its
differences.

Regarding the Yukon River, there was no
fishing on the Yukon River for king salmon or chum
salmon last summer. This created an enormous hardship
for the people living on the Yukon trying to feed their
families and their dog teams. Lack of salmon puts most
pressure on moose, caribou and other fish as people
still try to meet their subsistence needs.

Council members are very concerned
about the bycatch in the Bering Sea and Area M
fisheries and how they may be impacting the Yukon River
salmon. Members feel that the genetic sampling of both chinook and chum salmon bycatch to identify which salmon stocks are being caught and our RAC was also one of the signers on the bycatch letter that went to the National Marine Fisheries Commission or Council.

We have had concerns over hunter safety and hunter ethics. It's an ongoing project and it just seems it's a slow, slow process. We were told about a survey that was done by Amanda Pope up on the northern portions of the caribou and moose areas off the Taylor I believe it was and Central. The very nice report that she had given to the Council on how hunters responded to that.

We have a lot of concerns across the Council of the heavy snowfall for the Interior, although we were reported that the Porcupine was lower snowfall and then the eastern part over by Chisana was a little bit lower snowfall than the rest of the area. That it may negatively affect our moose survival. I've had moose walking through my yard bellied out.

At any rate the Council feels that there needs to be more moose surveys completed in areas of low moose abundance in the middle Upper Yukon River Drainage, including the Noatak drainage, where moose numbers have been declining for years.

There are lower sheep numbers in this Eastern Alaska Range. Council members brought up that House Bill 4716 is now in Congress. It was to stop trapping on Refuge lands. We put in our views to that. This is very offensive to our way of life. It was brought aware to us by Bruce Ervin about the land disposal by the State of Alaska on the Taylor Highway and we made our comments to that against it because it's an area where it's heavily used by subsistence people in the region.

I wanted to go into this in-person meeting, the problems of it. As I listen to this meeting and how hard it is for people to get online, after two years it's even more exasperating of a problem. I don't see how we're doing a fair job and making decisions. We've had problems caused by the teleconference meeting and people getting knocked off. It's just been annoying.
One of the Council members said he'd never attend another meeting by teleconference. Bill Glanz and I talked. That was Bill. He was vice-chair at the time and I said, Bill, I'll drive to Fairbanks if you drive to Central and we were told they can't stop us from meeting, so we did meet. We went to Fairbanks on our own dime and actually TCC had meetings going on at the same time. We had six of us there. We arranged to meet on our own in the North Thompson Center and it was nice to meet some of the RAC members I'd never met before.

It's just really sad that we can't be meeting in person. Hopefully we can have a change in that. We were able to meet in a Federal building, so it didn't cost us any money to go there and meet. Staff allowed it, but they didn't want anyone in there, public comments, so it was a little bit awkward, but we did get through it.

When our meeting had started one of the first things that came up was OSM had the authority to adjourn our meeting if things get out of hand. This was alarming to the members. You know, I've been on this Council 21 years. I've never seen anything like that, that it could happen. The Council members were very concerned about that. What did it mean. Would they really adjourn one of our meetings.

I'm sure there never was a time, but it was sad that it had to be brought up, like saying that something is going wrong with our meeting. So it's a deep concern that we would be going through a meeting and all of a sudden Staff would adjourn one of our meetings.

I wanted to bring up also that I have a concern on the lengthy introduction of government people at our teleconference meetings or even our regular meetings, in-person meetings. We had a joint meeting with Southcentral. I think it took almost an hour.

I feel like there ought to be a system there that government people should come together before the meeting starts. All sign in someway, somehow, and then we just get a report of how many people are online because it just takes so long to do that. We're volunteers and I believe that our time is
precious and having more time for the work that we have
to do as Council members is very important.

There's a hunt -- we've been working on
a hunter education safety and ethics thing for, jeez, I
think six years now. It just is a slow process. It
gets a little frustrating that things can't happen a
little faster. Us as a Council we're only as good as
our coordinators.

The Eastern Interior has gone through
quite a few coordinators here in the last couple years.
I'm real excited to have the new gal Brooke online
because I feel that she's in it for the long term and I
think that's what's important for us as the RAC
members.

I'm looking at my points here. You'll
have to forgive me. And I do want to mention that
there was a late mailing of our books for our winter
meeting 2021. We didn't get them until the deadline
was over for public comment. Also there was -- people
around our area were saying that when they do the
tribal consultation that's during a busy hunting and
fishing season. There's no chance to comment when that
happens.

And I want to talk about my frustration
over that Fisheries Proposal 21-10 asking it to come
back to the joint RACs for a compromise. I feel like
there was a better way to go about doing that. I think
it would have been nice to -- well, we were told that
there would be no public comment. So everything that
was presented to us in our individual RAC meetings came
to us for a compromise to a joint meeting. It seems to
me that that could have been better handled in that
more work was done, more information and new
information and new public comments because it's really
hard to throw something back to you that you already
had taken up without new information.

I agree with everything Gloria said
about that and I'm sure our RAC members the same, would
totally agree with everything because we really didn't
accomplish much at the meeting I don't think other than
I think the board may have learned a lot more about the
process and how the members feel.

I did want to bring up a problem that
occurred probably six months ago or longer. The Alaska Gateway School District asked for an educational permit for something they had done for five years with kids working on building a fishwheel and then they wanted to get an educational permit. The year before they just had one of the people put in for a permit to go and get the fish on the fishwheels in Slana off the Copper.

It seemed like -- I don't know. It just seemed like something went awry there because it was a good program and it was just an individual's name and then they asked for it as an educational and cultural permit. I was told about it three days before the meeting and as Chair I should be on it. They ended up pulling that permit because there was not enough time for them to deal with everything and getting it ready for the summer. So they ended up having to do something in Tok instead.

At any rate, I just had some concerns and I wanted to bring them up. The Council is always concerned about the Yukon River fish and its depletion and it probably is a holdover to how they would feel about other fisheries like on the Copper River.

That's it.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Appreciate your comments today. Any questions from the Board.

MR. LORD: Mr. Chair. This is Ken. Just a quick comment.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Ken, go ahead.

MR. LORD: I'd just like to respond to the concern about designated Federal officers adjourning RAC meetings. That's something that we didn't make up. That's actually in the Federal Advisory Committee Act regulations that apply to all advisory committees nationwide. So it's not something that we can either change or have any control over.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for the clarification there, Ken. I hope that helped answer your question. All right. Hearing no more questions from the Board. Sue, can we go to the next
MR. G. BROWER: Mr. Chair. Members of the Board. This is Gordon Brower, North Slope Regional Advisory Council Chair. I'd like to thank the Federal Subsistence Board for the opportunity to express our concerns and our recommendations and things like that.

Our Council approved the annual report on March 8 and 9 of 2022, so we met last month and the Council wishes to share information and raise a number of concerns dealing with implementation of Title VIII of ANILCA and the continuation of subsistence uses on the North Slope. I'm going to start off with some of my own observations and concerns and dovetail that into our report.

