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PROCEDINGS

(Teleconference - 2/1/2022)

(On record)

OPERATOR: (Canned Initial Announcement)

I would now like to turn the call over to Sue Detwiler. Thank you, you may begin.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Operator. This is Sue Detwiler, Assistant Regional Director for Office of Subsistence Management. And we're getting ready to start the Board -- the Federal Subsistence Board's work session. We are -- I understand from the operator that we're still trying to get people logged into the session. So I don't know if, Mr. Chair, Anthony Christianson, are you on the call?

(No comment)

MS. DETWILER: Okay. The Chair may still be waiting to get patched into the call.

Court reporter, are you on and ready to record?

REPORTER: I am on, and, yes, I can begin.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. I'm going to give it another minute or so to let more people get patched into the call and then we'll start doing a roll call to see who's online.

REPORTER: Very good.

(Pause)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hello, Sue.

MS. DETWILER: Yes, Tony, this is Sue.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, she had me on a non-speaking line there so I'm on now, so, thank you, Sue. We'll just give everyone a few minutes and give the operator time to -- it sounds like she's
juggling a few people and trying to get them moved over.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue.

(Pause)

MS. DETWILER: And we have not done roll call yet, either, Mr. Chair, but we do have the court reporter online.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. We'll give everyone just a minute or two. If most people are on -- just cue me when you think we're ready and we can go ahead and do roll call, Sue. Thank you.

(Pause)

MS. DETWILER: This is Sue. We're checking with the operator now to see how many folks are still trying to get online.

(Pause)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Are we getting pretty close, Sue?

MS. DETWILER: Yes. I'm trying to get a hold of.....

MR. BROWER: Good morning, I'm finally on. Hello.

MS. DETWILER: Hello. This is Sue Detwiler. Charles Brower, I believe that's you. We're still waiting -- there's still some people on hold trying to get into the call so we were holding on for just a couple of minutes so that we could get more people added to the call. And I'm going to check right now -- we're checking with the operator to see who -- how long the cue is yet to get online.

MR. BROWER: Okay, thank you. I'll be on mute.

REPORTER: Thank you.
(Pause)

MS. DETWILER: Mr. Chair, this is Sue again. I'm trying to reach the operator. I'm going to suggest that we have the operator at least open up the lines so that everybody can hear what's going on and as soon as we do that we can, at least, keep people in touch on what the status of the Board quorum is.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue. We wait several months for a meeting, we could wait a few minutes to get everybody on. Thank you.

(Pause)

MR. BROWER: Good morning, Tony, can you hear me.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Morning, Charlie, loud and clear, brother.

MR. BROWER: Okay, I'm on mute right now. Okay.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Right on.

MS. PITKA: Hi, this is Rhonda, I'm on.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hi, Rhonda, good to hear your voice.

(Pause)

MS. DETWILER: Mr. Chair. I just sent a message for someone on our Staff to ask the operator to please open all the lines so that we can begin.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue.

(Pause)

MS. LAVINE: Everyone has joined us now. We do hope that anyone in the speaker's room can have their lines opened.

MS. DETWILER: Robbin, this is Sue. I think we should just open up all the lines so that people aren't waiting, so they can hear what's going on.
MS. LAVINE: Correct. I think we've just done that.

MS. DETWILER: So was the operator going to make an announcement, or should we just begin?

REPORTER: I believe she did already, Sue. This is Tina.

MS. DETWILER: Oh, okay.

REPORTER: So you may begin.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you. Tina, are you recording now then?

REPORTER: Yes, go ahead.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, great. Okay, I think we should start recording. Morning, Mr. Chair. This is Sue Detwiler. Would you like me to go through the Board roll and see who's online, see if we have a quorum?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, please, Sue, do that, thank you and I'll turn it over to you.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. Starting with Board Member, National Park Service, do we have Sara Creachbaum on.

(No comment)

MS. DETWILER: Okay. From Bureau of Land Management, do we have Thomas Heinlein on.

(No comment)

MS. DETWILER: From Fish and Wildlife Service, do we have Karen Cogswell.

MS. COGSWELL: I'm here, Sue.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you, Karen. Forest Service, Dave.....

MS. COGSWELL: I think.....
MS. DETWILER: Oh, I'm sorry, go ahead.

MS. COGSWELL: I also -- I think Tom is on, but I wonder if he's not on the speaker mode, and that might be the same for Sara.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. So.....

MR. HEINLEIN: Yeah, this is.....

MS. DETWILER: .....yeah, Katya, or Robbin, can you check with the operator and make sure everybody is listening -- is able to listen in?

MS. WESSELS: Sue, this is Katya. She just wrote that, yes, they can hear us.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. So we need to make sure that our Board members are not in a -- are able to speak. That would be Sara Creachbaum, Thomas Heinlein, and I'm not sure who else yet.

MR. HEINLEIN: This is Tom Heinlein, can you hear me?

MS. DETWILER: Yes, thank you. This is Sue Detwiler, Assistant Regional Director for Office of Subsistence Management, and I'm just going through the roll call now to see which Board members are present so I will mark you as present. And then.....

MR. HEINLEIN: Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: .....the next -- the next Board member, Dave Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: Yeah, good morning, Sue. Dave's on.

MS. DETWILER: Good morning, Dave.

BIA, Gene Peltola.

MR. CHEN: Good morning, Sue. This is Glenn Chen. Our Regional Director, Mr. Peltola, asked me to sit in for him briefly this morning. He's in another teleconference and will be able to join everyone at about 9:30. Thank you.
MS. DETWILER: Okay. Thank you, Glenn.

Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: Good morning. I'm here.

MS. DETWILER: Good morning, Rhonda.

Public Member Charles Brower.

MR. BROWER: I'm here.

MS. DETWILER: I'll go back to see if Sara Creachbaum has joined us yet, or if Kim Jochum, the InterAgency Staff Committee member knows whether she's trying to get online.

MS. JOCHUM: Good morning, this is Kim Jochum. I know Sara is online -- on the call as well so we've been communicating here the last half hour so I will doublecheck with her if she has issues speaking. Thanks.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

MS. WESSELS: Yeah, Sue, this is Katya. The operator says that Sara Creachbaum is not on the call.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. I'll check back in a minute then. We'll see what other key Staff we have here from Department of Interior Solicitor's -- Regional Solicitor's Office, do we have Ken Lord.

MR. LORD: Good morning everybody.

MS. DETWILER: Good morning, Ken. Mike Routhier, also from the Regional Solicitor's Office.

(No comment)

MS. DETWILER: Okay. Moving to USDA, Office of General Counsel, do we have Jim Ustasiewski.

(No comment)

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

MR. BURCH: Good morning, this is March Burch.

MS. DETWILER: Good morning, Mark.

Moving to the Regional Advisory Council Chairs. I will go through numerically. Region 1, do we have anyone from Southeast?

MS. PERRY: Thank you, and good morning, Assistant Regional Director, Chair and Members of the Board. This is DeAnna Perry, Coordinator for Southeast and Southcentral Regional Advisory Councils. Neither Don Hernandez, Chair of the Southeast Council, nor Greg Encelewski, Chair of the Southcentral Council was available to join this week's work session, however, I stand by to answer any questions.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, DeAnna. Kodiak/Aleutians, Della Trumble, are you on?

(No comment)

MS. DETWILER: Bristol Bay, Nanci Morris-Lyon.

(No comment)

MS. DETWILER: Yukon Kuskokwim Delta, Ray Oney.

(No comment)

MS. DETWILER: Western Interior, Jack Reakoff.

(No comment)

MS. DETWILER: Seward Peninsula, Louis Green.

(No comment)
MS. DETWILER: Northwest Arctic, Mike Kramer.
(No comment)
MS. DETWILER: Eastern Interior, Sue Entsminger.
MS. WESSELS: Good morning, Sue, this is Katya Wessels, the Council Coordination Division Supervisor. I will be standing in for Sue Entsminger who could not attend this meeting.
MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you, Katya.
North Slope, Gordon Brower.
(No comment)
MS. DETWILER: And that's it for the Regional Advisory Councils for now. From Department of Interior here in Alaska, Sara Taylor, are you on?
(No comment)
MS. DETWILER: Okay. So I'm just going to check again to see if we have Sara Creachbaum, Board member from National Park Service on.
MS. WESSELS: Sue, this is Katya. You know, Kim Jochum told me that she is -- we could not hear her so she hung up and is calling back in so she should be in in a moment here.
MS. CREACHBAUM: Yeah, good morning, this is Sara Creachbaum. Can you hear me?
MS. DETWILER: Yes, thank you, Sara. This is Sue Detwiler. We're just doing roll call now so we can hear you loud and clear.
MS. CREACHBAUM: Okay, yep. Oh, great, great, thank you. I've been on, I just -- I was screaming into my phone and you just couldn't hear me.
(Laughter)
MS. DETWILER: Okay. Well, thank you. And thank everybody for their patience as we once,
again, try to work through the difficulties of having
these meetings by teleconference and getting everybody
to call in and having the right number available for
everybody and waiting in line as we work through
getting people into the listening and speaking rooms.
So thank you everybody, again, for your patience.

And, Mr. Chair, we do have a quorum of
Board members so I'd turn it over to you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. Good
morning everybody. Thank you, Sue, for that. Thank
you for everybody taking the time to call in this
morning. This is Anthony Christianson, Board Chair,
for the Federal Subsistence Program. And today we're
starting the Federal Subsistence Board work session on
February 1st and 2nd, 2022. And at this time, again,
I'd just like to say Happy new Year to all of you and
we'll bless this meeting we have and hope that we all
come together with intention and pure hearts and get
through this agenda with accomplishing what we set to
accomplish today.

So moving forward, I'll go ahead and
open up the floor at this time to review and adopt the
agenda.

MS. DETWILER: Mr. Chair. Did you want
me to go through the agenda.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Sue, that
would be fine. Go ahead and review it and then we'll
move on to review and comment. Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. Thank you.
Following adoption of the agenda the current agenda
that we have calls for the next item to be information
exchange.

Following that would be Board
recommendations on the 2022 Fisheries Resource
Monitoring Plan, that is an action item.

Next item, Item 4, would be
presentation and Board action on individual customary
and traditional use request, ICTP21-02 pertaining to
salmon in the Batzulnetas area of the Copper River
Drainage, Prince William Sound, area within Wrangell-
St.-Elias National Park, that's an action item.
Next item is informational item, update on deferred Wildlife Special Action Request WSA21-01, which is a proposal from the Northwest Arctic Regional Advisory Council requesting a temporary closure to caribou and moose hunting by non-Federally-qualified users in Units 23 and 26A.

Next agenda item is informational, it's an update on review of the annual report reply process.

And then Item 7 is also informational Federal Subsistence Management Program budget briefing.

And that's the final item before adjournment, which is Item 8.

That's all I have, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue.

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Charlie.

MR. BROWER: Move to approve the agenda.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion been made to approve the agenda, do I hear a second.

MS. PITKA: This is Rhonda, I'll second it,

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Second. Any discussion; additions, deletions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none -- are there any additions or deletions to the agenda?

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right. We'll call for the question.

MR. BROWER: Question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been
called. All in favor to accept the agenda as presented for the Federal Subsistence Board work session, February 1st and 2nd, 2022, please say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Opposed, same sign.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion carries, unanimous. Thank you. We'll go on to information exchange, and at this time we'll go ahead and open up the floor. This is a time where Board members and key Staff can share information about what's important to the program and, again, a little time for us to just T off with where we're at, and all that with our programs. And, so at this time we'll go ahead and open up the floor for information exchange between the Board members and key Staff. Thank you.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chair, Dave Schmid.

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

MR. SCHMID: Yeah, good morning, Mr. Chair and other Board members. Just an update here from the Forest Service and primarily affects Southeast Alaska.

I just share that last summer, in July, the Secretary of Agriculture, Vilsack, announced a new strategy here for Southeast Alaska, it's called SASS, the Southeast Alaska Sustainability Strategy, and there were four parts of that. The first part was a repeal -- actually it was a proposal to restore the roadless protections to the Tongass from the 1920 -- or 2020 Rule. That had an open comment period, it ended just last week and we'll be moving forward with that rule and parts of -- that rule as well. The other parts were to end large scale old growth logging on the Tongass, as well as increasing our tribal consultation here with tribes across Southeast and what most folks were interested in, was also an economic investment of $25 Million into programs here to help add capacity and
strengthen the economy in Southeast. And so those are all coming forward here. I know these were all very important issues for the Southeast RAC here and subsistence and a number of the rural communities that were looking for community use of resources and especially access to subsistence uses, so that's happening.

I just wanted to share that with folks today, Mr. Chair, thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Dave. Always good to hear you and thank you for all that good information and it's good to hear that, you know, through all of our works that we had to get through here in Southeast and that stuff, that out comes a positive outcome and more opportunity for us to continue to work together. So thank you for all your leadership.

