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CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I think we're ready to get started. We were going to start with 51 for Mr. Brower but we need to wait for Jennifer, I think, she is coming in -- on her way in and we will do that as soon as she comes in. So in the meantime we'll go ahead and get started with -- I think we should start with maybe 21 and then go to 23.

So if -- yes.

MR. MCKEE: We already did 23 yesterday, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: We already did, okay, 23 is -- okay. So we'll start with 21.

MS. MORRIS LYON: That'll be great.

(Laughter)

MS. MORRIS LYON: But I do have a person, can I make sure the phone line is working first, too, because I do have somebody that wanted to testify.

REPORTER: The phone line is open now.

MS. MORRIS LYON: I told her so is she on or do you know.

REPORTER: I don't know, but you can ask if there's anybody on line, the line is open, and it's star one.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay.

REPORTER: Just go ahead and ask if there's anyone on line.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay.
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: So we're going to start with Proposal 14-21 and if, according to what I'm hearing it's on Page 223.

We'll start with the Staff analysis and as soon as -- for those of you that are on line, especially for you in Bristol Bay, as soon as you're on line let me know and.....

(Teleconference music interruption)

(Laughter)

(Pause)

OPERATOR: Good afternoon, this is Sarah, do I have a speaker on this connection.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you.

OPERATOR: Hi, how are you today.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: We're doing well.

OPERATOR: Very good. Are there other speaker locations that will be dialing in to join you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: There should be someone from Bristol Bay.

OPERATOR: Okay. And I'm getting an echo back when I'm speaking. I don't know, am I coming across okay for you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: You sound okay on this side.

OPERATOR: Okay. And who am I speaking with.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: You're speaking to Tim Towarak, I'm the Chairman of the Subsistence Board.

OPERATOR: Towarak, okay. All right, so we've got the call scheduled for quite a duration today, do you expect that it will kind of run all day for you.

(Laughter)
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: We're hoping to be
done sometime close to noon.

OPERATOR: Okay. All right, close to
noon. You must be Pacific Time then, sir.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: That's noon time,
Alaska time, right now it's a quarter to 9:00.

OPERATOR: Oh, okay, Alaska, very good.

(Laughter)

OPERATOR: Well, I do show it looks
like there is another speaker location dialing in right
now so we'll join them, right now you are in a private
speaker conference, okay, and we'll join that other
connection in here with you in just a moment.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay. We will
proceed, we've got other things going on, we will call
on the people on line for testifying as soon as we get
to that portion of the meeting. Thank you.

Is that good.

REPORTER: Yes, go ahead, we're on
record.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay, thank you.

So we're going to continue and start
with Proposal 21 and have our Staff analysis start the
process.

MR. MCKEE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. As
mentioned Proposal 14-21 has an executive summary
beginning on Page 223 of your booklet. It was
submitted by the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council
and requests an extension of the to be announced winter
season and an increase in the harvest limit for moose
under Federal hunting regulations in Unit 17A.

The proposed regulatory changes would
align with recent changes to State regulations and
follow recommendations of the Unit 17A Moose Management
Plan. This is the same request as an emergency special
action WSA 13-01, which was approved in November of
2013.
Federally-qualified subsistence users are required to have a State registration permit during the fall and winter moose seasons and could harvest moose under the recently changed State regulations regardless of the Board's decision. However, if adopted, Federally-qualified subsistence users would be provided with additional harvest opportunity under Federal regulations, which would include the use of Federally-designated hunter regulations.

The moose population continues to increase in Unit 17A as illustrated in Figure 1 on Page 229 of the booklet and is within the estimated carrying capacity of the area. The proposed changes would provide the Togiak National Wildlife Refuge manager with flexibility to adjust the length of the winter season and harvest limit to more effectively manage the population.

So the OSM conclusion is to support WP14-21 with modification to delete the regulatory language found in Unit 17A may be announced season and delegate authority to the Refuge manager to open and close the season and set the harvest limit, including any sex restrictions for moose via delegation of authority letter. As mentioned the proposed regulatory changes are consistent with the recommendations of the Unit 17A Moose Management Plan, which state that when the moose population is increasing and approaching carrying capacity more liberal harvest regulations that allow for a longer season, increased harvest limits and potentially allowing for the harvest of cows should help to reduce the population at more sustainable levels.

The OSM modification includes creating a delegation of authority letter to provide the Refuge manager with flexibility to adjust the length of the winter season and harvest limit to more effectively manage this population.

That's all I have for this analysis.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Are there any questions of the Staff on this proposal.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Not hearing any, then thank you. We will continue with the summary of
public comments from the Regional Coordinator.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. There were no written public comments received on WP14-21.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. We will then open the floor to the public testimony, and my understanding is that we have someone on the phone from Dillingham -- I'm sorry -- we do have one person who has signed up for testifying, Courtenay Gomez.

MR. PELTOLA: She's on the phone.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Oh, she's on the phone, okay.

MS. GOMEZ: Good morning, but I didn't even know what proposal we were on. Thank you for having me. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Federal Subsistence Board and all that are participating today.

My name is Courtenay Gomez and I am the director of Natural Resources at the Bristol Bay Native Association in Dillingham. I appreciate the ability to attend the meeting telephonically and I am thankful for BBNA Subsistence Fisheries and our Bristol Bay RAC co-Chair Nanci Morris Lyon for the ability to listen in this week and are working very hard with you.