On the Slope there's a fisheries up here with some concerns that I would like to express. The local whitefish runs that occur from about September 10 to about October 10. The concerns I raise are based on climate-related changes for the ability to harvest the broad whitefish.

There's been some response to some of these concerns like, oh, well, you know, you can wait until it freezes or move over to an adjacent river or some other way to just brush it off to the side and try to address it as winter sets in, but the understanding behind these fish is that they only run in the Ikpikpuk, Chip for a brief period and then they disappear. They go back to where they come from, from the lakes and go back.

That's highly -- that's traditional knowledge that we use and where we try to make the effort to harvest these fish when it's prime, when they're getting ready to spawn. Lately the river and the Ikpikpuk is -- you need to have a cover of ice over the river in order to put your nets under and it's been plagued by moving ice for the last maybe 10-plus years.

Back in the '70s and early '80s we would have nets under the ice around September 18 and September 15 and then the fish that we harvest were flash frozen. Where they're fresh, they maintain their
color and we're able to store them until winter sets in to where you can haul them to the communities in November for Thanksgiving and Christmas.

We're just not seeing it happen that way. For instance a lot of my catch will start to spoil. I mean don't get me wrong. Even the spoiled fish we eat them, but the delicacy of having fresh fish with the eggs being bright yellow is a very sought after condition of those fish. We struggle with that today. It's kind of like a food security issue.

More often I'm going to small tributaries because the main river is not frozen. There's icebergs coming downriver. You try to fish and it will tear up your nets and then you miss out on the run. So I try to go to small tributary rivers when the river is high because the current is less and then they freeze over and I'm able to fish on some of the smaller rivers.

All I'm trying to say is there is these climate related issues of the subsistence resource. I was taught by my parents and they'd always say don't forget how to fish here because there's lots and lots of traditional knowledge and family and related times for at least a couple hundred years in these areas where it supported the ability to fish for periods of hunger, periods where the communities were starving in the past and these areas were able to support community-wide fishing.

It's not the same in the adjacent river like the Meade. There's no comparison in the fish runs in these areas. Not even in the Colville River, the whitefish runs, like it does in the Ipkikpuk. So very different. The Colville is primarily qaaktaq and the arctic cisco.

That's a concern I would like to bring and there needs to be some acknowledgment of how we continue to be able to harvest these and preserve them in their fresh condition because the weather is not conducive to doing this. The run is not going to change. The timing of the run will not change. So I try to do my best to look at what's going on with this stuff.

The other thing that we've expressed,
especially in Anaktuvuk Pass, is the availability of subsistence caribou, to be able to harvest caribou. We know Anaktuvuk is surrounded by Gates of the Arctic. It has state land that is managed for the benefit of all residents and it's important to recognize those kind of concerns.

One of the things that the North Slope Borough -- and, by the way, I serve as the Chair of the Regional Advisory Council. At the same time I sit as the Director of Planning appointed by the Mayor to be the North Slope Borough Land Management Administrator within the entire boundary of the Borough to manage lands in accordance with the adopted policies and land management regulation of the North Slope Borough, which are codes and ordinances that are important to recognize even by the Federal entities because the Borough Land Management Ordinance is multi-jurisdictional. It's enforced on Federal land. It's enforced on State land. It's enforced on private land.

One of the concerns about Noatak and the Northwest Arctic Borough that we support these time area management issues and Federally qualified users on Federal land to have rural preference when the ability to put food on the table is at stake. We see those kinds of concerns and the Borough has created corresponding comprehensive plans for communities.

It's important, even though if the Federal Subsistence Board cannot comprehend what's going on in an Organized Borough on how to look at ways to provide for communities is an important task I think for land managers to recognize in these areas and co-mingle.

One thing I like to call out is the Village Area of Influence in all of the Village Comprehensive Plans in the Organized Borough, the North Slope Borough as the land manager, that the Village Area of Influence in its definition is the lands immediately outside of the village district.

Village district is like the city limits. The lands immediately outside of the village district that are used for traditional and contemporary subsistence practices to support the community and have a higher emphasis to protect the subsistence
traditional uses and practices that support the community.

Those are important features to recognize. I would say pay attention to the North Slope Borough Land Management Ordinance as well when we're looking at -- you're almost doing practically the same thing when we're looking at time/area management when we look at a request.

Well, we need an area to focus on rural preference because the caribou migrations are being affected in some way and with many different variables involved. We just can't put our finger on it and point what's the matter. It's a very important process in the Federal process to look at rural subsistence priority and when we need to act to preserve these resources.

So they're not just managed in a way that we're going to consume them. Sometimes I cringe at the way the State manages the resources where they're managed for everybody, the entire state, until a resource is at the brink, which we should never allow these resources to be managed to the brink and then everybody is cut off, you know.

Those are just some of the concerns that I bring about locally here within the boundaries of the North Slope Borough. I feel it's also my responsibility to make sure, as the land management administrator for the Borough and implementing the land use policies and we need to find a way to work together around some of these laws.

When the comprehensive plans are adopted by the Assembly that are required by state statute and then by the charter of the North Slope Borough to bring these land management practices and using them. Sometimes it might be easy to just brush that off and say, hey, we don't deal with that stuff.

There needs to be a way to address those things and then work towards them because we can effectively do the -- with the Village Area of Influence with managing the need for communities to put food on the table because that's what the Village Area of Influence does on the North Slope.
With that, Mr. Chair, I'm going to go ahead and go through some of our letters. Again, our report was adopted March 8 and 9, 2022 in our winter meeting and the Council wishes to share information and raise a number of concerns dealing with implementation of Title VIII of ANILCA and the continuation of subsistence using on the North Slope.

One, there's a request for monitoring of Unit 26C muskox and transboundary management with Canada. One of the things that we're seeing in working with ADF&G is the movement of muskox in Unit 26A. Now there exists some opportunity for a harvest and some of our proposals are going to be acted upon by this Board as well.

But in the far most reaches of Unit 26C, the struggle for muskox population growth and trying to define the eastern population from the western population, the struggle continues in Unit 26C with some information bleeding over from the Canadian side, that there's some evidence of liberal management of muskox in the borderlands between Canada and the United States that leads to suggest maybe that population is not really allowed to move more westerly around that boundary.

So the Council is very concerned about the continuously low muskox population in Unit 26C. There has not been any subsistence harvest opportunity for muskox in the region for many years. Maybe it had never been. This muskox population's range extends across the border between Canada and the eastern side of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in the United States. Muskox move back and forth between the two countries.

The Council has heard reports that high muskox harvest occur in Canada and is concerned that overharvest in Canada may be keeping the overall population low. The Council requests information on cross-boundary management of muskox within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Canada and would like to explore options for the creation of a joint U.S./Canada muskox management group similar to the Porcupine Caribou Management Board.