Anyone else.

MS. CREACHBAUM: Mr. Chair, this is Sara Creachbaum.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Sara, welcome, you have the floor.

MS. CREACHBAUM: Thank you. I thought I would take this opportunity just to introduce myself. I've been sitting in this chair a scant week now so brand new. Not the first time in Alaska for me and I'm happy to be back. I'm a 30 year Veteran of Federal service, about 10 years with the Forest Service, and the remaining with the National Park Service, and subsistence is an issue that is dear to my heart and I'm really excited to be part of the Board, and just wanted to say thank you for Chairing the meeting and to say hello to everyone.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Well, thank you, and welcome aboard and welcome back to Alaska. I know people who come here and work here always want to come back and so welcome back and welcome to the Board. Look forward to working with you today.

MS. CREACHBAUM: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other
information, the floor is open.

MR. HEINLEIN: Good morning, Mr. Chair. This is Tom Heinlein with the BLM.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hi, Tom, welcome aboard, you have the floor.

MR. HEINLEIN: Thank you. Just a quick update from BLM. I have not met several of you. I've been the Acting State Director for BLM Alaska since August, that's likely to continue for a little while. Upon the departure of Chad Padgett as our State Director, I took over in an acting capacity. The BLM is actively working to hire the next permanent State Director for BLM Alaska. I do not have a timeframe. I'm hopeful that can be accomplished by the summer but, again, I don't have a specific timeframe. For those of you -- I do know several of you. For those of you who don't know me, normally I am the Anchorage District Manager for the BLM.

Thank you. Looking forward to the meeting.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Tom. Welcome aboard and look forward to working with you today.

Any other Board who would like to share information or give us an update, the floor is open.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing no further Board information, information exchange, I would just like to say, again, welcome aboard to the new Board members and good to hear voices of our old Board members on here and look forward to a productive day working and so we'll go ahead and just again call on Sue to work through the agenda as we work forward through this work session. I'll lean on Sue to go ahead and keep us in the order of the business and I'll entertain people as we go forward being recognized. So thank you all for, again, joining the meeting today. We'll move on to No. 3, recommendations for the 2022 Fishery Resources Monitoring Plan, and I'll just go ahead and turn it over to Sue to call on her Staff and explain where we are in the agenda.
Thank you, Sue.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you, Mr. Chair. And I apologize, I was waiting for the Board members to finish their updates, and I did have a couple of updates from OSM if you wouldn't mind me.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, you have the floor.

MS. DETWILER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, you have the floor.

MS. DETWILER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you very much. And I just had two things. One is just some updates to our OSM Staffing and then I wanted to just mention two upcoming Board meetings we have scheduled.

We have, since the -- since you -- since the Board last met in August of 2021 we have had some pretty significant Staffing changes. Fortunately adding Staff, some very good Staff to our office and I just wanted to sort of highlight some of those changes.

On our administrative team, Sherri Gould-Fehrs has stepped up and has been temporarily promoted to OSM's executive secretary position, while we work on filling that position permanently.

We lost Catherine Avery, who was our administrative assistant. And then we lost another administrative assistant who was with us for a very short time named Ricky (Indiscernible), and so we're currently in the hiring process to fill those two admin team positions.

In the Anthropology Department, we're very happy to welcome Liz Williams back to OSM. She worked with OSM about 12 years ago and she is returning as an anthropologist this month. She started January 2nd. And also in anthropology we're very glad to welcome Jason Roberts as an anthropologist, he started January 17th and he is coming to us from BIA in
Billings, Montana.

In Council Coordination we had three vacancies left by the departures of Donald Mike, and Zach Stevenson and also by the promotion of Katya to the supervisor of that Division, and so we're very much looking forward -- we have -- we're in the process of finalizing the hires of three new Council Coordinators and we expect those three new coordinators to be onboard in mid-February to mid-March.

In the Fisheries Division, we want to welcome back Scott Ayers. He left us a little bit more than a year ago and he left his fisheries biologist position, he has just recently come back now as the Fisheries Division Supervisor. And we are also in the final stages of hiring two new fisheries biologist who we expect to come onboard in mid-February to mid-March.

And, finally, in Staffing, in the Regulatory Division, Caron McKee, who was our outreach coordinator took a position with the National Park Service and so Kayla McKinney, who is our Administrative Records Specialist has stepped up as the Acting Outreach Coordinator while we're working on filling that position permanently.

So those are the Staffing changes.

I also wanted to mention two upcoming Board meetings.

The first one is March 30th from 1:00 to 4:00 p.m., and that will be take action on deferred Special Action Request WSA21-01, which is the proposal was -- or a Special Action Request that was submitted by the Northwest Arctic Regional Advisory Council and it requested a temporary closure to caribou and moose hunting by non-Federally-qualified users in Units 23 and 26A. That Board meeting will be held by teleconference.

And, similarly, April 12th to the 15th is the Board meeting to act on proposals for the 2022 to 2024 wildlife regulations and that meeting also will be held by teleconference.

So thank you for letting me get that in there, Mr. Chair. And with your approval I will just
hand it off to Item No. 3 on the Board's agenda, which is recommendations on the 2022 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Plan. That will be led by Scott Ayers and Brent Vickers.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, thank you, Sue. And welcome back, Scott, and look forward to the presentation.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hey, welcome back partner, it's good to hear you Gene; you got the floor.

MR. PELTOLA: I just wanted to let you know I was online and I apologize for my tardiness this morning, I had a VCC that ran late.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Before we do get started we did have an opportunity for information exchange and before we jump into recommendations and work here, I'd offer you the floor if you had any updates or want to express any information or share there, Gene.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just have a couple items to bring to everybody's attention.

One, is that we have a subsistence employee that'll be retiring this coming year, who has been very supportive of the Program, not only at the BIA, but also in positions prior. I will not mention a name, I'll leave it up to the individual to do that.

So we'll be, later on, this -- probably early summer recruiting for that, but prior to that position the Bureau of Indian Affairs will be advertising an additional subsistence position and it will be run either as a 401 Fish and Wildlife administrative or anthropologist, and that'd be, I believe, at the 12/13 level for that new position. So anybody who may be interested, look forward to that, and we're pleased, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, to be able to beef up our Subsistence Program just a little bit here using our existing funds.

And that's the only announcements I
had, Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Gene. And congratulations to who's retiring and look forward to picking up some new people there so thank you.

I'll turn it back over to you, Sue, you have the floor.

MS. DETWILER: Yep, I believe Scott Ayers was going to kick off the item on the FRMP.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Welcome aboard, Scott.

MR. AYERS: Good morning, Mr. Chair, this is Scott. Can you hear me clearly?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Got you loud and clear, man.

MR. AYERS: Excellent. Well, I wanted to say good morning to you and the rest of the Board members. And, again, for the record my name is Scott Ayers and I'm the Fisheries Division Supervisor for the Office of Subsistence Management.

MR. VICKERS: Good morning, Mr. Chair. Members of the Board. My name is Brent Vickers. And I'm the Anthropology Supervisor for the Office of Management. Can everyone hear me clearly?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Welcome aboard. We got you loud and clear partner.

MR. VICKERS: Thank you.

MR. AYERS: Okay. So today we're going to provide you information about the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program and the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Plan within that Program. Following our presentation on the Monitoring Plan and a period for questions we'd appreciate your recommendation on the plan.

The Monitoring Plan is in your books for this meeting. The book, as well as the slides that we're talking about today are all available on the OSM
When the Federal Government assumed responsibility for management on Federal public lands, the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture made a commitment to increase the quality and quantity of information available for management of subsistence fisheries on Federal public land. The Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program was created in the year 2000. This Program was to identify and provide information needed to sustain subsistence fisheries on Federal public lands.

The Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program is organized around six regions that correspond to fish, stock, harvest and community issues held in common within an area. These are Northern, Yukon, Kuskokwim, Southwest, Southcentral and Southeast regions.

One of the main functions of the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program is to develop the biennial Monitoring Plan. This plan consists of fisheries research and monitoring projects that provide information to manage subsistence fisheries on Federal public lands. The Monitoring Plan funds projects across the six regions and includes projects administered by the Federal and State government, rural Alaska organizations, non-profits and universities. When a project spans more than one region it is considered multi-regional.

Projects submitted to the program are reviewed and scored on their technical merits by the Technical Review Committee. The Technical Review Committee members are the only ones that see the complete project proposal. Executive summaries of the proposals are then reviewed by the Regional Advisory Councils, who offer comments on the proposals relative to important regional subsistence issues within their respective regions. The InterAgency Staff Committee then provides comments concerning the projects and the draft monitoring plan. Today we're here to ask you, the Board, to provide your comments and recommendations on the plan. The last step in this process will be for the Assistant Regional Director for OSM to make a final determination based on available funding.

The Technical Review Committee, who we
mentioned first reviews and scores the completed project proposals is foundational to ensuring the credibility and scientific integrity of the proposed evaluation process. The Technical Review Committee consists of senior technical experts from Federal and State agencies. The Office of Subsistence Management's ARD makes the Technical Review Committee appointments. The Committee is composed of members from the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Forest Service and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Two Office of Subsistence Management Staff members act as co-Chairs to facilitate the project review process. The Technical Review Committee reviews and scores every submitted proposal. They're committed to an inter-disciplinary approach and strive for a 50/50 split between biologists and anthropologists.

Some of the program's major policies and funding guidelines are outlined on this slide.

First, projects may be funded up to four years.

Second, studies shouldn't duplicate existing research.

Third, monitoring plan funding is prioritized for non-Federal agencies.

And, last, long-term projects are considered on a case by case basis.

There's some activities that are not eligible for funding through this program. This includes projects that focus on habitat protection, mitigation, restoration and enhancement. Projects that focus on hatchery propagation, restoration, enhancement and supplementation. Project for contaminant assessment, evaluation and monitoring. And projects in which the primary objective is outreach or education such as science camp, technical training or intern programs. It was determined at the initiation of this program that there were other agency programs that specifically addressed these types of activities and, therefore, was not necessary for them to be eligible here.

Five criteria are used for evaluation
of the projects by the Technical Review Committee.

First criterion is that the projects be a strategic priority, meaning that the study must have a Federal nexus and be responsive to identified issues and priority information needs.

The second criterion is the technical quality in the study. The project design must meet acceptable standards for information collection, analysis and reporting.

The third criterion is the investigator ability and resources. Investigators must show they are capable of successfully completing the proposed study.

The fourth criterion is partnership and capacity building. ANILCA, Title VIII mandates that rural residents be afforded a meaningful role in management of subsistence fisheries. The Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program offers that opportunity for partnership and participation of residents in the monitoring research.

The final criterion is the cost benefit of the project. The cost of the plan study must be reasonable for the intended outcome.

There is also a set of general budget guidelines for the geographic regions. These guidelines provide an initial target for planning, however, they are not final allocations and are adjusted annually, as needed, to ensure quality projects are funded. The target split of Department of Interior funding is 17 percent Northern region, 29 percent Yukon region, 29 percent Kuskokwim region, 15 percent Southwest region, 5 percent Southcentral region, and 5 percent multi-regional. Department of Agriculture funding targets are 32.5 percent Southcentral region, 62.5 percent Southeast region, and 5 percent multi-regional.

MR. VICKERS: Hello, this is Brent Vickers again. This brings us to your 2022 Draft Monitoring Plan. In this call for proposals 43 projects were submitted for consideration. If all were funded this would be at an annual cost of around 17 million. Of the proposals, the Technical Review
Committee has recommended 37 projects were worthy of funding. The executive summaries for all submitted projects, as well as comments from the Regional Advisory Councils and the InterAgency Staff Committee are all included in the Draft Monitoring Plan. The next step -- the next set of slides lists those projects by region that are recommended for funding and that fit within the anticipated funding available. We are not going to speak about individual projects unless there are specific questions, in which case OSM Staff would be able to answer at the end of the presentation.

These projects are all identified in Table 7 on Page 114 of your books.

The Northern region projects consist of:

1. Kotzebue Sound sheefish describing coastal movement, temperature preference and potential range expansion.
2. Unalakleet River chinook salmon escapement assessment continuation.
4. Traditional ecological knowledge of salmon in the river drainages of Kotzebue Sound.

The Yukon Region projects consist of:
1. Eastfork Andreafsky River weir chinook and summer chum salmon abundance and run timing assessment.
2. Gisasa River weir chinook and summer chum salmon abundance and run timing assessment.
3. Western Alaska coho salmon genetic baseline development.
5. Humpback whitefish and other non-salmon fishes traditional ecological knowledge and
biological sampling in Upper Koyukuk region.