Obviously I guess I'm testifying on Proposal 14-21. This proposal demonstrates the ability of Bristol Bay residents to effectively engage in the public processes that regulate our customary and traditional ways of harvesting and sharing; BBNA's definition of subsistence. In order for WP14-21 to even today -- to be presented before you today, this took many years of cooperative communication, research and management between our local harvesters, tribes, State Advisory Committees, the Bristol Bay RAC, ADF&G, Togiak National Wildlife Refuge, BBNA and OSM Staff as well as decisions previously made by the Alaska Board of Game and, you, the Federal Subsistence Board. First the Refuge worked with everyone to identify the resource cause of concern, then they worked to build the population of moose back up to a harvestable level. Many thanks to all of the individuals and organizations who have worked so hard for so long to bring us to this
decision that you are about to make today.

We would also like to publicly extend
our gratitude to the Federal Subsistence Board for your
decisions earlier this winter approving tribal requests
to extend winter moose seasons in 17A and for approving
an emergency special action to open the Federal
registration permit moose hunt in the 17C section of
the Togiak Refuge. Your quick response in addressing
the needs of our people provided additional
opportunities for Bristol Bay families to harvest moose
during this winter of extreme climate conditions.

The modifications to WP14-21 as
presented by OSM are consistent with the guidelines
established in the GMU 17A Moose Management Plan and,
now, through regulation will provide opportunities for
sustainable customary and traditional harvest for moose
in Western Bristol Bay.

Thank you so much for your service and
opportunity to engage in this process. We look forward
to your decision approving WP14-21 and continuing to
work with you to cooperatively manage subsistence
resources in Bristol Bay.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Are
there any questions of.....

MR. PELTOLA: Courtenay.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: .....Courtenay from
the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you,
Courtenay, for taking time to testify on this proposal.
Are there any -- is there anyone else
on the phone that would like to testify.

OPERATOR: If so at this time please
press star one so your line may be identified, again,
star one, if you would like to testify.

(No comments)
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Not hearing any response but in case someone is trying, we will give you the floor as soon as you are available. We will continue then with the Regional Council recommendations from the Chair.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you.

Bristol Bay Subsistence Regional Advisory Council supported Proposal WP14-21 with modification as described in the OSM conclusion.

The moose population is increasing and rural residents of the area using the resource are in support of maintaining a healthy moose population. And I would just like to stress for the Board, for them to understand that this was a huge, huge undertaking, this is a moose population that has been recovering. The villages of Togiak, Twin Hills, Manokotak, Aleknagik, Dillingham, plus all of the agencies, governmental agencies have been involved in this for years and it took many long nights and it took a lot of talk and effort and this was a plan that has been agreed upon by everyone, so I would urge you to move forward with it as well. We've even got the State aligned so things are all aligned.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Are there any questions of the Chair.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: We will then continue on with the Department of Fish and Game comments.

MR. CRAWFORD: Good morning, Mr. Chair.

Drew Crawford, Department of Fish and Game.

The State supports the original proposal of Wildlife Proposal 14-21. We have no objections to the proposed modifications that simplify Federal regulations without changing the proposal's original intent.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Any questions of the Board.
(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Not hearing any then
we will hear from the InterAgency Staff Committee.

MR. KESSLER: Mr. Chairman. I think
that there was supposed to be comments from the Yukon
Kuskokwim RAC also, it's a crossover proposal.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I'm sorry, I -- are
there any comments from the YK RAC.

MR. ROCZICKA: Quyana, Mr. Chair. The
YK RAC did echo the InterAgency Staff Committee
comments that we -- essentially we supported the
proposal and agreed with the Staff analysis and
recommendation.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. I assume
that it doesn't affect any other region.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay. Then we will
continue with the ISC Chair.

MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair. Just the
standard comments for this one.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The standard
comments, thank you. I assume that there are no tribal
consultations, Mr. -- Jack.

MR. LORRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
In consultations we had one comment from the village of
Atmautluak. They spoke in support of WP14-21 but
didn't give justification why.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. We're
down to Board discussions with Council Chairs and the
State liaison if there's any questions of any of those.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Not hearing any then
the Board -- the floor is open for Board action.

MS. JACOBSON: Mr. Chairman. I move to
adopt Proposal 14-21 with modification as recommended
by the Bristol Bay Council and consistent with the
Yukon Kuskokwim Council. I'll provide justification if I get a second.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Second.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: You heard the motion and the second. And I apologize for not introducing, Cindy, who is sitting in for Mr. Haskett.

MS. JACOBSON: Thank you. Federally-qualified subsistence users are required to have a State registration permit during the fall and winter moose seasons in Unit 17A and could harvest moose under the recently changed State regulations regardless of the Board's decision. However, if adopted, Federally-qualified subsistence users would be provided with additional harvest opportunity under Federal regulations, which include the use of Federal designated hunter regulations. The moose population continues to increase and is within the estimated carrying capacity for the area. The proposed changes would provide the Togiak National Wildlife Refuge manager with flexibility to adjust the length of the winter season and harvest limit to more effectively manage the population.

I intend to vote in favor of the motion.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Any further discussions on the motion.

(No comments)

MR. C. BROWER: Question.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Question's been called for. All those in favor of the motion say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any opposed, say nay.

nay.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The motion passes unanimously.

We will proceed on then to the next
And while we're at it I want to say thanks to the Bristol Bay group for putting all the time and effort into that proposal and we unanimously agree with you.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And it means a lot to us that you did unanimously agree. There was an awful lot of effort put in by a lot of people, a lot of people.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The next proposal, yes.

MR. MCKEE: The executive summary for the next proposal, WP14-22 begins on Page 238 of your book. It was submitted by the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council and requests two changes to the Federal caribou hunting regulations for the Mulchatna Caribou Herd.