Number two. The ongoing concerns about contaminants in subsistence fish within NPR-A it seems
this concern is either escalating and now starting to affect other species. The initial concerns came back about maybe five or six years ago related to broad whitefish having this mold, like Saprolegnia I think is the scientific word for it.

There have been more concerns raised. A fish that they normally didn't see with fish mold occurring on them, but we're starting to see some other concerns that it's maybe starting to be seen in the arctic cisco. So the Council remains very concerned about contaminants in subsistence fish within Federal lands of the National Petroleum Reserve, NPR-A.

This is an issue of real distress for the community of Nuiqsut whose residents continue to find sick and dying fish. Residents now have anxiety about eating fish that have traditionally been essential to their diet and well-being for many years. The Council tried to find a way to monitor contaminants in subsistence fish through the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program.

The Council has been informed that this needs to be done by the land management agencies. Thus, the Council requests that the Bureau of Land Management funds this necessary contaminants research. BLM is responsible for the permitting of the past and present industrial activities within NPR-A that are the source of these contaminants.

The Council seeks the support of the Federal Subsistence Management Program to ensure these essential subsistence fisheries resources are protected and that communities get answers about contaminants so that they can safely continue to eat healthy traditional subsistence foods.

That seems to be something that we talk about for years and years. I mean I can remember talking about Umiat and the landfill that's eroding and being undercut in some of our own inspections as a land management administrator for the Borough. Dispatching inspectors to river breakup season to look at what the landfill might be doing during breakup because those concerns continue to be coming in from the community.

That debris gets shot out during breakup season and we don't know what the Corps of
Engineer's timing might be to try to clean up the Umiat landfill. We've heard estimates of $980 million to dig it up and fly it out to $460 million to put a road in and truck it all out, but you've got to dig it up and get it out of the path of the Colville River to do some of these.

I don't know if that's part of the extent of contaminants and perceived issues relate to fish mold and things like that. So it's just an important thing to keep up the pressure and talk about these things because they affect the harvest of subsistence resources for the Arctic.

Number three is a recognition in support of community harvest and sharing patterns. The Council wishes to highlight the importance of traditional community harvest and sharing of subsistence foods. Subsistence communities need to take care of each other and continue to have access to healthy subsistence food especially during ongoing hardships of the pandemic.

The Council encourages the Federal Subsistence Management Program to recognize and support these traditional sharing practices and share easy access to designated hunter permits and community harvest programs. It might be an elder and not be able to go out and do the normal hunting you did as a young person, but it is the diet that they love and the foods that they have customary traditional determinations to and the ability to continue for all range of our rural residents.

Number four. Request the Federal Subsistence Board to further consider continuation of subsistence uses and that substantial evidence include local and traditional knowledge when making actions on proposals. I think those are some of the most important things.

The indigenous people, the traditional knowledge of those that do subsistence and live off the land have an intimate relationship with the land, the subsistence resources and the animals. We tend to be our own ways of conserving. Many of the new laws on the North Slope came from traditional knowledge when we were faced with a serious decline in Western Arctic Caribou Herd back from 2014 to 2017 and ADF&G was going
to propose additional regulations and limit the harvest and take of those caribou. We stepped up to the plate
and said, hey, you know, we do a lot of conserving ourselves.

We don't hunt the bulls when they're in rut. While the other competing users look out for
taking the trophy value, we never do. We put laws into place that we are not going to hunt bulls from October 10 until December 6 until the rut flavor is out of the bulls and things. So we are in our own right. Traditional knowledge has showed us we're not going to hunt the bulls from this period to this period because they don't taste so good and we'll hunt them later when the hormones are reduced in that.

So supported by substantial evidence, that's an emphasis made by the Council, is one of the top criteria the Board considers in its decision making on regulatory proposals and Special Action Requests. The Council has observed that the expertise of local and traditional knowledge is often not considered along with Western science when identifying substantial evidence.

Rural and indigenous communities have direct experience and observations that span life lived on the land throughout the years and throughout a knowledge handed down across generations. Traditional knowledge and the observations and experiences of subsistence resource users are as substantial as Western science. The Council requests that the Board better incorporate local and traditional knowledge in its decision making.

Council also requests the Board to give greater consideration for continuation of subsistence uses in its decision making as well. Subsistence priority cannot be achieved without access to subsistence resources. Actions from non-subsistence resource users may deflect animals away from rural communities, change migration patterns and timing and have other effects that prevent subsistence resource users from accessing fish and wildlife populations.

I think those are important and far-reaching words about competing users on lands from those that are from rural residents or indigenous folks with traditional knowledge on the use of these
resources. We expect them. We know their trails and it's important to recognize that the North Slope Borough has worked to develop a comprehensive plan that also incorporate village area influence with definitions about what that area of influence is.

Someday I would think the North Slope Borough may want to work with the land managers that are present here in the Federal Subsistence Board to look at how we look at areas of influence and zone those as such and apply policy in those areas to protect the migration patterns much the same way as we do that with the bowhead whale where we have time area closures.

We often have industry stop. If we don't have a conflict avoidance agreement with the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission, we will do a cease and desist on industrial activities in their barging operations and such until the harvest of bowhead whales have been achieved by communities because it is an important subsistence resource.

(Teleconference interference - participant note muted)

MR. G. BROWER: I will stop there and I think that's the extent of our report. The North Slope Regional Advisory Council appreciates the Board's attention to these matters and the opportunity to assist the Federal Subsistence Management Program in leading its charge of protecting subsistence resources and uses of those resources on Federal public lands and waters.

REPORTER: Okay.....

MR. G. BROWER: The Council looks forward to continuing discussions about the issues.....

REPORTER: .....whoever is typing please mute your phone.

MR. G. BROWER: .....of the subsistence users in the North Slope Region. If you have any questions regarding this report you can contact me, Gordon Brower, Regional Advisory Chair for the North Slope or Eva, but I heard that, Eva, and congratulations on the new post, Eva. Our madame
coordinator will be moving over to a new position I heard.

Thank you. That concludes the North Slope Regional Advisory Council's report.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that, Gordon. Appreciate the report. Any questions from the Board for Mr. Brower.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right. Hearing none. I appreciate all the Regional Advisory Council reports. That gives us good insight to not only what's in their report but what's happening at the ground level and some of the processes on the ground that are the day-to-day operations and then, you know, the struggle that we've all had here through the pandemic, the meetings virtual, wanting to be back and in person, down to working on the ground with agencies, partners, land managers and everything in between, trying to coordinate it.

I just want to thank all the coordinators, all the RAC Chairs and everybody who came together today to get your report to us and then to have time here to provide testimony about each of them and thank you all for that.

With that we're going to go ahead and move on to the next part of the agenda. Before we do I'd like to take a 15-minute break. So I'm going to go ahead and call for a 15-minute break right now at this time. That means we'll come back here at -- let's just say five to 4:00. So if we can have everybody sign back off, take a quick break and then we'll come back and continue with public testimony opportunity.