The Kuskokwim projects consist of:

1. Takotna River weir salmon run timing and abundance.

2. Kuskokwim River broad whitefish subsistence harvest and spawning abundance.

3. George River salmon weir.

4. Bethel subsistence harvest surveys.

5. Kuskokwim Management Area post-season subsistence salmon harvest survey.

6. Local and traditional knowledge of salmon harvest and use for subsistence in the Lower Kuskokwim River drainage.

7. Natural indicators of salmon in the Upper Kuskokwim River.


The Southwest Region projects consist of:


2. Chignik River subsistence surveys and escaping indexing.

3. False Pass and Nelson Lagoon subsistence harvest monitoring and traditional ecological knowledge investigation.

4. Subsistence harvest and uses of salmon and other wild resources in Manokotak Alaska.

5. Reliable estimates of subsistence harvest and uses in Ouzinkie and Port Lions.

The Southcentral Region projects consist of:
1. Copper River chinook salmon in-river abundance.

The Southeast Region projects consist of:

1. Hetta Lake sockeye salmon stock assessment.


5. Northern Southeast Alaska eulachon population dynamics monitoring.

6. Updating Icy Strait community household subsistence harvest surveys and documenting subsistence harvest patterns.


In the year 2022 the anticipated funding available for new projects is approximately $2.6 million by the Department of Interior and approximately $800,000 by the Department of Agriculture for a total of around $3.4 million. This slide, which is also summarized in Table 8 on Page 118 of your books shows that the expected percentage of funding by region in comparison to the suggested guidelines for both Department of Interior and Department of Agriculture. The percentage of funding is close to the suggested guidelines for most regions.

Final project recommended by the 2022 Monitoring Plan would provide a mix of project type across the state. The table I am showing on this slide identifies the amount of funding by region spent in the harvest monitoring, traditional ecological knowledge type projects versus stock, status and trends type projects. This information is also displayed on Table 8 of your books under the columns labeled HMTEK and SST. The split between these two categories of
research is about 30 percent for HMTEK and 70 percent for SST projects.

The final slide shows the anticipated funding levels for this year for Department of Interior and Department of Agriculture which give us a total estimate for the year 2022 of around $3.4 million. You'll note that the average annual cost changes for 2023, 2024, and 2025. This is because investigators requested different levels of funding for each year of the projects.

This ends our presentation. We are happy to take any questions from the Board.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Staff, that was a good presentation. Appreciate the information. I'll open the floor at this time for any questions from the Board to Staff as they presented the Monitoring Plan.

(NO COMMENTS)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing none, we've received the recommendations on the 2022 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Plan. I think at this time, do we open the floor, Sue, I believe, to accept the recommendations from the Staff Committee and the Staff has presented in the summarization we did just get as far as the recommendations for the Fishery Program -- I believe now we would open up and entertain.....

MS. DETWILER: A motion, yes.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: .....a motion, Sue, yes, thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So the floor is open to accept the information as presented from the Staff for the Fishery Monitoring Program 2022 Resource Monitoring Plan.

MS. COGSWELL: Mr. Chair, this is Karen Cogswell.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Karen, you have
the floor.

MS. COGSWELL: I'd like to move that the Board accept the recommendations for funding for the 2022 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Plan based on the Technical Review Committee ranking, the Regional Advisory Council comments and the InterAgency Staff Committee comments.

MR. BROWER: Second.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Karen, for that thorough motion there. Thank you for the second. The floor is open for discussion, any further Board discussion, questions, or deliberation.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the question.

MR. SCHMID: Question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Since it requires -- there's money involved, Sue, we'll just go ahead and do a roll call at this time.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you, Mr. Chair. Start with Karen Cogswell.

(No comments)

MS. DETWILER: The motion is to accept the recommendation and so the -- the vote would be yes or no.

MS. COGSWELL: Yep, sorry, I thought my mute was off -- yes.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

BIA, Gene Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: BIA votes yea.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

National Park Service, Sara Creachbaum.
MS. CREACHBAUM: Yes.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

BLM, Thomas Heinlein.

MR. HEINLEIN: Yes.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

MR. SCHMID: Yes, Forest Service supports the motion.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: Yes, I support the motion.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Public Member Charles Brower.

MR. BROWER: Eee, yes.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

And, finally, Chair, Mr. Anthony Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support as presented by the Committee and Staff. Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Motion passes unanimously.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Cool, thank you, Sue. And thank you to the Staff for all the hard work that goes into these, the ISC committee members and all the people that pour over these, look at them and, again, rank them the way they do and work over them and find all the good attributes to each project and elevate them up and just thank you guys for all the diligence that goes into that.

We'll go ahead and move on to the
presentation and act on individual C&T request, Sue, I'll turn that over to you.

MS. DETWILER: Yes. I believe that's Barb Cellarius from National Park Service presenting this agenda item.

MS. CELLARIUS: Good morning, Mr. Chair. Members of the Board. Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Can hear you loud and clear, you have the floor.

MS. CELLARIUS: Great. Thank you. My name -- for the record my name is Barbara Cellarius and I'm the subsistence coordinator for Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve. Today I'll be presenting an overview of the analysis for individual customary and traditional use determination Proposal, ICTP21-02. The written analysis begins on numbered Page 119 of your meeting book and that's Page No. 123 of the PDF file.

Federal Subsistence regulations allow the Board to make individual customary and traditional use determinations in NPS managed National Parks and National Monuments where subsistence is authorized. The Board revised its policy on individual customary and traditional use determinations at its January 2021 meeting. Under the new policy proposals may be submitted at any time and the Board will act on the request at the first public meeting following receipt of the recommendations from the affected Regional Advisory Councils.....

(Teleconference interference - participants not muted)

MS. CELLARIUS: .....submission.

On March 9th, 2021 the Park received a request from Kathryn Martin for an individual customary and traditional use determination for salmon in the Batzulnetas area which is defined as waters of the Copper River and Tanada Creek between National Park Service regulatory markers. The map on Page 121 of the meeting book shows the location of Batzulnetas off of the Nabesna Road in the northwestern corner of Wrangell-St. Elias National Park.
Analysis of customary and traditional use requests, C&T for short, considers the so-called eight factors, although the factors are treated holistically rather than being a checklist. This applies to individual C&T requests as well as to those for communities and areas. The analysis that follows addresses these factors.

Kathryn Martin is the granddaughter of subsistence rights advocate Katie John and Batzulnetas is the site of her grandmother's traditional fish camp at the headwaters of the Copper River. Kathryn grew up in Mentasta Lake Village which has a C&T determination for salmon in the Batzulnetas area and she began harvesting resources at Batzulnetas in 1992. In 2005 she moved away from Mentasta for employment and consequently lost her eligibility to fish for salmon at Batzulnetas under Federal regulation. She now lives in Tazlina, which is a rural community on the Copper River and a resident zone community for Wrangell-St. Elias but it doesn't have C&T for salmon at Batzulnetas.

If approved, this individual C&T would allow Kathryn to resume harvesting salmon at the traditional site where her family has fished for generations.

Batzulnetas is an important traditional salmon fishing site at the headwaters of the Copper River. The area was occupied until the 1940 when the occupants relocated so that their children could attend school but they continued to fish at Batzulnetas. Kathryn Martin's family has fished for salmon and harvested other subsistence resources at Batzulnetas for many generations. Their ability to fish at this site was disrupted by a State of Alaska regulation that went into effect in 1964 prohibiting subsistence fishing on the Copper River tributaries and on the mainstem of the river above the mouth of the Slana River. Fishing subsequently resumed following a series of lawsuits in which Kathryn's grandmother, Katie John, was the lead plaintiff. Salmon are harvested at Batzulnetas using fishwheel and dipnet, subsistence harvest methods characterized by efficiency and economy of effort. In addition to fishing for salmon, Ms. Martin has harvested moose, berries, firewood, roots and steam bath rocks in the Batzulnetas area. Ms. Martin preserves salmon by drying, jarring, and freezing and she shares with family members who aren't
able to harvest or preserve salmon themselves. She
learned fishing skills and values from her
grandparents, Katie and Fred John, her Aunt Ruth Hicks
and her great uncle Houston Sanford and she shares her
knowledge with family as well as others by taking them
with her to harvest, process and put away the fish. An
important venue for sharing knowledge is the annual
Batzulnetas Culture Camp.

If adopted, this proposal would recognize Kathryn Martin's customary and traditional
use of salmon at Batzulnetas and allow her to resume fishing at a site where her family has fished for
generations.

Because this C&T determination is for a single individual with a history of salmon harvest in the area, the effects on other users should be minimal.

The NPS preliminary conclusion is listed on Page 127 of the meeting book. It is to support ICTP21-02. Ms. Martin exhibits a long-term pattern of use of salmon at Batzulnetas. This pattern has been repeated for many years and through several generations. Methods and means of harvest are characterized by efficiency and economy of effort. Knowledge of handling, preparing and preserving salmon is shared among and between generations. Salmon is regularly shared. The eight factors associated with customary and traditional uses are evident. For these reasons there is substantial evidence to support granting the applicant the requested individual customary and traditional use determination.

Although formal tribal consultation is not required for individual C&Ts, I did reach out to the Federally-recognized tribal governments for Mentasta and Dot Lake, those are the two communities that have C&T for salmon at Batzulnetas and both replied that they had no concerns with it.

And, with that, I would be happy to answer any questions. Thank you, Mr. Chair and Board members.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that, and thank you for the presentation. Is there any Board members that would like to ask any questions.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, hearing none, we'll give Kathryn Martins, the proponent, to go ahead and have an opportunity at this time to speak.

MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chair, I believe Kathryn Martin is on the phone but I don't know if she needs to get let into the speaker's room.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that. Operator, if you can see if Kathryn is available and open her line, thank you.

(Pause)

REPORTER: Hello.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hello, is that you Kathryn?

REPORTER: No, I'm sorry, this is Tina. I didn't hear anything, I thought I got dropped. Sorry, Tony.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, hi, Tina.

REPORTER: Hi.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: It's good to hear your voice. We're just waiting for Kathryn to get on and wait for the operator to open her line, thank you.

REPORTER: Okay.

MS. CELLARIUS: And, Mr. Chair, we also have recommendations from the RACs and the SRC when you're ready for those.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes. We'll take those two up following Kathryn, thank you.

OPERATOR: This is the Operator, Kathryn, if you would either like press star-zero, so I can find your line so I can open it.

(Pause)
OPERATOR: All right, Kathryn, your line is open.

MS. MARTIN: Thank you. Good morning, this is Kathryn Martin, can you guys hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Good morning, Kathryn, welcome, yes, we can hear you, you have the floor.

MS. MARTIN: Thank you. I just want to say I hope the Board would support this proposal. I've been fishing at Batzulnetas pretty much ever since we were able to start fishing there. I lived in Mentasta at that time and as Barbara mentioned I moved in 2005. I still go back to Batzulnetas every year for our annual cultural camp that we have and the last two years, the first year due to Covid it was cancelled, but my kids all being adults now said, mom, you know, we always go back to Batzulnetas and so we ended up going back ourselves and just camped out. We weren't able to operate the fishwheel at the time because I -- you know, we don't have the use and only my one daughter is eligible right now because she's living in Mentasta and then, you know, last year we -- they were planning to do Culture Camp again and it got cancelled but some of us had taken time off of work and they said, well, if you guys want to still go up, you know, we'll provide the food and stuff so we went up again. But I've gone back every year to Batzulnetas. I've always gone there. And even when I've -- I'm not able to use the fishwheel, when they've gotten fish at Culture Camp, I've been teaching the kids how to cut fish, how to hang fish, how to preserve it, those types of things, and I just want to be able to go back there and be able to fish because that's what my grandma fought for.

And I do live in Tazlina, I do not have a wheel down in this area just due to respect. I know that, you know, there's other people that have family fish sites and we never had a fish site down in this area and I don't want to intrude on anybody's area to, you know, put a fishwheel in. I've used other people's wheels in the area by invitation and I greatly appreciate that. I just want to be able to go back to Batzulnetas, though, and be able to fish and get fish from the fishwheel.
And, with that, I'll stop my remarks.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Kathryn. Thank you for calling in. Any questions from the Board for Kathryn.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, appreciate that and look forward to hopefully supporting you today. We'll move on to the RAC and ISC [sic] recommendations.

MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the record this is DeAnna Perry, Coordinator for the Southcentral Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. I'm providing information on behalf of the Chair, Greg Encelewski.

This Council supported the individual customary and traditional use determination for Kathryn Martin for salmon in the Batzulnetas area of the Copper River drainage Prince William Sound. This Council's recommendation is found on Page 132 of your meeting books. The Council determined that based on the information presented, there was sufficient evidence to support this individual customary and traditional use determination. They noted that Ms. Martin has a long established use of this area which she learned from her grandmother, Katie John, and she continues those traditional practices today.

That concludes the recommendation of the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council.

Thank you.

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

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll move on to the ISC recommendation.

MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair, this is Katya Wessels. There is a recommendation from the Eastern
Interior Council as well.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor, Katya.