It requests the establishment of permit requirements for all of the units within the herd's range, that includes Units 9A, B, C, 17A, B, C, Units 18 and Units 19A and 19B. The proposed changes would align with recent changes to State regulations, which require a State registration permit to hunt caribou from the Mulchatna Herd instead of using general harvest tickets.

The proposal also requests that the to be announced season in Unit 17A remainder and 17C remainder be shortened from August 1st to March 31st, to August 1st to March 15th, which would also align the potential dates of the to be announced season in Unit 17 remainder and 17C remainder with other seasons within the herd's range.

The proposed regulation changes would align permanent requirements throughout the Mulchatna's range under State and Federal regulations and result in a consistent August 1 through March 15th season, except for the split season in the portion of Unit 18 east and south of the Kuskokwim River. That harvest area, I'll discuss in the next proposal, WP14-26.

The Board approved temporary special action WSA 13-02 in July of 2013 which requested the same changes as this proposal, thus, these requested
changes were in place during the 2013/2014 time period. Also in 2013 the Board rejected a second temporary special action WSA 13-03, which requested the same changes as -- which requested the closure of Federal lands throughout the range of the herd to non-Federally-qualified users.

The Mulchatna Herd had declined from 1996 to 2008, and estimated bull/cow ratios have been below the management objectives since 2001, but recent composition surveys have shown some improvement of the bull/cow ratio. The herd size peaked at 200,000 animals in 1996 and the last finalized photosynthesis in 2008 provided a minimum count of 30,000 caribou, which is at the low end of the State's management objective. The preliminary results from a 2012 photosynthesis suggests the population may still be around 30,000 caribou. In addition, preliminary data shows that the number of -- the pregnancy rates for two and three year old cows are the highest in 2013 since they've been since they began collecting this data in 2000.

The proposed changes would allow for more responsive in-season management for the herd, which continues to be low. The State registration permit has a requirement to report harvest within five days of taking a caribou whereas the general harvest tickets have a requirement to report harvest within 15 days of taking the bag limit or the close of the season. Harvest reporting is an important aspect of harvest management, especially with fluctuating populations, like those of the Mulchatna Herd, and reporting would likely improve as reporting rates are higher with registration permits. Also aligning Federal and State permit requirements and seasons will help reduce regulatory complexity for users and law enforcement.

The OSM conclusion is to support Proposal WP14-22 with modification as shown on Pages 258 through 260. The modification is to delegate -- delete regulatory language found in portions of Unit 17A and 17C and issue a delegation of authority letter to the Togiak Wildlife manager for specific in-season management authorities. The authorities mentioned are already delegated, this would just take them out of regulation and put them in a letter. In Unit 17A within all drainages west of Right Hand Point, delegate the authority to open and close the season and set the
harvest limit and in Unit 17A remainder and 17C remainder it would delegate authority to open and close a season, set the harvest limit and identify the hunt area for the may be announced season.

That's all I have for this analysis.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK:  Thank you.  Are there any questions of the Staff.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK:  Not hearing any then we will continue with the summary of public comments from the Region Coordinator.

MR. MIKE:  Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Donald Mike, Regional Council Coordinator.  There were no written public comments received on WP14-22.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK:  Thank you.  We will open the floor for public testimony.  We don't show anyone here in the building, is there anyone on the phone that would like to testify on this.....

OPERATOR:  Again, from.....

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: .....Proposal 14.....

OPERATOR: .....the phone lines if you would like to testify press star one at this time, star one at this time if you would like to testify.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK:  I am assuming that there isn't anyone on the phone that wants to testify so we will continue on with the Regional Advisory Council starting with Bristol Bay.

MS. MORRIS LYON:  Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Bristol Bay Subsistence Regional Advisory Council supports this proposal with modification as described in the OSM conclusion.

The Council, we talked at length about this because it has several different implications.  We
stressed the importance of the rebuilding of this herd. We enjoyed it when it was at its peak and have seen it fall quite rapidly. The registration requirement will enable managers to track the harvest of the herd much better than it has been done. The herd count is still low. We are also optimistic with the increased calving rates that we've been seeing here in this past year but we still feel that conservation concerns of this population necessitate registration hunts in order to monitor the caribou population and make sure it's not just a burp and that it's actually going to happen and come back to the numbers that we had.

This particular herd affects us in an unusual way because -- well, and not so much for caribou, but as you know we have two different sides of the bay and they're actually pretty distant and over -- like over in 9 where I actually live and hunt, we have not seen many of this herd for a long time and, of course, our Northern Peninsula Herd that we used to use so much, we can't even use anymore, and the Southern Herd is just now starting to come back for us and it's only -- only the southern villages on that side of the bay can use it. So this herd affects us on both sides of the bay. We were a little bit reluctant to give up some additional time, the additional two weeks on the end, but it doesn't really affect us in the 9A area, more so in the 17, but, again, just because of the conservation reasoning we decided we'd go ahead and align dates right away too because it showed our -- the importance we were putting on conservation for this herd so it could come back for both sides of our bay.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Any questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: We will continue then with Yukon Kuskokwim RAC.

MR. ROCZICKA: Yeah, Quyana, Mr. Chairman.

And the YK RAC did support the proposal as far as the registration portion of it goes.

But they also included a modification,
they did not want to see the restriction in place for
the no more than one may be a bull, and they wish to
keep that within the regulation, and their reasoning
behind it, the folks that spoke to it, were that in the
fall when people that do go after caribou, it's quite a
lengthy run up some of the tributaries to get up into
the foothills of the mountains where the caribou are at
at that time, and, so if the only one that you were
able to get close enough to get a good shot at happened
to be a bull they wanted to be able to -- happened to
be bulls, they wanted to have the opportunity to take.
So that was their rationale.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Are
there any questions of the YK RAC.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Not hearing any, we
also have the Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory
Council recommendation and we don't have anyone here
from the Seward Peninsula but we note in the
information sheet that they also support the 14-22.