Thank you.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Welcome back. Anthony Christianson is here, so whenever you're ready you can just do a roll call and make sure that we have a quorum again. No rush.
MS. DETWILER: Okay. Well, I will start with you and you're here, so I can check you off that you're present. Let's see.

Start again with Park Service, Sarah Creachbaum.

MS. CREACHBAUM: I am present. Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

BLM, Thomas Heinlein.

MR. MCKEE: This is Chris, BLM. Tom is on a call right now, but he'll be back momentarily.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. Thanks, Chris.

Fish and Wildlife Service, Sara Boario.

MS. BOARIO: I'm here, Sue.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Sara.

Dave Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: I'm back. Thanks, Sue.

MS. DETWILER: Gene Peltola, BIA.

MR. CHEN: Hello, Sue. This is Glenn Chen. Gene stepped out for just a sec. He'll be back shortly. Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: Hi, I'm here.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Rhonda.

Public Member Charlie Brower.

(No response)

MS. DETWILER: Mr. Chair, we're waiting on Charlie Brower and we have a couple of ISC members
standing in for the two Board members who should be joining shortly. So you do have a quorum.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue. We'll just wait a few more minutes.

(Pause)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: It looks like it's 4:00 o'clock now, so we'll go ahead and get started, Sue.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. Just to follow up, I believe we were waiting for Tom Heinlein from BLM and Gene Peltola from BIA and Charlie Brower, Public Member. If any of them have signed in.

The next agenda item is Agenda Item 5, public comment period on non-agenda items.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll open the floor at this time. Operator, if there's anybody online that would like to speak to non-agenda items, this is the time for the public to go ahead and do so. Operator, you can create a cue for that. Appreciate it.

OPERATOR: Certainly. For any comments at this time please press star, one. Please unmute your phone and record your name clearly when prompted. Once again it is star, one.

I do have a comment that cued up earlier. I'm not sure if it's relevant at this time. Kevin Meyer, your line is open.

MR. MEYER: Thanks. Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes. You have the floor.

MR. MAIER: Oh, great. Thank you. My name is Kevin Maier. I'm here representing the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Juneau-Douglas Advisory Committee. I'm not sure if this is the appropriate moment, but I would love the opportunity to comment briefly on Wildlife Proposals 22-07 and 22-08. Is this an appropriate time to do so?
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I believe both of those are on the agenda.

MR. MAIER: They're on the non-consensus agenda. So should I wait to do that when they come up?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I'll give you an opportunity here to provide a small summary of it, but, yeah, you can have time here and there. This is usually a time for anything that's not on the agenda, but since you called in I'll allow it.

MR. MAIER: Okay. Great. I apologize for misunderstanding and I'm thankful for the opportunity. I've submitted written proposals on behalf of our advisory committee, but just wanted to quickly say that we're hoping that you can help maintain consistent and equitable access to deer hunting opportunity for all residents of our sparsely populated region by approving Proposals 22-07 and 22-08.

Our full written comments are on pages 658 to 659 in the book. I think I'll wait and call back in before -- call back in when you're considering those proposals if that's okay. Again, thanks for the opportunity to quickly register our concerns here and I look forward to that discussion.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, thank you for taking the time to call in today. Appreciate that.

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

OPERATOR: Yes, sir. Our next comment is from Mike Adams.

MR. ADAMS: Hi. I want to start by thanking the Board for an opportunity to speak. I'm calling with a request to remove Proposal 20 from the consensus agenda and I respectfully request that the Board move this proposal to the non-consensus agenda and revisit the proposal as it was originally submitted.

Currently Proposal 20 is listed as having a consensus opposed to the proposal. The
proposal seeks to establish a C&T determination
supporting moose hunting in Unit 15C, the community of
Cooper Landing. The proposal was written and submitted
as a result of multiple conversations with Cooper
Landing community members and I can attest that
subsistence users in Cooper Landing do support the
proposal.

The Office of Subsistence Management
also supports the proposal with the following language
as justification for their support. Their
justification is stated as: The Board has previously
recognized customary and traditional use of other
wildlife including caribou and goat in Unit 15C by
residents of Cooper Landing. Based on these previous
determinations, Cooper Landing has already established
a recognized pattern of harvest and use of wild
resources in Unit 15C consistent with the eight
factors.

Cooper Landing residents pattern of
moose hunting and harvest generally exhibit the
characteristics of customary and traditional use in
Unit 15C as shown through comprehensive subsistence
surveys and data from residents hunting for moose in
Unit 15C under state regulations.

Cooper Landing has had its customary
and traditional use of moose recognized on all of the
Kenai Peninsula except for Unit 15C. The documents
proposal will expand recognition of customary and
traditional use of moose by residents of Cooper Landing
to the entire Kenai Peninsula consistent with the
Board's policy of making inclusive area-wide
determinations.

The proposal was also supported as
written initially by the Southcentral RAC with a
majority of votes in favor to one against. It is my
understanding that only after objections were raised by
a community member from Ninilchik did the RAC
reconsider this proposal as modified.

The modified language reads -- this is
from the minutes: It says support WP22-20/25A/27 with
modification to include only those lands within Units
7, 15A and 15B. After being modified the RAC seems to
have voted on three proposals all at once, not taking
up Proposal 20 individually. They voted 5 votes in
favor to 4 against with two abstentions. This modification effectively killed Proposal 20, which the RAC had already voted firmly in favor of.

This example seems to exemplify the statement made by the Vice Chair of the Southcentral RAC earlier today and it was difficult to vote on several proposals as a group especially when they dealt with more than one unit. In light of these facts, I do not believe this proposal received a true opposition consensus.

For all of these reasons I believe that Proposal 20 should be revisited by the Board as a non-consensus item to allow for further discussion.

Thank you, Mr. Chair and the Board.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions or comments from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that. We will consider that as we move forward.

Operator, was there anybody else from the public who wanted to call in and participate today?

OPERATOR: Yes. I have a comment from Ryan Beason.

MR. BEASON: Hi. Can everybody hear me?

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

MR. BEASON: Just like Kevin Maier earlier I was going to talk on the deer proposals, but if there's a more appropriate time later on I can certainly do that. Is that my understanding?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, there will be an opportunity to speak to these proposals in the public comment period on these. So today's public comment period is on non-agenda items. Want to talk briefly.

MR. BEASON: Yeah, I'll keep it brief.
I'm with Territorial Sportsmen in Juneau. Again, I'll talk further on this at the designated time. We oppose the four deer proposals 22-07, 08, 09 and 10, but again I will talk further at a more appropriate time later on in the meeting.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. Appreciate that. Any questions from the Board about that. Again, there will be opportunity before every proposal to go ahead and speak on it. Operator, is there any other public that would like to be recognized at this time?

OPERATOR: I'm showing no further comments at this time.