MS. WESSELS: Yes, thank you. For the record my name is Katya Wessels and I'm Council Coordination Division Supervisor. Today I am representing here Sue Entsminger for the Eastern Interior Subsistence Regional Advisory Council.

The Council reviewed this proposal and voted to support it because they think there is sufficient evidence to support an individual customary and traditional use determination for Kathryn Martin for salmon in the Batzulnetas area. The Council, by unanimous consent supports granting Kathryn Martin an individual customary and traditional use determination for salmon in the Batzulnetas area of the Copper River drainage Prince William Sound area. The Council Chair has known Mrs. Martin for many years and has shared her personal knowledge of Mrs. Martin being a true subsistence user following the traditional ways. Other Council members noting, supporting these determinations would keep the old traditional ways alive.

This concludes the Eastern Interior Council recommendation.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Katya. Any questions for Katya.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Hearing none, we'll move on.

MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have the floor.

MS. CELLARIUS: This is Barbara Cellarius again. I had a recommendation from the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park Subsistence Resource Commission to share.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have the floor, thank you.

MS. CELLARIUS: The SRC has determined that there is sufficient evidence to support an individual customary and traditional use determination for Kathryn Martin for salmon at Batzulnetas. They noted that Kathryn Martin has long-term customary and traditional use of the area and her family's history of using the area goes back thousands of years. Kathryn practices traditional ways of processing and preserving salmon and shares what she knows with her children and others.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Thank you to the Wrangell-St. Elias group. We'll go ahead and move on, with no questions from the Board, we'll go on to Board discussion on C&T individual request, ICTP21-02 for Kathryn here, so we'll just open up the floor for Board discussion, questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Good presentation from Staff. Thank you for all the recommendations. At this time, hearing no questions or further discussion I would open up the floor for the Board to take action in the form of a motion.

Thank you.

MS. CREACHBAUM: Mr. Chairman, this is Sara Creachbaum.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Sara, thank you, you have the floor.

MS. CREACHBAUM: Mr. Chair and Board members. The National Park Service moves to adopt ICTP21-02 to recognize an existing pattern of use of salmon in the Batzulnetas area between National Park Service regulatory markers and waters of the Copper River and Tanada Creek by Kathryn Martin as per the request outlined on Page 119 of our meeting books. Following a second, I'll be happy to explain why I support my motion.
MR. BROWER: Second.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Second's been made, you have the floor.

MS. CREACHBAUM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I intend to support my motion to grant Kathryn Martin an individual customary and traditional use determination for salmon in the Batzulnetas area consistent with the recommendations of the Eastern Interior and Southcentral Regional Advisory Councils and the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park Subsistence Resource Commission. The analysis presented strong and sufficient evidence regarding a long-standing pattern of salmon fishing by Kathryn Martin in the Batzulnetas area. Harvest methods are characterized by efficiency and economy of effort and both salmon and knowledge about how to process it are shared. All eight of the factors associated with determining customary and traditional uses are evident.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that good, thorough justification. Any other questions or deliberation from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll call for the question.

MR. BROWER: Question.

MR. PELTOLA: Question, BIA.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been called. All in favor of accepting the individual C&T request, ICTP21-02, please signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Opposed, same sign.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion carries unanimously. At this time I'm going to go ahead and
call for a five minute break. If everyone could just please stay online, I need to take a five minute break here and we will come back with an update on deferred Wildlife Special Action Request WSA21-01. So I want to take a five minute break.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hello, welcome back. I'm back. Sorry about that I needed to take a quick break. So when everybody comes back, Sue, we can go ahead and reconvene, thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. Do you want me to run through the Board members real quickly, Mr. Chair, just to make sure we have everybody back online?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, please, Sue.

MS. DETWILER: Oh, okay, thank you.

Park Service, Sara Creachbaum, are you there.

MS. CREACHBAUM: I am here, thank you, Sue.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Thomas Heinlein, BLM.

MR. HEINLEIN: I'm here, thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Karen Cogswell, Fish and Wildlife Service.

MS. COGSWELL: I'm here, Sue, thanks.

MS. DETWILER: Thanks.

Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

MR. SCHMID: I'm here, Sue, thanks.
MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Gene Peltola, BIA.


MS. DETWILER: Okay.

Rhonda Pitka, Public Member.

MS. PITKA: Here.

MS. DETWILER: Charles Brower, Public Member.

MR. BROWER: (In Native)

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

It looks like everybody's here, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

We'll go ahead and just get back to the agenda where we were. We were on an update on deferred Wildlife Special Action Request WSA21-01, Units 23 and 26A, caribou and moose, and so if we can get the update from Staff on that, Sue, I'll leave that up to you.

MS. DETWILER: That would be Hannah Voorhees.

MS. VOORHEES: Good morning, Mr. Chair and Members of the Board. This is Hannah Voorhees, Anthropologist with OSM. This is an informational update only.

Wildlife Special Action Request WSA21-01 requests closure of moose and caribou hunting to non-Federally-qualified users in Units 23 and 26A during August and September. The Northwest Arctic Regional Advisory Council originally submitted this request in February 2021 due to lack of caribou during the traditional harvest season. The Council expressed concern that non-local hunters and transporters are interfering with caribou migration. For moose, the closure request was submitted due to conservation concerns over declining local populations.
In June 2021 the Board deferred WSA21-01 to the 2022/2023 regulatory year and requested that the Office of Subsistence Management seek additional input on concerns related to caribou from multiple entities and stakeholders. These included, the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group, Federal land managing agencies, local Fish and Game Advisory Committees, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Regional Advisory Councils, commercial guides and transporters and subsistence users in the area. The Board also asked OSM Staff to include comparisons of moose harvest by survey area within Unit 23 in their analysis. For clarity and simplicity, the analysis has now been divided into WSA21-01(a) for caribou, and WSA21-01(b) for moose.

Next, I will give you a brief overview of OSM's outreach process as we followed up on the Board's request.

OSM held guided discussions on the special action request and concerns related to caribou with each of the four affected Regional Advisory Councils at their fall 2021 meetings. The executive committee of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group asked that OSM Staff speak directly to members to receive input. Staff spoke with 11 working group members who reside within the range of the Western Arctic herd and five members who do not reside within the range of the herd. Results were then compiled and sent out to all working group members prior to their December 2021 meeting. At that meeting the group voted on WSA21-01. Following deferral, OSM held two additional public hearings to seek input on the closure request and concerns related to caribou. Those took place on November 17th and December 2nd, 2021. Feedback from Federally-qualified subsistence users came from Council members, testimony received during public hearings, correspondence submitted during an earlier written comment period, Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group members and Subsistence Resource Commissions. Feedback from transporters and guides came from public hearings, Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group members and correspondence submitted during an earlier written comment period. In September, OSM hosted a discussion on WSA21-01 with the Federal land managing agencies to seek their feedback on this closure request and discuss data needs. A third round of tribal and ANCSA Corporation
consultations were held on January 27th. OSM reached out to State of Alaska Advisory Committees in affected regions through written correspondence during the course of this outreach. Following deferral, OSM and Interagency Staff Committee members engaged the Alaska Department of Fish and Game in discussion on this special action request. OSM Staff summarized feedback from all these groups and considered it as an existential component of the revised analysis. New data, such as an updated population estimate for the Western Arctic Caribou Herd were also included in the analysis.

In terms of development of the analysis for the closure request pertaining to moose, OSM submitted a request to ADF&G for more detailed data on Unit 23 moose harvest by survey area. ADF&G provided data on moose harvest by user group and drainage which is included in the revised analysis.

Part A and B analysis were reviewed by Team field members, the OSM Leadership Team and InterAgency Staff Committee members in December and January. On January 14th the revised analysis were finalized for the Regional Advisory Councils and are currently being distributed to Council members in preparation for their winter meetings. The revised analysis will be available on the OSM website before the winter 2022 Council meetings.

In February and March, the Northwest Arctic, North Slope, Western Interior and Seward Peninsula Councils will have the opportunity to make a recommendation on the revised analysis.

The Board meeting on deferred Wildlife Special Action WSA21-01(a) and (b) is scheduled for March 30th at 1:00 p.m., via teleconference. The meeting will be open for the public to listen in and a news release will announce the call-in information.

Thank you. That concludes my update on WSA21-01. I would be happy to answer any questions and my colleague Lisa Grediagin is also available if needed.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions from the Board on the update.
MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

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

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good morning. Appreciate that summary. One question I raised when the Board voted to push back this proposal until later on this spring, is that we had a verbal report from the land management agencies about the efforts put in to permitting on impacted lands and I was wondering -- and in reference to the Section .810 requirements of issuing permits, and I was wondering if OSM has looked at those from the impacted land management agencies as part of the evaluation of this proposal.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MS. VOORHEES: Thank you. Through the Chair, this is Hannah. We have met to discuss this with Federal land managing agencies. I know that the way this is done has been a matter of discussion internally but we have not been given access to the whole scope of that process.

MR. PELTOLA: Okay, thank you appreciate it. Thank you, Mr. Chair, for the opportunity.

MS. PITKA: This is Rhonda, hi.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hello, Rhonda, you have the floor.

MS. PITKA: Yeah, so I was wondering, how was the caribou harvest this year, do we have any updates on that? Because I thought part of the reason to defer was what Gene said, but also that the harvest would be increasing on State lands, so do we have any data on the actual harvest for that area?

MS. VOORHEES: Thank you for that question. The pattern this year appears to have repeated the previous several years. There were -- for example, in Unit 23, there were few caribou available
locally around Kotzebue and none around Noorvik. Let's see, in Kiana, the community was able to hunt but only very late, immediately before freeze-up set in. In Selawik, people have not been able to put nearly enough, if any caribou in their freezers for the last several years. Shungnak reported extremely late harvest. Buckland has expressed extreme hardship with getting caribou -- with getting caribou in 2021.

So the picture was a little bit better in Unit 26A where caribou have been relatively abundant and available.

But in Unit 23 the hardship has certainly continued based on the feedback we have received.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any other questions for Staff from the Board, thank you, Rhonda.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, thank you, hearing no other, thank you on that deferred and we'll be taking this up later. Any additional questions, or hearing no other comments we'll go ahead and move on to update on annual report reply process and review.

MS. PITKA: This is Rhonda, sorry, I have a question really quick.

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

MS. PITKA: You mentioned taking this up later, when will we be taking it up?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I think at the.....

MS. VOORHEES: Through the Chair, this is.....

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, go ahead, Staff.

MS. VOORHEES: Thank you. This is
Hannah. This is scheduled to be taken up on March 30th from 1:00 to 4:00 p.m.

MS. PITKA: And that's when we'll also be getting public testimony at that time, and a summary of all the tribal consultations?

MS. VOORHEES: So the compilation of all the feedback, including tribal consultation will be coming to the Board two weeks prior to that meeting and the analysis, and, yes, public testimony will be compiled there -- I am unsure of the Board's plan for accepting any public testimony on March 30th, but my understanding was it may just be a listen in session for public -- for members of the public.

Thank you.

MS. PITKA: Thank you very much for that answer, I appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other questions for Staff, any comments from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, thank you for that. Update -- we'll move on to update on annual report reply process review.

MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair and Members of the Board. For the record my name is Robbin LaVine and I'm the Subsistence Policy Coordinator for OSM. The meeting materials for this agenda item begin on Page 135 of your Board book and this is not an action item.

During the Federal Subsistence Board's August 2021 work session the InterAgency Staff Committee briefed the Board on the annual report reply process and possible revisions to improve workload efficiency and response to Regional Advisory Council concerns.

As you are aware, ANILCA, Section .805 authorizes the Councils to prepare an annual report to the Board containing information related to important subsistence resource issues within their region and these reports are invaluable. With this knowledge, the
Board can make informed decisions. Historically the Board has strived to provide responses to every topic listed in annual reports, regardless of its authority to address the issues raised, however, it is unclear if Board responses on all annual report topics are helpful to the Councils, while taking considerable Staff time to complete and Section .805 does not require replies to these reports.

The ISC has suggested process revisions.

One would be consider annual reports to serve solely as a means to inform the Board of local conditions, issues and needs; and, two, a proposed letter writing as a way to request Board response on any topics of concern.

The Board reviewed and discussed report reply process in August and agreed to forward this topic to the Councils for their input on the suggested revisions, including possible ideas of their own, OSM Staff briefed the Councils on the suggested changes during the fall meeting cycle and prepared them to take action and provide input on the annual report reply process this winter meeting cycle. So we hope to brief you, the Board, on Council comments on your next work session.

Thank you.
I'm ready for any questions.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that. Any questions for Staff.

MS. PITKA: This is Rhonda again, sorry, for all the questions. So you mentioned our March -- wait, did you say the March meeting, that we will be taking this up in the March meeting or we'll be getting another update?