If there are no other comments from the
Regional Councils we will go to the Department of Fish
and Game comments.

MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, Mr. Chair, Drew
Crawford, Fish and Game.

The Department comments for Wildlife
Proposal 14-22 are the same as our comments for 21. We
support the original proposal. We have no objections
to the proposed modifications that simplify Federal
regulations without changing the proposal's intent.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Any
questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: We will then move to
the InterAgency Staff Committee comments.

MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair. The
standard comments for this one as well.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The standard
comments, thank you. Any tribal consultation comments.
Mr. Lorrigan, Native liaison from the Office of Subsistence Management.

We had one comment from the Association of Village Council Presidents who spoke to WP14-22, which would require a State registration permit for caribou all across various units of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd's range. AVCP had submitted a special action request to close Federal public lands within the affected area to non-residents and non-locals primarily to allow for more Federally-qualified subsistence users to harvest but it was denied by the Federal Subsistence Board. They felt that the implementation of this regulation to require the State registration permit is a form of restriction and that an area closure -- the area closure was justified.

I couldn't tell if they were speaking in support or opposition of the proposal.

Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Towarak: Thank you. Any questions of Mr. Lorrigan.

(No comments)

Chairman Towarak: Thank you. If not, we will open the floor for Council discussions between the Council Chair and the State liaison if there's a need to.

Mr. Cribley: Well, I guess the only question I have is the suggested changes that YK Delta RAC has suggested and maybe ask what the State's position is on it in regards to that suggested change.

Essentially they wanted, in Unit 18, in the -- wanted to eliminate the restriction of only being one bull but it not being limited to just, it could be either -- well, maybe the RAC Chair can explain it, but they had suggested a change to that particular reg.

Mr. Roczicka: It's on Page 242 of the book. It would strike the language that no more than one caribou may be a bull and this was also -- we made it specifically, it was only for Unit 18, we didn't want to impose that to other regions or if -- or other
areas of the range of the folks there that did not want it so, anyway, it would strike the language that no more than one caribou may be a bull and no more than one caribou may be taken August 1 to September 30, and that's in both the east and south of the Kuskokwim and the Unit 18 remainder. And, again, it was just because it's such a lengthy trip to get up to that area where the caribou are and the cost of gas these days, you know, it's not like people can make multiple trips like they used to be able to do in the past when gas was only 2.50 or $3 a gallon, instead of $7 like it is now.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. CRAWFORD: Okay. Drew Crawford, Department of Fish and Game. I haven't had an opportunity to confer with our area management biologist on this, but my understanding was that we supported the original proposal because it was in line with the State's regulations so I would assume that that would be our position.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Any further discussions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The motion then on the floor is to accept it as it is.

MR. PELTOLA: There's no motion.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Oh, there's no motion, okay, that's right, I'm ahead of myself.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: See how well -- okay, we will -- if there aren't any further discussions between the Chairs and the State we would -- I'll open the floor for Board action.

MS. JACOBSON: Mr. Chairman. I move to adopt Proposal 14-22 with modification as recommended by the Yukon Kuskokwim Council. I'll provide my justification if I get a second to the motion.

MS. K'EIT: Second.
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The motion has been moved and seconded. Continue the discussion.

MS. JACOBSON: It is clear that the Mulchatna Caribou Herd is in decline and adaptive management is needed to insure conservation of the resource. Changing from a general harvest ticket to a State registration permit will allow for better harvest monitoring due to reporting requirements. Better harvest tracking will allow managers to be more responsive to in-season management needs. The new permit requirement would also align State and Federal caribou regulations which will help reduce regulatory complexity for all users and law enforcement.

Shortening the potential season dates for the may be announced caribou season in Unit 17A remainder and 17C remainder will also reduce regulatory complexity by aligning season dates with the range of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd.

Issuing a delegation of authority letter will clarify the language in the public regulations booklet. The letter would not expand the current delegations but would allow the Board to change what has been delegated in a more timely manner, if needed.

This modification would make the caribou regulations across the range of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd more consistent while addressing the concerns of the Yukon Kuskokwim Council in Unit 18.

I intend to vote in favor of the motion.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Any further discussion on the motion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. KESSLER: So I guess I'm curious about the motion, which was on the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta's recommendation, which is, of course different than Bristol Bay and Western Interior. And so what's -- maybe you could go back over the rationale for why the motion is on the YK, which -- Regional Advisory
Council recommendation, which I believe is different than the State's regulations currently in place for the same area and the idea that you brought up is to try to match those regulations and it doesn't seem like it does that.

Thank you.

MS. JACOBSON: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The floor is yours.

MS. JACOBSON: This motion is consistent with the others, it just addresses what the Yukon Kuskokwim Council is asking.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: It -- go ahead.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: So your motion is to also accept what the YK is proposing to get that additional opportunity if they do have to -- go up the river on their machine, they can shoot just in case -- I would support that.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Greg.