MR. C. BROWER: Mr. Chair, I'm on now.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Welcome back, Charlie. We just went through the public non-consensus agenda item there and we've just concluded that part. We'll move on to old business and we have none, so now we're going to get an update from Orville on this tribal consultation process that we went through earlier. Orville, I'll call you up to the plate.

MR. LIND: Thank you, Chairman Christianson. Board members. Orville Lind, Native Liaison for the Office of Subsistence Management. I'll give a summary on this morning's consultation. Again, please, folks, if you hear something that is not on the summary or misconstrued or not true, please let me know as I go through this.

I'm going to start off with AITRC. They are concerned about misinformation related to community harvest system. People were upset that AITRC information may have been wrongly characterized. This is an OSM proposal, not an AITRC proposal. Ahtna and AITRC are separate entities. They had asked to publicly be able to speak on Fisheries Proposal 21-10 at the Council meeting but were told no. Concerned that the public process has been stifled.

They also were told that they should be able to speak on Fisheries Proposal 21-10 at the Federal Subsistence Board meeting. AITRC is comprised
of eight tribes and allows for cooperative management of wildlife on Federal lands. AITRC also requested possible step-down plans for how the 2016 agreement should proceed.

We had a member from TCC that says members rely on natural resources for their well-being. They want to improve their subsistence situation. Subsistence policy is critical and TCC is authorized to initiate consultation with the agencies. They do not seek to negotiate with agencies separately, but would like to talk with Federal agencies as a group. Based on January 21st, 2022 communications, TCC and the Yukon River Intertribal Fisheries Commission understood that co-management and consultations would be occurring.

TCC is concerned that the Joint Secretarial Order of the stewardship of Federal lands and water was not included in the RAC packet. These are directly related to the Regional Advisory Council agencies.

TCC also asked that all Federal staff be aware of these agreements. Tribes have been stewards of the land since time immemorial and seek to carry out their role and work with Federal subsistence staff.

We had a person from Bristol Bay tribe said that their involvement would be limited due to conflicts later on today, but they support the model of the Togiak Refuge and the community that is working to provide co-management for caribou. The community has helped distribute two caribou to the senior center in Dillingham. The tribal council opposed the ban on trapping on Refuges, which is under HR-4716.

Also the Second Chief from BBNA they said that Wildlife Proposal 22-40 is a concern. They have been coming to the Board on a positioning issue over past years. She also serves on the Bristol Bay AC for Alaska Department of Fish and Game. State regulatory language has been adjusted by the Alaska Board of Game. The proposed language matches language for Unit 23.

It would be best if this language would be taken up by Federal Subsistence Board. This has been quite a long time with the word positioning.
Caribou positioning wording is not going to work with wolverine and wolf. They want to go with existing wording in the proposal, not the proposed OSM modifications. They're still waiting to hear who will assure that ANILCA is being followed. ANILCA has priority and must be followed by the agencies and the Federal Subsistence Board.

We had a member from Tazlina. The Southcentral and Eastern Interior Councils oppose Fisheries Proposal 21-10. Now is not the time to put in a new fishery. They haven't been making chinook salmon escapement goals on the Copper River. Returns are low and they barely made sockeye escapement goals in the Copper river. Copper River fishermen have limited options compared to subsistence fishermen around Cordova.

There's sharing going on. Traditional sharing of subsistence food. The Native Village of Eyak has been opposed to Fisheries Proposal 21-10. There's opposition to this proposal because of the low fisheries returns.

We had the president of the Organized Village of Kake who stated they've been having problems with Fish and Game and they've been having problems with black bears. They were in a search and rescue situation where a person fell off the dock, but they were also at the same time having bear problems.

ADF&G rules are to skin a DLP bear, defense of life and property bear, and send it to them. Of course, the two Federal marshals came into town to arrest the person who did not follow regulations. They could have taken care of this with a summons. They are more concerned about live animals than people. The tribe filed suit against the State several years ago, but the State continues to pursue this even though they had lost it in court. The State wants to continue to fight.

We had a person from Southeast Tribal Council state that commercial fishermen are wiping out the crab resource around the villages and communities and he's very concerned. Traditionally people have settled in the communities where there are lots of resources, but if resources are being taken away from them, outsiders are taking the village's deer and the
crab. There's pressure from everywhere. Villages
don't have the option to go to Costco. This is
important to Angoon subsistence way of life. ADF&G
needs to look at the impacts on the villages when
resources are being taken out of their area.

We had a Northway Tribal member. He
said there was no consultation done on a State cabin
site project. They are opposed to the land sale noting
that ADNR chose a very busy subsistence time for Tanana
tribes for public comments. They are concerned that
locals will be displaced from the important subsistence
use area.

He requested that consultation should
occur any time land sales are in an area. This area is
highly used for subsistence uses. Every year outside
hunters come into this area and utilize the same
resource. He's working with the Eastern Interior
Regional Advisory Council. He also requests the
Federal Subsistence Board's support.

That completes the summary I have for
you, Chairman and Federal Subsistence Board members.
I'm available for any questions at this time.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Orville. Appreciate the summary for the Tribal Council
consultation this morning. The floor is open for any
Board member who would like to ask Orville any
questions, comments, feedback.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: all right.
Hearing none. We'll go ahead and move on to number 7,
the 2022-2024 Subparts C&D proposals and closure
reviews. We'll call for the announcement of the
consensus agenda. I'll go ahead and turn it over to
you, Sue, to call on Lisa.

MS. DETWILER: I'll call Lisa
Grediagin. Thank you.

MS. GREDIAGIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
This is Lisa Grediagin, the Wildlife Division
Supervisor at OSM. The consensus agenda contains all
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 consensus agenda can be found after the public meeting agenda in the Board meeting materials. The analyses for these are contained in Volume 1 of the meeting materials. Anyone may request that a proposal or closure review be removed from the consensus agenda and considered individually by the Board. However, only a Board member may actually remove a proposal or a closure review from the consensus agenda.

So, for example, we had a request to remove WP22-20 from the consensus agenda, but that was a member of the public who made that request, so currently it will remain on the consensus agenda unless a Board member asks for it to be removed off the consensus agenda and put on the non-consensus agenda.

After the Board acts individually on all the non-consensus proposals and closure reviews, the Board will take up the consensus agenda and vote on it collectively toward the end of this meeting.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

That concludes announcement of the consensus agenda.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Lisa. At this time we come to a public comment period on consensus agenda items. This is the opportunity available at the beginning of each day before we take final action. I said earlier there would be a time later on the agenda for consensus agenda items and this would be the opportunity for the public to speak on the consensus agenda as presented. I know we did have one public person who called in wishing for Proposal 20 to be pulled, but I believe that was a public and not a Regional or Council Chair.

So at this time I would ask the Operator if there's any public comment online for the consensus agenda items.

OPERATOR: As a reminder for any comments, please press star, one. Please unmute your
phone and record your name clearly when prompted.