MS. LAVINE: Probably during the -- the March meeting -- so you have two meetings scheduled at the moment. The first is a meeting just to take action on Wildlife Special Action 21-01 and that's March 30th, and then following that meeting there is the wildlife regulatory session, which is April 12th through 15th. And both -- well, that agenda is pretty full, so we
might anticipate that you will take action on this agenda item during the summer work session. We haven't scheduled that yet but that might be, you know, some time in July or early August. That's also the time when the Board reviews the annual reports and confirms Board replies, it's a good time to review Council input during that session.

Thanks.

MS. PITKA: Okay. So this is -- sorry, this is Rhonda again. I have some concerns about it because I really want the Regional Advisory Councils to have that sort of flexibility in their annual report to the Board, that they can discuss anything that's not normally like an agenda topic in that report. I think that's an important part of the program so that's my concern about this particular review. I think it's an important part of the process and I would hate to see it go away.

Thank you.

MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Council Member Pitka. This is Robbin. And, through the Chair, I would agree with you. And I think, you know, as has been noted, both in my briefing and in the briefing document in your Board book, we recognize how critically important these reports are to ensure that you are informed on all things that impact our regions and their subsistence way of life. This review has -- is in no way intending to change that reporting process. We continue to value it. It's about ensuring that we know, from the Councils as well, what they feel is -- would be the most responsive way to both acknowledge their expertise and to respond to those critical issues in a way that's useful.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Robbin. Thank you, Rhonda, for those good questions. Any other questions from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Discussion.

(No comments)
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Appreciate the effort, and thank you for those reports. And, again, it is good to get the entirety of every situation and what affects -- what's happening on the ground in rural Alaska that affects our subsistence way of life. So I always encourage and like to see that information myself because it gives a broader picture of the impacts that do end up on our Board agenda items and we do have to discuss them and figure out a path and the replies because those replies give direction to the rural members and then they find other relationships they can build that can help strengthen their subsistence base in rural Alaska as well. So thank you guys for those replies and all the work that goes into it because it leads people down the path to an answer to the questions that they have so thank you for that.

We'll go ahead, any other discussion.

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Charlie.

MR. BROWER: Just concern, you stated that the only way the Council report and recommendations could be changed to process how the Board responds to the Council, how would that be done to proceed. Just a question, thank you.

MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Charlie, this is Robbin. Through the Chair. Per the Board direction during your work session, we are taking these suggested process revisions to the Councils and we're looking to have a guided discussion with all 10 Councils on this -- the report reply process. Again, asserting how critically important the reports are to informing the Board and Board action on many things. And really we're looking at Council feedback on these suggested revisions and then Board discussion on this during our next work session in the summer.

Thank you, Mr. Chair and Council Member Brower.

MR. BROWER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Charlie. Thank you, Robbin. Any other questions or
discussions from the Board, update on annual report reply process.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. That takes us to No. 7, Federal Subsistence Management Program budget briefing and so I'll turn that over to you, Sue.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'll kick this item off and I also want to note that the briefing document that we will be working from is also online on the Board's web page along with the other materials for this meeting.

So by way of background, the Board asked Staff to prepare a report providing an overview of the Federal Subsistence Program budget. The main purpose of this report is to provide the Board with information from each of the Federal agencies on the Board, describing their subsistence-related budgets and how those budgets are allocated within their agencies for the purposes of implementing Title VIII of ANILCA. The report includes separate individual reports from each agency. When you look at the document you can see the formats for each agency are different. As we go through the presentation here, each InterAgency Staff Committee will present their own agency's budget. We'll start with Jill Klein who will do an overview of the Fish and Wildlife Service overall subsistence budget, and then I will present the OSM portion of the Fish and Wildlife Service budget, and then the InterAgency Staff Committee members from the Park Service, BLM, BIA and the Forest Service will each present their respective agency budgets.

When the Board has previously discussed the Federal Subsistence budget they have also raised issues such as whether the budget is adequate to meet current Subsistence Program needs, whether expenditures are appropriately aligned with Federal Subsistence Management Program priorities, and whether current Federal Subsistence Management priorities should be evaluated and modified, and, if so, what would be the budgetary needs to address those priorities. So Pat Petrivelli from BIA has gone back through budget-related concerns that the Regional Advisory Councils have brought up in previous Council reports and
recommendations and she'll present that information after the agencies are finished presenting their individual reports. Pat's memo to the Board is located at the end of the budget document.

And, so, with that, I will turn it over to Jill Klein, the Fish and Wildlife Service ISC member to begin the Fish and Wildlife Service part of the presentation.

MS. KLEIN: Hi, Sue, this is Jill. I just want to check that you can hear me?

MS. DETWILER: yes.

MS. KLEIN: Okay, great. All right. Good after -- or good morning everybody. My name is Jill Klein, as Sue mentioned, and I am the Regional Subsistence Coordinator for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and also as Sue mentioned I participate on the InterAgency Staff Committee. I'm going to give an overview of the subsistence appropriations for the Alaska region of the Service. And just for your reference, I will refer to either the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as the Fish and Wildlife and/or the Service throughout my presentation.

I am first going to share some budget history information before I start walking through the table. And I also just wanted to mention that myself and Karen Cogswell will be available for questions at the end of the overall presentation.

And so I thought sharing a little bit of the budget history would be helpful for some of the new Board members as well as a refresher for the others. And this information that I'm sharing can be found, if people are interested in further reading, on the National Park Service's website, there's a document called Alaska Subsistence; A National Park Service Management History, and some of this information is found in Chapter 9.

As folks know, the Federal Subsistence Management Program first began with season funds in 1990 and this was for wildlife management, the Federal Subsistence Board and the Regional Advisory Councils. The first earmark from Senator Stevens began in 1999 -- 1991, with most funds coming through the U.S. Fish and
Wildlife Service as the lead agency administering the Federal government's Subsistence Program, however, there were funds that were also distributed to other Federal land management agencies and also at times to the State of Alaska. When the Federal government expanded into management of subsistence fisheries in 1999, the participating Federal agencies of the Department of Interior and inclusive of the Forest Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, as well as the Office of Subsistence Management, they began to consider their Staffing and budget requirements. An InterAgency Staff Committee was formed and it had members from the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Fish and Wildlife Service along with Staff from OSM, and the Committee developed what was known as the unified plan, and it was for implementation of the Subsistence Fisheries Program. And the plan, which was inclusive of a budget was adopted, in principle, by the Federal Subsistence Board in September 1999. This then led to coordinated efforts by the Departments of Interior and Agriculture for appropriations request beginning in 2001. And you can also see the Federal agency needs for subsistence management were also identified and communicated in their internal budget justification documents, which are known as (indiscernible - muffled) that get submitted to Congress.

For the past two decades, the Alaska Fisheries Subsistence funds to the Service continue to follow the spirit of that unified plan that was outlined, as I mentioned, two decades ago. And these funds, plus the subsistence wildlife funds that are allocated to the Service are distributed to the Office of Subsistence Management; Fisheries and Ecological Services, which is a division of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; and the National Wildlife Refuges in Alaska and it's to fulfill the wildlife and fishery subsistence mandates and delegated authorities that are consistent with ANILCA, subsistence management regulations for public lands in Alaska and the policies of the Federal Subsistence Board.

So with that I would then like to turn your attention to Page 2 of your supplemental materials where you'll see a summary budget table. And it has a blue header, it's called summary table FY2021, Fish and Wildlife Service, Fisheries and Wildlife Subsistence Appropriation. And so I'll first go over the fund
categories that come into the Fish and Wildlife Service in Alaska and I'll go over the amounts that were received and a short description of those amounts.

And we did present some more information to the Federal Subsistence Board in 2020, we're now presenting Fiscal Year 2021. And you can see in the center column the total amount is $12,389 million, so that's the total subsistence funds appropriated to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in the Alaska region. And you'll see on the left-hand column there are two lines that I'll be going through and they're named Alaska Fisheries Subsistence and Alaska Wildlife Subsistence and they're both underlined to help you differentiate as you look at it.

So the Alaska Fisheries Subsistence line is $9,554 million. This is a line item in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services allocated budget, and you can see it's in the section called Fisheries and Aquatic Conservation/Population Assessment and Cooperative Management. And then you'll see underneath that, there's some italicized language that reads: Less HQ Service-wide Enterprise Assessments. And these are Service-wide national assessments that are done at the headquarters level that, in turn, provide services such as information technology which is IT, network security, human resources and emergency management. And so the cost to the Service for the Alaska Fisheries Subsistence line in FY21 was $313,445. And so underneath that you'll see remaining fisheries subtotal becomes $9,240,555 million and you'll see in the notes that this is the amount that gets regionally distributed to OSM, and it shows the percentages and that refers back to the unified plan that I was talking about that helps guide the breakout of how these funds are distributed; so 83 percent goes to OSM, 10 percent goes to Fisheries Ecological Services, which we call FES, and then the Refuges in Alaska at 7 percent. And I'll discuss more about that in the tables on Pages 3 and 4.

So next I'll share about the Alaska Wildlife Subsistence line item, and that's $2,835 million, and that gets allocated in the Refuges, Wildlife and Habitat Management. And you'll see again in the italicized language the headquarters Service-wide assessment for the same services such as IT, ethics, emergency management and that's at $159,000.
And so you get the Wildlife subtotal below that at $2,676 million. And that gets distributed to the Office of Subsistence Management at 100 percent.

So if you look at the blue header at the bottom of that table on Page 2 it's titled Total Subsistence Fisheries and Wildlife allocated to Region, and so that amount is now $11,916,555 million, and that is comprised of the 83 percent from the Alaska Subsistence Fisheries line, so if we take 83 percent of the $9,240,5555 million, that then totals $7,669,661 million and there you'll see that breakout in the notes, and that gets added to the wildlife subtotal of the $2,676,000 million and so you get that total amount of $10,345,661 million and that's the total Fisheries and Wildlife Subsistence distribution to OSM and Sue Detwiler will share information about OSM's budget in her presentation. But you'll see that that's their starting number.

And then the final row on the table on Page 2 is the total Fisheries Subsistence distribution then that goes to Refuges, and Fisheries and Ecological Services at $1,570,894 million, and that goes to fulfill delegated subsistence fishery management activities, such as on the Yukon River, Kuskokwim River, Chigniks, Bristol Bay, Alaska Peninsula and Aleutian Islands plus Cook Inlet and Kodiak.

So if we now move to the table on Page 3 it starts off with a big green header and it's called the Detail Table, and so this is where I'll share some more detail about the distribution of funds and how they're further broken down. And you'll just see the note on the green row where, again, we mention that the percentage of the fisheries subsistence distribution between OSM, FES and Refuges has been consistently in place for two decades and we've made a note that the regional allocation to the Service as been mostly flat for these past decades and remained at about the same amount on an annual basis and it follows that unified plan strategy that I mentioned that was created in 1999.

So, again, for the Office of Subsistence Management their distribution is in that peach row and you'll see their total amount is compromised of the Alaska Fisheries Subsistence funds at $7,669,661 million and that's the 83 percent of the
Alaska Fisheries Subsistence line item, and then you'll see the Alaska Wildlife Subsistence Funds at $2,676,000 million, and that's 100 percent of the Alaska Wildlife Subsistence. And you'll see that subtotal again at $10,345,661 million. And Sue will go into further information but we just give some notes here about what the OSM funds are used for, such as Board support, the regulatory cycle, special action analysis, Regional Advisory Council Coordination, Fisheries Resources Monitoring Program, Partners Program, coordination of the InterAgency Staff Committee, Program administration, liaison with the Alaska Board of Fisheries and Board of Game, and tribal communications and consultations.

So below that we'll have the Fisheries and Ecological Services Subsistence Fisheries distribution, and this is in a yellow header, and this is 10 percent of the Alaska Fisheries Subsistence line that's allocated to the region and it's broken down between four offices. And so the first one is the Anchorage and Kenai Field Offices and that amount is $352,830; and it's similar to what I mentioned earlier, it supports in-season fisheries management out of these two offices for the regions of Cook Inlet, Bristol Bay, Chignik, the Alaska Peninsula, Aleutian Islands, and it also includes time for outreach and consultation with communities and subsistence users, resource monitoring, regulatory analysis and Regional Advisory Council participation. Then below that is the Conservation Genetics Lab at $24,762 and that is for biometric and in-season management technical support so this would include work like the Yukon chum salmon genetic mixed stock analysis that takes place in- and post-season. Then there's the Fairbanks Office at $399,031 and that supports in-season fisheries management delegated responsibilities for the Yukon River. It includes outreach and tribal consultation with communities and subsistence users, resource monitoring, regulatory analysis, Regional Advisory Council participation and coordination among the three different Councils. And then there's the Regional Office, which is in Anchorage and that's at $147,432 and that's for participation in the Federal Subsistence Board processes, Staff support to the Fish and Wildlife Service Federal Subsistence Board member, the Fish and Wildlife Service InterAgency Staff Committee representative to participate in special action and regulatory analysis plus tracking Alaska Board of Fish and Board of Game actions. So
that subtotal to Fisheries and Ecological Services, which is FES is $924,055.