MR. ROCZICKA: Mr. Chairman. Not to repeat myself for whatever I already laid out for Mr. Kessler, but also maybe a side issue on that is that there is not the effort on the caribou that there has been in the past when we were growing our other moose populations, both in the fall hunt and the winter hunt now with the opportunity that there is for -- to get moose over on the Yukon side since we've got such a burgeoning population there. People are actually more -- focusing more on harvesting there because, of course, a moose equals about three or four caribou when it comes to the amount of meat you get from it and plus it's not as long a trip and not over as much rough terrain as where the caribou like to be up in the foothills of the Kilbuck Mountains.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. KESSLER: I guess I'm still confused. Because if we look at the State regulation on Page 249 it's under Unit 18, there is says, no more than one bull may be taken, no more than one caribou
may be taken August 1 to January 31st. Anyway, it says no more than one bull may be taken. And then if we look at the OSM conclusion, it says for Unit 18 remainder, no more than one caribou may be a bull and then we look at the YK's recommendation and it crosses that out about no more than one caribou may be a bull. So it seems like there's not alignment of Bristol Bay, YK, Western Interior, the State and the OSM conclusion, and I'm -- so I'm just trying to make sure I understand what we're voting on here.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Kristin.

MS. K'EIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yeah, that's a good question, Steve, it is different from the recommendation of Bristol Bay. But the thing is YK Delta RAC is asking for it for just this particular unit, that is more -- this Unit 18 has more of an affect for the YK Delta residents and so it may not align with the State in this unit but the several other one, like seven -- seven other units will align and this addresses the particular concern that the YK Delta RAC brought forward.

And, you know, building on something Greg also said is they realize the conservation concern for this Mulchatna Herd is still there and the reality is most of their users are focusing more on a moose hunt anyway but because of the economic cost of trying to get to the herd as it comes into the eastern side of Unit 18, they'd prefer not to have to go further if -- if they see a bull, they don't want to have to pass it up and keep going further to find a female.

So it's just one unit out of eight in this proposal that would not be aligned with the State.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Steve.

MR. KESSLER: Thank you for that explanation. I'd be very curious about if the Bristol Bay Chair could say anything about this recommendation of the YK Delta which would be inconsistent with your recommendation and I.....

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. KESSLER: .....don't know that we
have Western Interior represented so we can't ask them.

       CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

       MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

       I think -- we did not discuss this when we were -- when we had made the proposal and it had not been brought in front of us, and I guess the only caveat that I would say is if there's no biological concern I do not see that we would have a concern with it because we were fully aware that area was allowed to take caribou, granted in a little bit different manner than what you proposed, but if there's -- our biggest concern was maintaining conservation until we knew the herd was going in the proper direction. That was the emphasis of our discussion. And as long as there's not going to be a biological issue because of it, then I don't see a reason why I would think our RAC would not have supported it.

       Thank you.

       CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any further discussions. That clarifies your question.

       MR. KESSLER: Well, it certainly helps because we have three Councils and, you know, they've got different recommendations on this and, you know, of course we're trying to defer to the Councils and have some rationale for why we would adopt one versus the other.

       So I think that what I'm understanding is for going with the recommendation of the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta Regional Advisory Council is to continue subsistence users but it wouldn't result in a conservation concern so that would be okay and we would tell the other Regional Advisory Councils that's why we would be going along with this recommendation.

       CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any further discussion.

       MR. CRIBLEY: Well.....

       CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

       MR. CRIBLEY: .....I'll ask a question.
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Question's been -- oh, go ahead.

MR. CRIBLEY: And maybe this could be directed to either the OSM or the ISC, from the standpoint if there was any consideration, if this suggested changes made by the YK Delta, would have any biological -- if there were any biological concerns about implementing their change from the standpoint of not limiting the harvest to just one bull.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. MCKEE: I don't think we have any real conservation concerns just because this State permit will -- since these new proposals will give us better in-season management, I don't think we're going to really have any concerns since these changes are implemented.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Further discussions.

(No comments)

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Question.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Question's been called for. All those in favor of the motion say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any opposed, say nay.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Motion passes unanimously. The next proposal.

MR. MCKEE: Too many pieces of paper here. WP14-26 begins on Page 267 of your booklet.

Proposal 14-26 was submitted by the Yukon National Wildlife Refuge and requests that for Unit 18 that portion to the east and south of the Kuskokwim River the caribou hunt be managed and require a joint State/Federal registration permit. The one bull harvest restriction be eliminated and the split season be eliminated and a continuous season from August 1 to March 15th be established. Additionally,
the proponent asks that the Yukon Delta Wildlife
manager be given delegated authority to close or reopen
Federal public lands to all users for this unit, if
needed, for conservation concerns, after consultation
with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, the Togiak
National Wildlife Refuge manager and the Chair of the
Yukon Kuskokwim Delta Regional Advisory Council.

I should state that after further
discussion with the proponent, it was determined that
this hunt should be administered via State registration
permit, only, and not the State/Federal permit as
written in the original proposal, and our modification
on Page 276 reflects this.

I'm not going to go into any discussion
on the biology because I already discussed that in the
last proposal. I would just add that the creation of
this delegation of authority letter will give added
management flexibility through in-season adjustment, as
I mentioned, to close or reopen the season. So it's
very similar to what we just talked about in 22, except
for the addition of the delegation of authority letter.
So without repeating myself I'll just end my discussion
with that.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Any
questions of the Staff.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Not hearing any then
could we get a summary of public comments from the
Regional Coordinator.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. There
were no written public comments received on WP14-26.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Is there
anyone that would like to testify on 14-26, either in
the building or on the phone.

OPERATOR: Again, it is star one if
you'd like to testify from the phone line, star one.

(No comments)
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I am assuming that there isn't anyone that wants to testify so we will move on to the Regional Council recommendations, starting -- I assume with Bristol Bay.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We supported this proposal with modification as described in OSM's conclusion but do not delegate authority to the Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge manager to open or close the season, which I believe is the same thing that was stated previously. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any questions. (No comments) CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The YK Delta RAC recommendations.