(No comments)

OPERATOR: Once again that is star, one for any comments. We do have a few coming in. One moment. I have a comment from Mike Bethers.

MR. BETHERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Is this the time when I speak on WP22-09? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Sue, is that one on the consensus or not consensus, please? Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Maybe Lisa Grediagin has that information at the tip of her hands.

MS. GREDIAGIN: Yes, Mr. Chair. WP22-09 is on the consensus agenda, so this is the appropriate time to comment on that proposal. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Guest, now you have the floor. Thank you.

MR. BETHERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to comment. My name is Mike Bthers, with a B, and I ask you not to support Wildlife Proposal 22-07, 22-08 -- I guess I'll keep this only to 22-08 at this time.

I've had a lot of experience in the past writing wildlife regulatory proposals and I don't believe these proposals will really do what these proposers really wanted. I've been a lifelong 74-year-old deer hunter. I live in either Auke Bay or Tenakee Springs.

The last 50-plus years my hunting has been on Admiralty and Chichagof Islands. I spend about 50 days a year in the woods and use a deer call and I still hunt. I access areas in my boat and I don't have to shoot from boats and haven't been on the Hoonah road system in decades.

The last several years deer have been very abundant and at or near carrying capacity. If a crippled-up old man like me with a bunch of medical
issues can go into the woods and find as many deer as
I've been seeing, there's basically isn't any
legitimate reason I can see for subsistence users not
going their deer, you know.

Federal qualified users, they have a
definite priority to the resource. They extend their
season in January when they're most often available
quite often. The designated hunter program, you know,
you can shoot for others. Further, you know, Federally
qualified users typically live right in or really close
to the hunting grounds and they're really, really close
to that hunting opportunity.

Usually available ADF&G deer harvest
data on both qualified and non-qualified hunters showed
that Federally qualified hunting effort is way down
since the 2007-2008 hard winter. However, those
Federally qualified users still hunting are doing just
fine. They're getting more deer than they got in the
past.

Juneau deer hunters, they're residing
at least 50 miles away from either the Hoonah place or
the Angoon. They're not impacting their deer hunts and
they're not causing a problem there. They just can't
be.

Anyway, specific comments on Proposal
2008 follow. Hoonah has dealt this wildlife habitat
two major blows through extensive clearcut logging and
a hundred miles of logging roads. These have both
proven many times to have very negative impacts on the
wildlife populations and wildlife movements.

Many studies have shown that deer shy
away from roads in order to survive. It's called
natural selection. The road system in Hoonah really
changed hunting. It made it real handy and real easy,
but now the deer near the roads are wiped out soon
after the opening of doe season.

This proposal also includes much more
area than I think you need to address the concerns of
the road system. The Federally qualified users in
Hoonah that I know are still hunting. They're having
no problems. They're getting their deer.

This proposal also impacts the north
shore of Tenakee Inlet, which should be excluded from
the proposal. Tenakee is not attached to the road
system and has none of the road system issues of
Hoonah. ADF&G deer tagging data shows minimal movement
of deer between drainages draining into Tenakee Inlet
and areas draining north towards the Hoonah Road
System.

Consequently, the deer harvested on the
north shore of Tenakee Inlet is separate from that of
the area accessed by the Hoonah Road System and the
Tenakee harvest would have absolutely no impact on the
Hoonah areas closer to the road system.

Drainages flowing south into Tenakee
Inlet are identified in an area called ADF&G Wildlife
Analysis Area 3526 and you can see that on some maps
there in this literature printed on these proposals.
Anyway, this area 3526 should be excluded from Proposal
22-08.

Excluding this area is especially
important to Tenakee as when the east or north winds
blow hard in Tenakee Inlet we can't cross the inlet to
hunt on the south side and the north shore is the only
place we're able to access the hunt.

In conclusion, Hoonah Wildlife Proposal
22-08 should be amended to include only areas accessed
by the Hoonah Road System. That's the roads that are
hooked to the Ferry Terminal. I think this is where
your greatest perceived problem lies.

This proposal will make no changes in
the non-qualified user deer bag limit on any
State-owned beaches bordering the North Chichagof
Management Area and be no impact to hunting on State
land, you know, between high tide -- or high mean tide
and the low water line.

The north shore of Tenakee Inlet, like
I said above, specifically Wildlife Analysis Area 3526
should be excluded from Wildlife Proposal 22-08 as it's
not used by Federally qualified hunters from Hoonah.
The deer harvest there has no effect on -- is accessed
by the Hoonah Road System and it's the only place
hunters from Tenakee can hunt in heavy northeasterly
winds.
Further, another comment. The last several years recent reductions in the Alaska Ferry Service to Hoonah will likely continue to provide less opportunity for Juneau non-qualified hunters to get to Hoonah.

That concludes my comments, sir.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for your comments there. Again, we're back on consensus agenda and I believe the proposal you spoke to was a non-consensus agenda item. So you'll actually have another opportunity to speak to that later.

MS. GREDIAGIN: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead.

MS. GREDIAGIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Lisa Grediagin for the record and I just wanted to clarify that WP22-07, 08, 09 and 10 all concern deer in Unit 4 and 07, 08 and 10 are on the non-consensus agenda while Proposal 09 is on the consensus agenda. That may have been where a little bit of confusion happened here.

I thought he was just speaking specifically to 09, but if any of the public wishes to speak on Proposals 07, 08 or 10, the other Unit 4 deer proposals that are on the non-consensus agenda, this is not the time to comment on those. They will be taken up individually later in the meeting by the Board.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Lisa.

OPERATOR: I have no further comments at this time.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Operator. Appreciate that. Thank you to the public for calling in. We do our best to take as much of the comments as we can and provide the opportunity. So I thank the public for their brief summarizations and also to come back at the opportune time here later in
the meeting to share your full testimony. So we look
forward to you staying involved in the process and
appreciate the Staff making that available for you. So
thank you guys.

We'll move on after the announcement
of.....

OPERATOR: I'm sorry to interrupt. I
do have one other comment.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: One other
comment online. Go ahead, Operator. We'll entertain
that at this time.

OPERATOR: Okay. Mike Adams, your line
is open.

MR. ADAMS: Thank you. I commented a
moment ago. I hope it was the right time for it about
removing Proposal 22-20 from the consensus agenda. I
wasn't sure if now is an appropriate time to just
provide comments about that proposal since it is
currently still remaining on the consensus agenda.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, this would
be the time for you to do that as I did make another
reminder. So this would be the opportunity for you to
do that.

MR. ADAMS: Okay. All right. Well, a
lot of stuff I guess I already mentioned. As I
previously mentioned, the proposal was written and
submitted as a result of multiple conversations with
other Cooper Landing community members who partake in
subsistence activities. So I can attest that other
subsistence users in Cooper Landing do support the
proposal.