So if you then move to the Page 4, this is our last table that shows the breakout that goes to the National Wildlife Refuge system and this is the 7 percent allocation from the Alaska Fisheries Subsistence line item. And we can see the Refuges listed on the left hand side and their financial amount breakout and over the -- for all of them the annual Subsistence Fisheries budget helps to provide support for personnel that work in multiple offices throughout the State of Alaska and this includes Refuge Information Technicians, interpreters, subsistence coordinators, fisheries biologists and resource monitoring activities that provide data to inform scientific bases for fisheries management. It also includes support for in-season fisheries management delegated responsibilities for the Kuskokwim River and Kodiak. And that total to the National Wildlife Refuge system is $646,839.

So that concludes the FY21 Fish and Wildlife Subsistence appropriation to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. And I'll now turn it back over to Sue Detwiler.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Jill. This is Sue Detwiler again. So transitioning from the Fish and Wildlife Service overall budget and the breakout to the other two programs, Fisheries and Ecological Services and Refuges and Wildlife, as you can see our budget starts on Page 5 of this document. And as you can see our budget, as Jill said is $10,345,661 million, and this is for FY21, and that was last year. And our -- on Page 5 our budget is broken out by office divisions which correlate to the different functions that we have so in the middle column you see the description of what that office function is, that division function is and then our costs, our salary costs in the right-hand column.

And so in the yellow column -- or the yellow section, the first line is the ARD office and that's the Assistant Regional Director's Office and that -- and in this group of people are me, the Assistant Regional Director, the Deputy Assistant Regional Director, the Native American Liaison, Liaison to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, the Policy
Coordinator and the Executive Secretary. So we provide overall management and supervision and policy direction for OSM in general. We also provide liaison to Alaska Department of Fish and Game, to tribes. We help the Board with tribal consultations. We provide InterAgency Staff Committee support to the public Board members. We coordinate the InterAgency Staff Committee and then work on subsistence policy issues as they come up. So the personnel costs for that group of people is $731,009.

The next division is the Fisheries Division. They provide technical analysis of fisheries regulatory proposals, closure reviews and special action requests. They also provide technical support to the Regional Advisory Councils, administer the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program and Partners Program, and also provide technical support to the Regional Advisory Councils -- sorry, that's a duplicate in there. Also -- so the salary costs for FY21 for the Fisheries Division were about $630,472.

Wildlife Division is similar to the Fisheries Division. They provide technical analysis for wildlife regulatory proposals, closure reviews and special action requests as well technical advice to the Regional Advisory Councils. The salary cost shown here of $271,956 was low last year because we had so many vacancies in the Wildlife Division at that time.

Moving further down, the Anthropology Division provides technical analysis of both fisheries and wildlife proposals, along with special actions, customary and traditional use determinations, rural/non-rural determinations, cultural and educational permits and technical support to the Regional Advisory Councils. The Anthropology Division also co-administers the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program with the Fisheries Division. Salary costs for the Anthropology Division last year were $589,384.

Council Coordination Division coordinates the Regional Advisory Councils, including meetings, travel, outreach, Federal Advisory Committee Act, or FACA reporting, administrative record, Regional Advisory Council membership and the nomination process. Salary costs for the Council Coordination Division were -- in FY21 were $739,538.
The Regulatory Division handles the rulemaking process such as Federal Register notices, coordination with Fish and Wildlife Service headquarters, Department of Interior and Department of Agriculture. That Division also handles subsistence permitting, the Federal Subsistence Program administrative record and litigation and outreach such as proposal books, public regulation books, informational fliers and media, advertisements such as print and radio announcements for upcoming Board and Council meetings. The salary costs for the Regulatory Division were $524,617 in FY21.

And, finally, still on Page 5 is the Statewide Support Division, which provides administrative support in our office, OSM, for handling correspondence, phones and other office administrative tasks and last year those costs -- salary costs were $271,247.

Turning to Page 6 we have some other expenditures, these include the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Plan where in FY25 [sic] we had -- or FY21 we had 25 active project agreements totaling about $2.6 million. We had the Partners Program where we had seven active partner agreements totaling about $1 million last year.

We also provide about $150,000 to a law enforcement program. They conduct enforcement activities relative to the subsistence priority and conservation issues.

We also have mandatory court reporting. It's mandatory for Regional Advisory Council and Board meetings, and that was about $225,000 last year.

Travel costs in a normal year would be $400,000. We did not travel this year because of the pandemic.

Office space for OSM in the Fish and Wildlife Service's Regional Office in Anchorage was about $580,000.

Printing costs such as for Regional Advisory Council books, Board books, regulation books
and so on is about $85,000.

And then general supplies and operations are about $84,000.

And each year OSM also gets some funding from USDA Forest Service to help support our work by our anthropologists and biologists for the regulatory processes with Southeast Alaska, which is primarily Forest Service land as well as Southcentral Alaska. So that funding provided by the Forest Service helps support OSM work on regulatory processes, FRMP, database management and Regional Advisory Council support in Southcentral and Southeast Alaska. So the funding that Forest Service provides varies by year but in 2021 it was $478,474.

So that concludes the OSM and Fish and Wildlife Service presentation of our budgets and next up would be Kim Jochum to present the National Park Service Subsistence Budget.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue. Any questions from the Board. (No comments) CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. We'll move on to the next. Thank you, Sue.

MS. JOCHUM: Hello. Thank you. This is Kim Jochum with the National Park Service. For the record my name is Kim Jochum. I'm currently the Acting Subsistence Program Manager. And I'm also an ISC member in my current position but also in my normal position as Subsistence Program Analyst for the Regional office.

So the budget I'm presenting to you today is a representative budget estimate for our current Subsistence Program region-wide and it's based on estimates of FY20 and separated by our Regional Office Subsistence Team, the National Park Service Regional Directorate costs as well the Park operations. I updated the Regional office FTE estimates because -- and the travel -- only to reflect travel costs pre-Covid, and to account for our Regional Staff increase from one to four Staff between FY20 and FY21. So we used to have a larger Regional Staff quite a while back.
and then as I was hired on, one -- a couple of other of my co-workers now, we can -- we're trying to get more capacity back at the regional level that's when we were up to four Staff, that's what that represents.

So overall, our annual cost estimate is $2,420,626 million. For the Regional Office Subsistence Program itself is estimated at $791,126, that includes the FTE, travel, some other costs, awards, training, utilities and printing.

And then we have a Subsistence Advisory Council project fund of $300,000 for a few years now. That's subsistence research funding and the source was established to provide -- to procure long-term funding to conduct baseline community socioeconomic studies as well as to conduct time sensitive research on specific resource management issues that require decisions by the National Park Service managers for wildlife and fisheries decisionmaking bodies in order to appropriately implement provisions of ANILCA related to subsistence use management as well as to continue to develop close relationships between Park Staff and local communities, cooperatively conduct community-based subsistence studies and is intended to be used to support Alaska National Park Subsistence Management Program. We're pretty happy to have that funding source available through our regional program.

Then we additionally have costs at the Regional Directorate level that's estimated at about $58,500, and the Deputy -- the Regional Director FTE percentage is a little higher and includes amongst others engaging with individuals on questions, Subsistence Advisory Council and Subsistence Resource Commission Chairs engagement, traveling to Parks, navigate hard issues, reviewing proposals and standing in for the Board member in absence. The Associate Regional Director for resources role in years past has been more expansive as well and it includes standing in for the Board member during absences, Subsistence Advisory Council contributions, program involvement, Regional Subsistence Advisory Council meetings, the National Park Service Subsistence Advisory Council meetings, amongst others and has gone up as high as 25 to 30 percent FTE for the associate Regional Director itself. So it does, you know, obviously variable a little bit and depends on what's going on as with everybody right now during limited travel time during
Covid, it's been less than usual and it's been
definitely having a little bit of harder time to keep
engagement we need to have with all of our subsistence
participants and Parks.

So Park Operations itself is estimated
at $1,571,000 million and it varies drastically by Park
as you can see. I'm not going to, you know, read every
number for each Park here, I think it provides a decent
overview of the estimate for each Park.

We do have -- I do want to point out
that we do have seven Subsistence Resource Commissions,
that's Aniakchak National Monument and Preserve, Cape
Krusenstern National Monument, Denali National Park and
Preserve, Gates of the Arctic National Park and
Preserve, Kobuk Valley National Park, Lake Clark
National Park and Preserve, as well as Wrangell-St.
Elias National Park and Preserve, so obviously there's
higher costs associated with (indiscernible) and
coordinator and so forth.

Overall, it's difficult to estimate
correct estimates on FTEs across Parks as well as many
positions such as biologists and anthropologists
partially support our, you know, Subsistence Team when
needed. So I think that's a challenge for every agency
obviously. So I just want to point that out.

And then as an example I wanted to
mention Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve,
for their Park and Preserve alone there has been 17
percent of the budgets, over $83,000 a year in
permitting alone, so they have a huge permitting load
on their end.

And I also wanted to mention that since
2021 we have a five year agreement with ANSEP, the
Alaska Native Science Engineering Program in place to
fund at least three summer bridge students annually and
that's about $245,000 we have in agreements with ANSEP
right now, that's not directly part of this budget but
I wanted to make you aware of that.

That's all I have to share. I'd be
happy to answer questions as well.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that. Any questions from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Appreciate that, thank you guys for your work. Sue, next.

MS. DETWILER: Yep, that would be BLM, and Chris McKee.

MR. MCKEE: Hi everybody, can you hear me okay.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I could hear you good, Chris, welcome.

MR. MCKEE: Great, thank you. For the record my name is Chris McKee, I am the Subsistence Coordinator for BLM in Alaska out of the regional office here in Anchorage. I have a pretty short presentation, just a couple of pages, and it starts, I believe on Page 9 of the budget overview document.

Funding for subsistence is expended as part of the normal activity for multiple program areas within BLM in Alaska but it should be noted that there's no specific subsistence program or funding stream that could be tracked and so that makes it difficult, if not impossible, to provide the kind of accurate specific outlay that other agencies have been discussing so far this morning. But in effort to try to describe why it would be problematic to give that specific outlay, I'm just going to kind of briefly describe the structure and function of various BLM programs and how subsistence is integrated into just about every one of them, in just about everything that BLM does in Alaska.

So there are more than a dozen different program areas of funding within BLM-Alaska and I list a subset of them here. They're pretty diverse, anywhere from rangeland and cultural resources management, all the way to oil and gas management and also resource management planning assessment and monitoring.

Under any one of these programs there could be a subsistence component involved. For
instance, the wildlife and aquatic habitat management includes funding for resource stewardship and monitoring as well as inventory and assessment of wildlife and aquatic resources. Any number one of these sources of funding could have an impact specific to subsistence-related resources. Furthermore, rangeland, oil and gas and cultural resource management also have funding for resource management plans and NEPA documents such as environmental impact statements and all of these involve work that has an obviously a critical impact on subsistence management on BLM lands in the state as well. Oil and gas management has had funding for components involving planning, permitting and enforcement, and obviously subsistence is involved in -- at some level on all of those as well. And also the Recreation Resources Management Program is involved in stewardship and monitoring as well as permitting and BLM is very heavily involved in the permitting process when it comes to subsistence management which is what I'll mention that in just a little bit.

However, in all of these program areas that I mentioned there's no specific subsistence funding stream that's tracked and, yet, as I mentioned, subsistence is pretty much deeply ingrained in almost everything that BLM does here in the state. It's one of the major reasons why it would be difficult to describe specific funding outlays. And, for instance, my position, the Subsistence Coordinator, is the only position in the state for the agency specifically designated to work on duties exclusively dedicated to subsistence management for the agency. But even my position doesn't solely work on tasks related to the Federal Subsistence Management Program itself. While a huge amount of my work does involve working with the Board and issues related to the InterAgency Staff Committee, I'm also involved in helping review and edit NEPA related documents, like EIS's and EA's and also do the same for resource management plans as well as writing and reviewing ANILCA Section .810 evaluations and updating policy the same as well.

I mentioned permitting earlier, I just wanted to mention as kind of a closing aspect to show just how involved BLM is involved in subsistence, is that, for FY21 BLM issued more than 4,500 subsistence hunting permits to Federally-qualified subsistence users and this comprises the vast majority of subsistence permits given out among all the land
management agencies involved with the Federal Subsistence Management Program. Furthermore, BLM Staff are involved in many subsistence resource inventory and research projects as well as writing resource management plans and NEPA documents that have a direct impact on any number of subsistence resources and subsistence users across pretty much the entire state of Alaska.

So not a detailed specific outline like the other agencies have reported but I just kind of wanted to kind of share how subsistence is involved in just about everything BLM does here in the state. So with that, unless there's any questions I'll hand it over to BIA.