MR. ROCZICKA: Mr. Chairman. I could reference my comments on Proposal 22, and if not for that delegation of authority that was included in here you could essentially take no action on this one, but, with that -- yeah, we supported with the modification, similar language as Proposal 22.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any questions. (No comments) CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. We don't have anyone here from the Western Interior RAC or the Seward Peninsula but please note that Western Interior supports the proposal with modifications and the Seward Peninsula Advisory did not take any action on this proposal.

Could we move on then to the Department of Fish and Game comments.

MS. YUHAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Jennifer Yuhas and we can brief on this.

We were opposed simply because we thought you could wrap everything into 22, which you essentially did, and so we're not in opposition with the RAC on this one.
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. We will do -- do we have anything from the ISC Chair.

MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair. The standard comments for this one as well.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Standard comments, thank you. Jack, any tribal consultation comments.

MR. LORRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We had a comment from the Kwethluk Incorporated. They supported WP14-26.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. We will then open the floor again for any discussions between the Council Chair and the State liaison.

Go ahead, Mr. Cribley.

MR. CRIBLEY: Well, I guess I'm confused. I'm not -- well, I guess I don't understand what we're doing here and then going back to the changes we just made recommended by YK in the last, you know, last one that we did where we changed the language in it and it's not reflected in this one, does that carry forward into this one or how does that -- it seems like this is in conflict with the one that we just completed, and then I'm not really sure what this is doing and how this, in regards to what, then, Bristol Bay is recommending that we don't do.

I'm just confused what we're doing here.

I don't know if anybody can explain that or is it just me. Am I lost again.

(Pause)

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.
MR. CHRISTIANSON: I think what the difference here is the delegation of authority letter that would be put forward and that's it, just to delegate that authority to the in-season manager to manage the hunt. That's the difference, so.....

MR. MCKEE: That's correct.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: .....that I see it, and that the RAC Chair.....

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yeah, our concerns with conservation have been satisfied through our biologist and I totally agree with Rick [sic], that this is more of an administrative -- yeah, issue, than it is another new proposal. It was basically taken care of in the last one, and -- with wording aligned. Everything's fine.

MR. CRIBLEY: So does that mean Bristol Bay supports this proposal; is that what you're saying?

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yes, we did.

MR. CRIBLEY: Okay. Okay.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yes.

MR. CRIBLEY: I'm unconfused, thank you. I think.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: It looks like we have.....

MR. CRIBLEY: I don't hear anybody screaming so I guess it's okay.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: .....everybody agrees on it -- we could almost make it a consensus agenda but -- it -- it appears that everyone supports it, including the State.

Any further.....
MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: ....discussion.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Well, there is a difference between the two RACs, though, one says to not delegate that authority and the other one is saying delegate that authority so there's a difference of the Regional Advisory Council's position on who has the authority for in-season management. So that's the difference here. And then one supporting it and one's kind of not supporting it so.....

MS. COOPER: Two support it.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Or two to one, so.....

MS. MORRIS LYON: Correct. But we're just talking across the table here and we decided that on the last one, with the State doing the permit system they were suggesting the other one, you don't have a problem with the State doing the permit system; is that correct, and that's basically what this comes down to?

MR. ROCZICKA: No, we do not.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Jennifer.

MS. YUHAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to clarify procedurally. The Bristol Bay RAC Chair stated that their conservation concerns were already satisfied, it almost might be worth, procedurally, to just bifurcate the question. The only question here is the delegated authority, which the RACs are saying they don't necessarily need, so when they met they had voted to support the proposal because the conservation concerns were in there. You separate that out and it's already been satisfied, the only question is delegated authority.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MS. MORRIS LYON: And if that is still confusing people, the question about who got the authority was, should it be a State registration permit
or should it be -- yes, and so we decided in the last
one that it should be a State registration permit, we
got concurrence, I think everybody agrees.

MS. YUHAS: Through the Chair. They
agreed to take no action, Madame Chair.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: I'm ready to make a
motion.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Is there a need to
change the motion.

MR. KESSLER: There's no motion.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: There's no motion on
the floor but.....

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay. Let's open --
let's open the floor for -- does the Staff have
comments.

(Pause)

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Do we just make a
motion in the positive here so we could either vote it
down or do we just take no action.

MS. COOPER: She's got a motion that
she's.....

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Oh, she's crafting
it, okay.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I think the motion
maker is working on a solution. The floor is open for
board action.

MS. JACOBSON: Mr. Chairman. I move to
take no action.

MS. K'EIT: Second.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: You heard the motion
and the second. Any discussion. Go ahead, Steve.

MR. KESSLER: So just to clarify. The
reason for taking no action is because of the action
taken on the previous proposal; is that correct?

MS. JACOBSON: Mr. Chairman. Yes, that's correct.

MR. KESSLER: Thank you.

MR. CRIBLEY: I second -- maybe not.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Greg.

MR. ROCZICKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And, you know, this really didn't come up as a major point of discussion when we were dealing with this proposal, but the intent of the RAC regarding this is they wanted one permit to be done under one permit and not have to get the multiple permit scenario that was suggested in there with the.....

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: So not taking any action will.....

MR. ROCZICKA: ......joint, so that -- that's fine, yes.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: .....take care of that situation.

MR. ROCZICKA: Yep.

MR. KESSLER: Question.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Question's been called for. All those in favor of the motion say aye.

IN UNISON; Aye.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any opposed, say nay.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Motion passes unanimously. We will continue then on with the next proposal, which is, I think 14-27.

MR. MCKEE: No, Mr. Chair, that one was moved to consensus and then we took no action on 28
based on action you took on 23, so the next one should be 32, I believe.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay. We're on 14-32.