The wildlife population obviously
fluctuates over time and I believe that regional
subsistence users should be allowed to exercise their
time-honored practice of traveling within the region in
pursuit of harvesting for themselves and the community
members by utilizing the populations of greater
abundance in accordance with customary and traditional
practices.

I think we all like to provide from the
land as close to home as possible, but the nature of subsistence has always required people to travel. Cooper Landing residents have, do and will continue to travel to Unit 15C to hunt and to gather just as residents from Unit 15C travel to Cooper Landing to harvest salmon and other resources.

I'd also like to point out that it seems like the primary resistance to this proposal has come from the community of Ninilchik, but 15C is a large area and also includes -- it begins in Kasilof. A lot of Cooper Landing residents travel to Kasilof to hunt the late season moose hunts, which concurrently that's the boundary. There does seem to be a consensus on the OSM findings that Cooper Landing residents do have a C&T in Unit 15C.

Another point I kind of came across with this is that an opposing view of C&T determination in this case seems out of balance with past decisions that the Board has made because in the past the Board has approved proposals to allow subsistence harvest of fish and wildlife resources in Unit 7 by residents of Unit 15C, sometimes just by very strong opposition from Cooper Landing community members.

A case in point is the subsistence dipnet fishery at the Russian River Falls. Right now Unit 7 and for many years now we've been in a period of historical low moose abundance. It seems like the numbers maybe rebounded a little bit in recent years, but nothing significant. We also have a lot of non-subsistence hunters from other areas outside the Kenai Peninsula that seem to be hunting here more and more often.

I believe this proposal will create opportunity for subsistence harvest for community members that might not otherwise have that opportunity, particularly in the late season hunt when fewer hunters are on the landscape and I think that will encourage greater subsistence community participation.

I believe that Board support for this proposal would show fairness to both communities in Unit 7 and in Unit 15C. I thank the Board for their time and if you guys have any questions for me, I'd be happy to answer them.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for calling back in. Any other public at this time for the consensus agenda items. Any questions from the Council.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

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

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For further discussion purposes BIA would like to request to have this proposal just commented on moved from the consensus to be put on the non-consensus.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Well, it pays to play. Thank you for calling back in. Thank you, Gene, for recognizing the need for this to be continually deliberated and we'll pull that from the agenda and move it to the non-consensus agenda. So thank you for calling in.

MR. C. BROWER: Do we need a second?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No. The Board can do that just like that for order of business. We'll have that moved and let the Staff note it.

Sue, I'll call on you to see where we're at in order of business.

MS. DETWILER: I believe that brings us to item 17, which is Board deliberation and action on non-consensus agenda items. I will turn that over to -- let's see, who is the first speaker on that? Lisa, can you help here?

MS. KENNER: Hi, Sue. This is Pippa Kenner and I am the first on the agenda.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

MS. KENNER: Shall I begin?

MS. DETWILER: Yes. Thanks.

MS. KENNER: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair and members of the Board and Regional Advisory Council
Chairs. The analysis for Proposal WP22-01 begins on Page 500 of Volume 2A of your Board meeting materials. My name is Pippa Kenner and I'm an anthropologist at the Office of Subsistence Management here in Anchorage.

This proposal was submitted by the Office of Subsistence Management and requests to clarify who is and who is not a participant in a community harvest system. First I'll describe community harvest system in Federal regulation.

Community harvest systems generally allow hunters to harvest animals up to a community harvest limit. Individual harvest limits such as one moose do not apply to hunters in a community harvest system. Each hunter may continue to harvest until the community harvest limit is met. These regulations generally describe what animal species may be taken, where they may be taken and who may take them.

The general regulation describing community harvest system harvest limits is split between pages 502 and 503 in your Council book. It says: An animal taken under Federal or State regulations by any member of a community with an established community harvest limit for that species counts towards the community harvest limit for that species. Except an animal taken as part of a community harvest limit counts towards every community member's harvest limit for that species taken under Federal or State of Alaska regulations.

So what the regulation doesn't say is that a person might not want to participate in their community harvest system for moose for example. This proposed regulation clarifies that a person can request a registration system where only people who register participate in the community harvest system.

The proposed regulation reads: For the purposes of this provision, all residents of the community are deemed participants in the community harvest unless the Board-approved framework requires registration as a prerequisite to harvesting or receiving any fish, wildlife, or shellfish pursuant to that community harvest, in which case only those who register are deemed participants in that community harvest.
This proposed regulation will not affect existing community harvest in Federal regulations. So the OSM conclusion is to support the proposal WP22-01. Thank you for your time. This is the end of my presentation and I'm available to try answering your questions.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Pippa. Any questions for the Staff.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right. Thank you. We'll go ahead and move on. Sue.

MS. DETWILER: That would be summary of public comments. Again Pippa.

MS. KENNER: No comments -- no public comments were submitted for this proposal during the public comment period. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Next on the agenda. Sue.

MS. DETWILER: Next up for this proposal is opening the floor to public testimony.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Again, Operator, if there's anybody online that would like to speak to this agenda item, the floor is open to the public at this time.

OPERATOR: Once again star, one if you'd like to make a comment. For any comments at this time please unmute and record your name. I do have a comment from Mike Bathers.

MR. BETERS: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. Is this the time and place to comment on Wildlife Proposals 22-08 and 22-10 or is there a more appropriate time when you'll be addressing these proposals? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. I'll call on Lisa for that answer.

MS. GREDIAGIN: Through the Chair. This is Lisa Grediagin and right now the Board is
considering Wildlife Proposal 22-01. Right now they're just asking for any public testimony specific to 22-01. So with the non-consensus agenda proposal they're taking them up individually and there will be an opportunity for public testimony on each proposal that's on the non-consensus agenda.

So this Proposal 22-01 deals with community harvest systems. Hopefully you have access to the meeting materials that outlines the non-consensus agenda and you'll see which ones the Board will consider before getting to 22-07. Considering it's 4:45, I would expect the Board will get to all the Unit 4 deer proposals tomorrow.

Thank you.

MR. BETHERS: Okay. Thank you very much. I appreciate that clarification. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, too. I just wanted to make sure we get the most precise answers. So thank you, Lisa. Thank you for your patience.

Operator, is there any other public online who would like to speak to the agenda at this time.

OPERATOR: Once again, star, one for any comments. We do have one coming through. One moment. I believe the comment is from Karen Linnell.

MS. LINNELL: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. I would like to thank OSM Staff for their summary and want to thank them for working on this proposal to clarify the error that was found during the formation of the Community Subsistence Harvest System for the AITRC and the eight villages that we serve.

I appreciate the work that went into it. I just want to thank the Board for their consideration on this item. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right. Thank you. Does that conclude our public testimony at this time?
MS. DETWILER: Yes, Mr. Chair. I believe the next step would be Regional Advisory Council recommendations. Since this is a statewide proposal, any of the Regional Council Chairs who are present may wish to speak on it.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. The floor is open for Regional Advisory Council Chairs.