(No comments)

MR. CHEN: Good morning, Mr. Chair and Board members. My name is Glenn Chen. I'm the Subsistence Branch Chief for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Our program is housed within the Trust Division here in the Alaska region. And I'll turn your attention to Page 11 in the first table that we've provided in our briefing.

For each fiscal year we receive about $550,000 Central Office through the Tribal Management and Development Program, and added to that we also receive monies from the Alaska Region Realty Program. These ANILCA funds amount to about $160,000 per year. So that gives us an annual operating budget of about $710,000.

We spend about $416,000 on Staff, and when we were able to go to Regional Advisory Council meetings about $20,000 was expended on travel to attend those meetings. And a small amount that we spend each year on IT equipment, office supplies and so forth.

The remaining monies, which typically amount to about $270,000 per year are given to individual Alaska tribes to support their subsistence efforts, subsistence studies and so forth. And that gives us our annual operating budget -- that accounts for our annual operating expenditures of $710,000.

If I could then turn your attention to the next page of the briefing.
I wanted to mention another avenue for funding subsistence efforts by tribes here in Alaska. Next is the Alaska Subsistence Special Congressional Appropriation. These funds are appropriated by Congress each year, or have been appropriated by Congress each year to support Alaska InterTribal Organizations collaborative management efforts that are associated with ANILCA Title VIII. And that's a key word here at the end of that sentence, is that, these dollars are dedicated to projects that involve collaboration with Federal managers on ANILCA Title VIII. So, for example, these organizations cannot expend the money to do projects related to (indiscernible), or waterfowl, or other aspects of subsistence if they're not directly tied to Title VIII. These are given to Alaska InterTribal organizations consisting of two or more tribes via competitive based awards. And because it's an annual appropriation, funding is only available for a single fiscal year and reliant on future appropriations to be continued.

We received $2 million each fiscal year, Fiscal Year '17 through '20, and last year in '21, $2.7 million were available. And so these funds are passed through our Central Office. The awards require use of Public Law 638 grant, those particular awards are then processed through our Self-Determination Branch here in the Alaska region. Past recipients have included the Yukon River InterTribal Fisheries Commission, the Kuskokwim InterTribal Fisheries Commission, the InterTribal Resource Commission, the Bristol Bay Native Association, and the Chugach Regional Resource Commission. These organizations represents a total of 103 tribes here in Alaska.

That concludes our presentation and I'll take any questions if you have any.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: This is Sue Detwiler. I just wanted to see if Chair Christianson was back online yet, he got dropped off.

(No comments)

MS. DETWILER: Okay. We'll keep trying to get him on and I think in the interim, I think it --
next -- the Board's Chair responsibilities go to you
Rhonda. And we do have a couple more presenters on
this topic. With Glenn concluding his
presentation.....

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Sue, I'm here.

MS. DETWILER: With Glenn concluding
his presentation it would go next to Greg Risdahl with
Forest Service. And, Tony, was that you that was on or
was that Charlie Brower?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You can hear me
now, Sue?

MS. DETWILER: Oh, oh, yes, Charlie --
sorry, Anthony.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, no,
that's -- you have the floor here, just keep doing
business, you're doing fine, thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. Thank you for
that. And now I -- I think we may -- yes, I think we
may have lost Rhonda to the non-speaking room, we'll
get her on as quickly as possible as well.

MR. RISDAHL: Sue. Mr. Chairman. This
is Greg Risdahl. Just let me know when you're ready to
go, we're waiting for Rhonda.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. We'll
just wait for her to sign on and then you'll have the
floor, Greg. Good to hear you.

MR. RISDAHL: You bet, same here, Tony.

(Pause)

MS. DETWILER: This is Sue again.
We're checking with the operator right now to get
Rhonda back in the speaking mode, Rhonda, are you on.

(No comments)

MR. BROWER: She said to press star,
zero to get back on.

MS. DETWILER: Oh, okay. I have a text
message, she can hear but apparently she is not in
speak -- are you -- is that you, Rhonda?

    (No comments)

    MS. DETWILER: Uh. Rhonda is trying to
get through to the operator but she pressed star, zero,
no response.

    REPORTER: Or you can press star, one.

    (Pause)

    MR. BROWER: Yeah, Sue.

    MS. DETWILER: Yes.

    MR. BROWER: Yeah, she pressed star,
zero and she still gets nothing.

    MS. DETWILER: Okay. And we're working
it from our end, too.

    MR. BROWER: That's what I'm telling
her.

    (Pause)

    MS. DETWILER: Robbin, or Katya, do we
have any updates from the operators?

    MS. ROBBIN: I think she's on, I see her
name, her phone number in the line up.

    MS. DETWILER: So is there a way we
could get to her and have the operator get that number
and open it up to the speaking line.

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

    MR. BROWER: She's on.

    (Teleconference interference -
participants not muted)

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

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

MS. LAVINE: I just want to note that there is somebody whose line remains open who may be walking across some wonderful hardwood floors. I'd like to remind all people to mute their lines unless they are speaking and that will help our court reporter keep accurate records.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REPORTER: Thank you.

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

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Amen. Thank you, Rhonda. We'll get back to where we're at again. We're all online, we've just been getting dropped, and so we're back to business. Sue, you have the floor.

MS. DETWILER: Yes. Greg Risdahl was going to start with the budget presentation for Forest Service.

MR. RISDAHL: Thank you, Sue. Members of the Board and Mr. Chairman. This is Greg Risdahl, the Subsistence Program Leader for the Forest Service and InterAgency Staff Committee member.

The Forest Service budget for FY2021 is the last table in your supplemental handout on Page 13 and it displays the Forest Service subsistence budget for Fiscal Year 2021. Note that the Forest Service subsistence budget is a line item in the Congressional budget. The total Alaska Forest Service budget for 2021 was estimated to be $2,649,373 million. Of that, approximately half, just slightly over half, or $1,351,761 million went to salaries and travel costs specifically to support the Subsistence Program.

Now, the total dollar value for salaries was derived from an estimate of the percent of time that each Forest Service Staff person spent conducting subsistence work. This includes Staff in the Regional office as well as Staff from both the Tongass and the Chugach National Forests. The dollar values for individual salaries were further estimated to be at the GS5 step -- excuse me, GS5 level. Note
that since this budget was put together the Forest Service has started a new budget process called budget modernization and salaries will no longer come out of the subsistence budget, there is a specific budget cost code for salaries only.

That takes us to the other half of the Subsistence Program budget. The other half, about 49 percent, or $1,297,612 million went to subsistence monitoring projects on the two Forests, support to OSM, which Sue Detwiler had mentioned during her presentation, about $50,000 to law enforcement and a small amount to the Regional Office.

The summary breakdown looks something like this.

So for 2021, the total distribution to the Regional Office was $522,023, as Sue mentioned $378,474 of those dollars went to OSM for support. The total Chugach distribution was $95,000. And the total Tongass distribution was $680,589. The reason why the Tongass distribution is much higher is because this is where all the FRMP projects took place last year.

And that concludes my summary, thank you very much. If you have questions I am ready to respond.

(No comments)

MS. DETWILER: This is Sue Detwiler. And I believe we had one more presentation after Greg Risdahl, and that was Pat Petrivelli summarizing budget related concerns that the Regional Advisory Councils have brought up.

MS. PETRIVELLI: Mr. Chair, this is Pat Petrivelli with the BIA Subsistence Branch.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hi, Pat, welcome aboard and feeling you're up to something, good to hear you.

(Laughter)

MS. PETRIVELLI: My presentation is Page 14 of the handout, it's the last page. And I looked at the Council issues that were submitted by the
Councils in their annual reports from 2000 to 2020, which almost stretches -- I started with Fish and Wildlife Service in 2000.

But I searched for concerns that related to funding and I found 50 of the 908 issues dealt with funding-related issues. The majority related to research concerns and I broke those down in those three bullet points. 14 involved increased funding for Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program, or other fisheries related concerns. 12 involved wildlife, either the need for a wildlife research monitoring program, or species specific concerns. And four involved just the need for increased fishery and wildlife monitoring in general. And those concerns were expressed with the need for more monitoring information to make decisions about proposals.

The remaining 20 concerns that were submitted usually -- a lot of them were submitted in response to a period when there were subsistence budget reductions and I think in past presentations those years covered, I think 2010 to 2015 where the budgets were drastically reduced. And in those categories the Councils had eight agency specific concerns and six related to increased funding for adequate Staffing to implement subsistence management activities and those were to Fish and Wildlife and BLM. And then the other two related to species-specific recommended activities where they just wanted more agency related projects for those species-specific activities.

The next categories were just either Council-specific or OSM-related concerns, and they mainly related to funding for travel to smaller communities or more Council training.

And then there was only two categories left out of those 50 and that related to one for partners, more funding for Partners Program and more funding for tribal consultation. And the Councils -- the Council that submitted that concern somehow decided that if there was more travel funds to go to smaller communities then the tribe could -- that tribes could directly participate in the Council meetings, so that's how it got categorized as tribal consultation.

And that was all I had.
MS. DETWILER: So, Mr. Chair, that concludes our presentation on the Board -- on the budget -- I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue. Any questions from the Board, any discussion on the budget as presented. The floor is open.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

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

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. First off I'd like to thank the individual agencies, their ISC members for coming up with this review of the budget. I do appreciate the time and effort. I know it was very challenging at times to go through of what was requested from the Board, what is anticipated or expected, and I do greatly appreciate the effort going through here.

I have a series of questions, if I may, Mr. Chair, to try to get to a complete understanding of how we are today and I'd like to -- just before I start with the questions, point out, on average based on my rough calculations it looks like each of the programs or agencies provides anywhere from three-quarters to a little over a million dollars a year of their operational budget to support of a Subsistence Program within the individual agency.

And a little back history for some of our newer members. At a Federal Subsistence Board retreat, which was held at Alyeska several years back a similar budget presentation was provided to the individual Board members and there is some discrepancies associated with the inflow and outflow and so that prompted the initial request for reviewing the subsistence budget throughout the program. Now, going through things that stood out to me of the -- and I'm going to kind of summarize and paraphrase for expediency-sake, but of the roughly $12.4 million that come into the Federal Subsistence Program, and it is managed via 50 CFR 100.10(b)(9), of that, there is approximately 500,000 that goes to the Fish and Wildlife Service under the terms the Less headquarters Service-wide enterprise assessments, and I understand that varies by year, that is very common with agencies
that have pass-thru. And if anybody that's done any
interagency agreements with others know that there is a
little -- overhead associated with transferring the
money. If you take the 12.4, subtract the 500,000,
that roughly leaves you 11.9 that goes to OSM. Of the
funding that goes to OSM, the -- and I'm trying to flip
my paperwork around here, there is a little bit more
than a million dollars, I believe, that is not
associated with the Office of Subsistence Management,
and as far as -- it's 1.435. If I recall the Fish and
Wildlife Service presentation, that is determined based
on a formula that was identified in the unified plan;
is that correct? That's my first question.

MS. COGSWELL: Mr. Board [sic], Karen
Cogswell. Or, Mr. Chair, I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you.....

MS. COGSWELL: Or Gene, the answer is
yes.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: .....have the
floor. Yeah, sorry.

MS. COGSWELL: Yeah, yep, no worries.

MR. PELTOLA: Okay, thanks, Karen,
appreciate it. So if we go down, the breakdown of that
1.435 and compare it to the expenditures from OSM, that
means that of the 10.3 and change going to OSM, that
figure is retained by the Fish and Wildlife Service.
Based on the unified plan which was adopted by the
Board some time ago, I think it was 1999, if you look
at the OSM expenditures that includes the regulatory,
council coordination, anthropology, you know,
administrative expenses, including space for the Office
of Subsistence Management, that is very significant,
yet, those expenses are not accounted for in the 1.435
that goes through. So of the 1.435, I'm assuming that
either is, since we had in the presentation at 100
percent to OSM, the 1.435, I assume that that goes back
to Fisheries Ecological Services, Refuges, via the
1534/1535 and 1261 budgetary codes. And when we look
at those expenses incurred by Fisheries Ecological
Services and Refuges there are some unique situations,
but also there are some expenditures that the other
agencies are absorbing within their own operating
budgets. Especially when you look at in-season
management authority, which seems to be a large portion of that 1.435 that is retained within the Service and those additional responsibilities, whether it be other agencies in Alaska with in-season management authority are incurred and absorbed by the existing budgets.

So with that, and I can't emphasize I do appreciate this effort because I know a lot went into it to getting us a more concise view of our operating budget for the Subsistence Program.

With that being said and the history of why we are here today at the point we are here today, going back several years about the original budgetary concern, all this is based on the unified plan which is approved by the Board. So I'd recommend, Mr. Chair, that if some agencies feel that that 1.4 may be spent on very worthy -- worthy projects, i.e., that benefit that Program, although I'd like to point out that it is not the FRMP or Federal Subsistence Program or Board directive on how to spend those funds, that prior to our July/August work session, Mr. Chair, I'd recommend that the Board establish a committee and look at the unified plan such that if -- as a group, and bring it to the Board's full consideration whether that unified plan should be modified or not.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Gene. Any other Board comments or discussion.