MR. C. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Yes.

MR. C. BROWER: Just a question, is the person that we're waiting for with Harry here yet or.....

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Yes. Okay. Would you prefer to go straight to 14-51 -- okay, we'll do 14-51 first and then we'll go back to 32 and 49. We'll start with the Staff analysis.

MR. MCKEE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The Staff analysis for WP14-51 begins on Page 336 of your booklet. Proposal WP14-51 was submitted by the State of Alaska and requests that the Red Sheep and Cane Creek drainages be opened to non-Federally-qualified subsistence users August 10th through September 20th in the Arctic Village Sheep Management Area of Unit 25A and that persons hunting within the Red Sheep Creek, Cane Creek portion of the sheep management area of 25A possess proof of completion of the Department approved hunter ethics and orientations course to include land status and trespass information upon hunting in this area.

The proponent states that the Red Sheep and Cane Creek drainages were closed unnecessarily and that the area was closed because of user conflicts focused mainly on issues of trespass.

The Alaska Board of Game adopted an ethics and orientation course requirement to safeguard against user conflicts in this area March of 2012. The proponent states that an ethics and orientation course would alleviate the need for closing these areas to non-Federally-qualified sheep hunters.

There is a long history associated with the opening and closing of the area in question dating back to 1995. In January of 2012 the Federal Subsistence Board adopted Wildlife Proposal 12-76 to close Red Sheep and Cane Creek drainages to non-
Federally-qualified subsistence users for sheep hunting. Both the Eastern Interior and North Slope Regional Advisory Councils supported this closure.

Surveys were conducted in 2006 through 2008 and 2012 within the Red Sheep and Cane Creek drainages and densities of sheep have remained stable with a density of 1.7 sheep per square mile in 2006 and 1.8 sheep per square mile in 2012. In 2006 a total of 188 sheep were counted from Red Sheep and Cane Creek while 197 sheep were counted in 2012. Although densities of sheep in that area are low relative to other areas in the Brooks Range this is probably more of a reflection of the poor habitat quality of the area. In 2008 during a sheep population composition survey 130 sheep and 20 groups were observed with a ratio of 59 lambs per 100 ewes suggesting good productivity. In 2012 a survey from Red Sheep Creek to Cane Creek counted 113 ewe like animals, 35 lambs and then 35 other rams along with 14 mature rams.

There are significant differences in sheep abundance and distribution within the Arctic Village Sheep Management Area, specifically the region north of Cane Creek has supported a sheep density of approximately eight times greater than the region between Crow Nest and Cane Creek. This is probably related to differences in geology and vegetation. Shelf formations that occur more commonly north of Cane Creek support more vegetation and, therefore, more sheep.

Data on the reported use of the sheep management area by Federally-qualified users is sparse and just how many sheep are harvested by Federally-qualified subsistence users in the sheep management area is not known. Compliance with the harvest permit system is generally low for residents of Arctic Village which is consistent with harvest reporting in other areas of rural Alaska. A total of six Federal permits to harvest sheep in the management area were issued between 1991 and 2004 and none of these were returned. Between 2005 and 2007 27 Federal registration permits were issued for the sheep management area, four sheep were reported harvested and 23 harvest reports were not returned. No permits were issued in 2008 and 2009. Four permits were issued in 2010 and of these only one sheep was reported harvested.

Harvest success by non-Federally-
qualified hunters in Red Sheep and Cane Creek drainages averages 69 percent from 2006 to 2009. Sheep harvest under State regulations range from two to seven sheep annually between 2006 and 2009, however, between 2006 when the Red Sheep and Cane Creek drainages were reopened and 2009 a total of 18 rams were harvested by non-Federally-qualified hunters.

If adopted, this proposal would open the August 10 to September 20th sheep hunting season to non-Federally-qualified hunters in Red Sheep and Cane Creek drainages and require all sheep hunters, including Federally-qualified users in these drainages, to possess proof of completion of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game approved hunter ethics and orientation course incorporating State regulations directly into Federal regulations. The State has not developed this course, which makes it difficult to anticipate any affects on subsistence users. Details of the State course are needed prior to adopting any proposals based on such a course. Adopting this proposal and opening this area to non-Federally-qualified users may adversely affect subsistence user's access and ability to harvest sheep in the area, and, thereby, fail to provide a meaningful preference for qualified subsistence users.

If adopted, this proposal would not affect the dall sheep population in the proposed area, the most recent population surveys indicate good productivity of the sheep population. Allowing sheep hunting by non-Federally-qualified users in these drainages is not a conservation concern because non-Federally-qualified users would be limited to one full curl ram during the hunting season. The harvest of full curl rams would not be expected to reduce the productivity of the local sheep population.

The proposal under consideration addresses the subsistence use clause of Section .815 of ANILCA, which provides the basis for the Board's action to close the area to non-Federally-qualified sheep hunters in 2012.

So while there may be no clear conservation reasons to close the Red Sheep and Cane Creek drainages to non-Federally-qualified users, there are reasons based on potential adverse affects to subsistence users to do so. Arctic Village residents have testified that allowing non-Federally-qualified
users to harvest sheep in these areas during the August
10 to September 20 period adversely affects their
ability to hunt in their traditional hunting area and
impairs their ability to successfully harvest sheep.
While the efforts of the proponents to require hunter
education and ethics orientation are recognized as good
faith efforts, such efforts do not go far enough to
assure that Arctic Village residents have continued
opportunity to harvest sheep in the Red Sheep and Cane
Creek drainages and receive the benefits of a
subsistence priority.