MS. BATES PILCHER: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board. For the record, my name is Nissa Pilcher and I'm the Council Coordinator for the Seward Peninsula Council. The Seward Peninsula Council voted to defer unanimously. The Council was presented with the proposal and discussed it, but deferred the decision to the home regions as there are no community harvest systems in the Seward Peninsula Region. That is all.

Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chair. This is Southeast Council, Don Hernandez.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor, Don.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Southeast Council took no action on these two proposals as we do not have any community harvest systems in place. Thank you.

MS. TRUMBLE: Mr. Chair. This is Della Trumble of Kodiak Aleutians.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor, Della.

MS. TRUMBLE: Thank you. For the record, the Kodiak Aleutians supported unanimously and they appreciated the regulatory clarity.

MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair. This is DeAnna, coordinator for the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council. I would just like to check if Gloria Stickwan is online to provide Southcentral's recommendation.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

MS. STICKWAN: I thought this was a
Southeast proposal. 22-01?

MS. PERRY: Yes, Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: The Council supported it. The Council supports the proposal based on the information presented and we'll clarify that those who are not listed under the community can still hunt under the Federal hunt regulations to meet their subsistence needs. The Ahtna people can continue their customary and traditional ways of hunting.

Sorry for the confusion.

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, this is Jack Reakoff, Western Interior.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor, Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: The Western Interior Regional Advisory Council supported WP22-01. The justification was the proposal allows people to opt out of the community harvest system. It will benefit all subsistence users statewide.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Jack. Any other Regional Advisory Councils would like to comment.

MS. MORRIS LYONS: Yes. This is Bristol Bay.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor.

MS. MORRIS LYONS: This is Nanci Lyons, Bristol Bay Advisory Council. We also support this proposal.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any other RACs that would like to comment at this time.

MS. MCDAVID: Mr. Chair. This is Brooke McDavid. I am Council Coordinator for the Northwest Arctic and I will be presenting because the Chair is unavailable.
The Northwest Arctic RAC supported WP22-01. They said that customary and traditional patterns of harvest in the region are consistent with community harvest systems and regulations. Hunters distribute their harvest to elders first and then to other households that need it most. The Council also supports the proposal so that regulations are consistent across regions.

I will also be presenting for the Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council. The Eastern Interior Council also supported WP22-01. They stated that the proposal is beneficial to subsistence users who will find this regulation less confusing.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any other RACs.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. At this time we'll call on tribal/Alaska Native/corporate comments. Native liaison.

MS. PATTON: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

MS. PATTON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Eva. We do have our North Slope Subsistence Regional Advisory Council Chair on the line to provide the North Slope RAC recommendation on WP22-01. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Eva. The floor is yours.

MR. G. BROWER: Mr. Chair. This is Gordon Brower.

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

MR. G. BROWER: I'm trying to go through the proposals. Is this 22-01?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, that's the one we're on.
MR. G. BROWER: The Council elected to support WP22-01 that's found on Page 511. Our justification was Anaktuvuk Pass has a community harvest system for sheep. Only Federally qualified subsistence users with customary and traditional use determination for that resource can participate in Federal Community Harvest System. We did hear from -- I think it was the Western Interior RAC on the lower numbers of sheep in this area.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any other Regional Advisory Council comments.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right. Hearing none. We'll go ahead and move on to tribal, Alaska Native, corporate comments.

MR. LIND: Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor, Orville.

MR. LIND: Yeah, there are no comments and no recommendations, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. At this time we'll call on the Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments. State liaison.

MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the record, Ben Mulligan, Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Thank you for your guys' indulgence on this item with the coming up having to do with the Community Harvest Hunt System.

While we here at the Department appreciate the clarifying proposals of 01 and 02, we did want to take the opportunity that if and when the Board takes any action on any more of these sorts of hunts in the future, that the participation and harvest data is collected and reported to be at the same standard as the individual hunt reporting requirements so that proper management can continue to occur and conservation concerns do not develop due to under-reporting.

It is necessary for consistent updates
to be given to the Federal agencies or else we could
have a situation that, you know, we did get remedied,
but there was a delay in being able to find out some
information on the Community Harvest System Hunt for
Unit 13 last fall.

I don't anticipate it to happen again,
but I just wanted to stress the importance of having
that same standard of reporting so that when our
managers are looking to determine harvestable surplus
for a possible next step phase of a hunt we can do that
in a timely manner to let users know.

Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
 Appreciate that. Any questions for the State.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none.
Thank you. Interagency Staff Committee comments. ISC
Chair.

MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
 Members of the Council -- or the Board. This is Robbin
LaVine and I'm the Subsistence Policy Coordinator for
OSM. I'm also the chair of the Interagency Staff
Committee.

The Interagency Staff Committee
forwarded their standard comment and their standard
comment reads as follows: The Interagency Staff
Committee found the Staff Analysis to be a thorough and
accurate evaluation of the proposal and that it
provides a sufficient basis for the Regional Council
recommendation and Federal Subsistence Board action on
the proposal.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Robbin. We'll move on to Board discussion with Council
Chair and State Liaison. This is the opportunity for
the Board to ask questions of the State or Council
Chairs.

(No comments)
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON:  All right.  Hearing none.  We'll move on to Federal Board action.  I'll open up the floor at this time to take action on WP22-01.

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

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

MR. HEINLEIN:  Mr. Chair.  I move to adopt Proposal WP22-01. If I get a second, I'll explain why I intend to vote in support of my motion.

MR. C. BROWER:  Second.  Public Member Brower.

MR. HEINLEIN:  Thank you. Adoption of this proposal will help to make regulations governing community harvest systems less confusing and easier for Federally qualified subsistence users and others to understand. These proposed changes to regulation will result in more equitable harvest options and flexibility for rural residents while preventing any unintentional restrictions on the individual harvest limits of those living in communities with a community harvest system.

Adoption of this proposal is also consistent with the recommendations of eight of the ten Subsistence Regional Advisory Councils.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON:  Thank you. Any further questions, comments, deliberation.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON:  Call for the question.

MR. C. BROWER:  Question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON:  The question has been called. All in favor of the motion as presented signify by saying aye.
IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Opposed same sign.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The motion carries unanimously.

At this time we made it to 5:00 o'clock and so I just want to appreciate the time and everybody being mindful of the process and where we do interject and help to keep us on the agenda. So appreciate the public and their patience with us. And all the staff in being able to clarify and give us the guidance today. I feel like it was a good productive day. Appreciate all the efforts.

I will go ahead and recess this meeting today. We'll reconvene again tomorrow at 9:00 a.m. At the beginning of each day we do provide an opportunity for the public to speak to non-consensus items and then we'll begin back up on some of the agenda items that we were talking about today with opportunities for further in-depth public testimony. So we offered that up today.

Without any objection we'll go ahead and recess for the day and reconvene tomorrow at 9:00 a.m. Have a good day.

OPERATOR: This concludes today's conference. You may disconnect at this time.

(Off record)
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