MS. COGSWELL: Mr. Chair, Karen Cogswell.

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

MS. COGSWELL: Thanks. Yeah, thanks, Gene, for walking through that. I think the one addition I would make to what you outlined regarding the unified plan is that that plan was created by the InterAgency Team that then forwarded that through the appropriate -- through USDA and the Department of Interior to put into budget books that then got appropriated by Congress. So I think the -- I just want to make sure that there is clarity around that larger process. That it wasn't just something that internally was decided and done, it really had to go
through a full budget cycle process within the full Department -- both Departments and the Administration and Congress.

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

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Gene, you have it.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And I appreciate that explanation. In addition to, if we go through this process, one thing I'd hope that'd be identified each and every agency's monetary obligations to execute the Federal Subsistence Program and that be part of the equation as well.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Appreciate all the input and, you know, if we do it from the Board's perspective here and start to take a look, it's good that we are getting a capture of all the agency budgets and where it's at, especially with the big review going on, both in the public and in the Department of Interior and also seeing today with the amount of projects we had on the list, knowing we need $17 million and we can only fund, you know, limited amounts of that. Not everybody gets the funding. You know getting where this money is, what the color is, how it flows, that gives us a better opportunity to maybe bolster it but also, you know, look for additional partnerships that the public knows, you know, where the money is and how it transfers from each agency, you know, because I say there's a lot of local possibilities for partnerships as well as additional money coming down through other agencies and for other means that could help address these in rural Alaska.

So appreciate the effort by all the agencies to pull together your budgets and getting this information and look forward to working through how we collectively prioritize this and keep moving forward as a Board.

Thank you.

Any other Board discussion, comments or questions.
MS. COGSWELL: Mr. Chair, Karen
Cogswell.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor Karen.

MS. COGSWELL: Thanks. One other thought that I have is around the history of flat funding for the Program. We've essentially, over time, since the unified plan and the initial budgets, particularly the funds that come to the Fish and Wildlife Service, I can't be sure about that for other agencies, so that'd be interesting to hear, but we have essentially stayed flat so our purchase power is very different now than it was 20 years as we've all experienced in many other ways. So I'm wondering if there is -- this is a good time to really start focusing on how we can grow our budget. If this is an opportunity for us to pull together what would be a larger budget proposal to move through our agencies to ask for additional funding, to even just get us up to where we were 20 years ago in today's dollars, but potentially even to go beyond that, if appropriate.

We heard from Pat's report out from the Councils around budget needs and I don't -- I don't know what all those numbers add up to but I think we could probably make a good case for the need for additional funding overall for the Subsistence Program in Alaska.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You got it Gene.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd have to concur with Karen's statement. When I arrived at the Office of Subsistence Management in '13 the budget hadn't been flat yet but within five to seven years prior to my arrival within the Office of Subsistence Management, the budget had been three-fold larger prior to '13 and my arrival, then when I did arrive, and then actually we didn't get to that solid 12.4 until like a year or two later. So just from '13 on, or '14 or '15 when we did have that plateau, just the amount we may have lost in purchase power over time with regard to inflation definitely does decrease our buying power of the dollar. In addition to, if you
look at the 12.4 versus historic levels, and granted there's a lot more required of the Program than in initial establishment of the Program but there was a significantly larger budget for subsistence even after that had been accounted for and additional responsibilities of fisheries.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chair. Dave Schmid from the Forest Service.

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

MR. SCHMID: Yeah, I'll just tag on to the conversation. I know we opened this discussion here, gosh, a couple years ago and I certainly concur and agree with Karen and Gene. You know I left Alaska after about 25 years working, and then in subsistence, came back and just saw that the budgets not only had gone down significantly but have been flat in recent years and have lost that. And I would just add that I think the time is ripe here, given certainly some focus with this Administration, a few of the Executive Orders, and even the Secretarial orders here by the Department of Interior and Agriculture, that if we could jointly move up proposals to increase, enhance our budget to just restore some of the capacity within our Councils and the efforts. And as you pointed out, Mr. Chair, there is just such a need, if you're looking at the proposals for fisheries monitoring that came in, well above current funding levels. I think the time is ripe and if we can do this jointly through the Federal family, with a lot of support from our partners, and the communities, I think we would have a fair shot at enhancing the budget.

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that Dave. Any other Board members, discussions, feedback.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Well, hearing none I just want to say that was a good discussion and I think we have a few points there that we can pay
attention to as far as moving forward and, you know,
maybe looking at sitting down and doing a pull together
meeting, as Gene suggested, and setting what our
priorities look like and then developing a plan and,
you know, reinforcing what Dave said, is a good
opportunity to look at a spectrum of projects, money
and things coming down the pike where we could increase
those opportunities and get locals involved in
prioritizing that as well. And then, you know, really
taking subsistence to the next level. It seems to be a
top priority in the, you know, tribal and public
arenas. And additional money coming to the state,
hopefully this will be something that gets prioritized
by all of our partners in these FRMP projects as well
as they do represent mostly tribal governments and
rural agencies that stand to be in a primary place to
assist the Program in moving forward. And so hopefully
all the players on the table continue to do the good
job they've been doing in promoting subsistence and
finding the funding and making sure that we can
adequately get our information and monitoring needs met
for the subsistence priority.

So I just want to thank all of you for
the optics, the update on the report, the grants and
monies and how it flows and I hope that helped answered
some of the questions and concerns that maybe the
public has or the Board members.

If there's any other additional
comments I'll just turn it over to Sue.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, it looks
like Sue just got -- Sue just got back on. You missed
my long-winded speech there, Sue, you were lucky.

(Laughter)

MS. DETWILER: Yes, well, my first
question would be -- I'm sorry I missed the discussion
there but I would be interested in knowing if there was
a Board action, Board direction coming out of this and
what specific direction there might be to Staff,
including the ISC and OSM, about what we are to pursue
from here and also if there's an assignment for us, you
know, exactly what that -- what that assignment is, and
depending on the assignment, I think we'd also like to
make sure that there is some continuing Board
involvement, Board member involvement as the ISC and
OSM pursue whatever the assignment is.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, Sue, that's what I was talking about. It sounded like a couple of the Board members were in concurrence here, Dave, Gene and Karen, also myself, with the offer to everybody else to weigh in at, you know, that additional meetings do need to occur, like you just suggested, and that we pull together this comprehensive, what happened today, you know, gave us a pretty good starting point. And then looking at, you know, moving forward with a committee of like a Council member or two as well as ISC Staff and people that are credible in the budget arena in each of these agencies and then look to get that information -- probably just another summary at our next meeting, I would think -- if any other Board member has another suggestion, but that we come back together again and then use the information that we have here to look at the shortfalls we have in our budget, knowing that, you know, we had a -- how much money that we do get requested from versus what we can fund annually and what our current commitments are and then see if how do we develop a plan to move that shortfall up the chain and encourage people to bolster their budgets or find additional monies or create partnerships that can fully fund these projects.

And so I think the first step, Sue, was to orchestrate a meeting between, and then with the spirit of moving that towards that prioritizing listing and then how do we increase these partnerships and the funding for the overall needs for the Program as they will be increasing as time goes on.

So, thank you.

If there's any other input from the Board you can add to that if Sue needs any direction.

MS. DETWILER: So, Mr. Chair, just so I can -- I'm trying to crystalize this in my mind and I want to make sure I understand. I think I have a general direction on which way we want to go. And I -- it sounds like what we want to do is kind of take it from this point, and the information that Pat Petrivelli provided about budget concerns from the Regional Advisory Councils could help inform this effort as we move forward to figure out, you know, what
are -- what are the things that are not being funded, what should be funded, maybe take a look at what the current priorities are, what additional funding is necessary for those to address those priorities. And so.....

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes. Yes.

MS. DETWILER: .....we would need to -- need to establish a working group, that would at least include the ISC, and, I, again, would like to get a commitment from Board members if they can -- they'll be involved in this as we move along to help provide direction from that upper level position that's more connected to, you know, the higher levels at both Departments. So I think I understand that.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair. BIA would be more than happy to work with the ISC and might I recommend also that Karen at Fish and Wildlife Service, and Dave, at least, in addition to probably a public member be a small group to work in conjunction with the ISC, if others are amenable.

MR. SCHMID: Yeah, Gene and Sue, I certainly am. This is Dave with the Department of Ag.

MS. COGSWELL: This is Karen. Gene, you beat me to it, I'm in.

MS. PITKA: This is Rhonda, I'll do it.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Right on. It sounds like we have some good commitment here. I think we have some clear direction. It sounds like the spirit is to get together and, you know, work out the shortfalls, the budget needs and assessments from each area and then develop that needs versus this, and then also you heard from the Board's -- the buying power, so what that dollar was buying before and what it buys now and then what we currently have funded and then the needs that we have existing and then working on upscaling that to how do we start to build an alliance to go ask for more money. So I think we're developing a team here, we have a committee and some direction and then Staff is confident and crystallized in the approach we'll take here is to continue these meetings between the committee who just said they're available and move forward from there with getting some semblance
of a plan pulled together, but time to be determined, availability by Council and ISC Staff.

MS. COGSWELL: Mr. Chair, Karen Cogswell.

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

MS. COGSWELL: Just one thing to add. With the goal, all of what you said but, in addition, with the goal of working towards an incremental funding request.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

MS. COGSWELL: Okay.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Karen, yes, that.....

MS. COGSWELL: Okay. I thought I heard you mention that but I wanted to make sure that that was part of a larger goal.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah. I think the end goal would be to -- you know, I've been involved in the Program for several years now and, you know, we've never really went back and attacked, you know, a bigger ask other than, you know, each agency, you know, fighting for the Program but the Program itself, in the capacity is pretty limited to lobbying and all that other stuff and I don't want to even use the word in my speech but, you know, being able to sit here and talk about creating a bigger ask and making a plan and prioritizing, you know, the shortfalls as something to target. It makes me feel good that we're on the right path here as the Program for Office of Subsistence Management and involvement of all you guys -- agencies because, you know, it's going to get to be a bigger problem. It's a way higher concern to the state and each of the perspective regions, if you look at the annual reports. This is elevating as a concern to the public. And we're going to need more money to do this and more boots on the ground if we're going to get the information and resources to all the people who depend on them and to conserve those resources for future generations it's going to require all hands on deck.
And so thank you guys for starting this process now and, you know, doing it in a way that can give clear and articulate plans and orders to our Staff and so just thank you guys for all of your input.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Gene.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just to build upon Karen's comment about the purchase power of the subsistence dollar. If we go back to when the 12.4 was solidified like '13/14, in that area, the purchase price of a dollar say compared to there, we've lost 20 percent. If you go back to 2010 the last Secretarial review, that dollar has lost 30 percent of its purchase power.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Gene. Any other Board input or discussion. Anybody have anything to add.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. It sounds like we've pulled together a pretty good priority plan here for the Staff in coordination with representatives and InterAgency Staff and people with knowledge of the budget and so we'll put that ball into Sue's court as an OSM directive there and look forward to a good productive program there.

So we'll go ahead and move on to the next agenda item -- Sue, I ran out on seven here.

MS. DETWILER: Well, that's -- I ran out as well.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, I was just making sure because I was like all right -- if it don't say adjourn then I'm stumped.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No, I'm just teasing. Hey, well, if there's any other business today, any other comments I'd entertain a comment at
this time, but if not it looks like we did a two day
meeting before lunch. So I want to thank you all.
Thank you everybody for calling in and participating in
the meeting and look forward to continuing to work
towards providing a priority preference for the rural
users in Alaska for subsistence and conserving the
resource for future generations. And without any more
comments or questions I will ask and open up the floor
for adjournment.

MR. PELTOLA: So moved.

MR. SCHMID: Second.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion's been
made and seconded to adjourn. Any opposition to
adjournment.

(No opposition)

MS. COGSWELL: Question.

MR. PELTOLA: One other thing, Mr.
Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead,
Gene.

MR. PELTOLA: Before we adjourn I'd
like to say happy birthday to one of our rural public
members and I'll leave it at that.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Happy Birthday.

MR. BROWER: Happy Birthday.

REPORTER: Happy Birthday.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: (In Native)
All right, any opposition to the motion to adjourn.

(No opposition)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
motion to adjourn accepted. Have a good day and God
bless you all. Bye.

(Off record)
(END OF PROCEEDINGS)
CERTIFICATE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

STATE OF ALASKA

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

THAT the foregoing, contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE BOARD MEETING, WORK SESSION taken electronically by our firm on the 1st day of February via teleconference;

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

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 4th day of February 2022.

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