In addition, adopting this proposal
would require Federal qualified users to take a State
approved hunter ethics and orientation course which to-
date has not been developed. However, the State
intends to work with the affected users to develop this
course.

So with all that being said, the OSM
conclusion is to oppose Proposal WP14-51.

And that's it for the analysis.

David Jenkins is also here to add some
comments as well.

DR. JENKINS: Mr. Chair. David
Jenkins. I'm the subsistence policy coordinator for
OSM. I'm also an anthropologist and I worked on the
proposal analysis from 2012 and I'd like to make a
couple of points that Chris mentioned, but I think
deserves some emphasis.

The State argues that the issue is
mainly a user conflict and a trespass issue, but a
review of the testimony over the last 20 years from the
Arctic Village residents and a review of the
ethnographic literature and the historical literature
indicates that it's not a trespass issue but it's an
issue of access that these people have been describing,
and apparent access to this particular resource.

And I'd like to reference, as well, the
substantial Board discussion from 2012 which resulted
in a motion from the Regional Director from US Fish and
Wildlife and I'd like to put this on this record, too.
And he made a motion to support the closure with the
following justification, he said:
Pressure from non-local hunting is affecting the use of and access to traditional prime sheet hunting areas and camp areas. The State's proposal to require hunter education and ethics orientation did not go far enough. The activities in the area by non-Federally-qualified users have resulted in displacement of sheep pushing them out of range which has then prevented Federal subsistence hunters from being able to harvest sheep and the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge Staff supports the closure.

And in 2012 the Board passed a motion to keep that closure in place.

And what I'd like to do is just remind the Board of the substantial discussion that the Board had in 2012 and place that as part of this record.

Mr. Chair.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Are there any questions of the Staff.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you for that analysis. We will then move on to the summary of public comments from the Regional Coordinator.

MS. PATTON: Mr. Chair. Members of the Board. Eva Patton, Council Coordinator for both the North Slope and Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Councils.

We have several comments. One is a written public comment, which is in your meeting materials. And submitted comments to the Board from the Fairbanks Advisory Committee, the Yukon Flats Advisory Committee.

We have one written public comment submitted by Donald Woodruff of Eagle in opposition to Proposal 14-51. He states as a RAC member we met in this area and have dealt with sheep in this area over
and over again. The current regulations are good and have sound reasoning with years of discussions with people of this area. The people of Arctic Village depend on this resource and the State fails to listen to their testimony.

We have a letter that's submitted to the Board from the Fairbanks Fish and Game Advisory Committee and this letter is in your supplementary materials packet. It's two pages. I will summarize the key points.

The Fairbanks Fish and Game Advisory Committee has considered Wildlife Proposal 14-51 to reopen Red Sheep and Cane Creek drainage within the Arctic Sheep Village Management Area to non-Federally-qualified users currently before the Federal Subsistence Board and recommends adoption of this proposal for the following reasons: They state:

Clearly the current closure falls well outside the authority of the Federal Subsistence Program as outlined under ANILCA 8.15 and there is absolutely no documented of predicted conservation concern as evidenced by both scientific data supplied by both the State and Federal managers at public meetings and by public comments made by Federal officials and Regional Advisory Council members at this meeting.

Nothing within the Federal authorities grants the Board an ability to close hunting to non-Federal qualified users or to prevent the possibility of vandalism or trespass.

They go on to state: Questioning ANILCA 8.15 can be used to incorporate any form of (cultural preservation for local residents) who have testified that it is not their culture to hunt with any outsiders in the area and they question whether -- to preserve culture by this means is in the authority of the Board.

They comment on the State's proposal to provide hunter education and state the State has been
clear they would insure that the interests of the local
people with regards to reports of trespass would be
reported and any final product -- and committed to work
with the local users rather than simply impose
bureaucratic scheme upon them which may not address the
problem.

Next the Fairbanks AC recognizes that
this hunting closure for non-Federally-qualified users
does nothing to serve the intent of the Board. The AC
states the area is closed to non-Federally-qualified
users for the purposes of hunting and is not closed to
other users. Sheep hunting by non-Federally-qualified
users in this area is documented and the Board is aware
that the numbers are minimal. And they question that
there’s other uses in the area that have been
documented such as hikers, rafters who may also come
into interaction with sheep in that area.

In short, this closure does nothing to
actually serve the Federally-qualified sheep hunter.
If the Federal Subsistence Board is looking for a way
to simply keep people out because locals don’t want
them there this is not the way to do that. This
closure only to the State qualified sheep hunters is
outside the Board’s authority and fails to address the
issues intended to -- and the Board -- and fails to
address the issue the Board intends to address. It
ignores the efforts of the State of Alaska to
compromise to find a solution for the benefit of users.

In conclusion, please adopt 14-51 and
lift this unnecessary and illegal closure which sets an
indeffensible precedent and is open to challenge.

And, again, Mr. Chair, members of the
Board, this letter was submitted by the Fairbanks Fish
and Game Advisory Committee.

We have one more comment from the Yukon
Flats Advisory Committee.

The Yukon Flats Advisory Committee
considered WP14-51 and opposes this proposal. The vote
was unanimous to oppose 14-51. And the AC noted that
the importance of the hunt area and the resource to the
people of the Arctic Village.

That concludes submitted written public
comments.
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Are there any questions of the comments.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Not hearing any then we will open the floor to public testimony.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: We don't have anyone in the building that wants to testify, is there anyone on the phone that would like to testify on Proposal 14-51.

Mr. Chair,

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Assuming there isn't anyone -- if there is anyone that would like to testify hit star one and we will put you on the floor but at this point we will then continue to the Regional Council recommendations. Is -- is.....

MR. H. BROWER: Flip a coin, sir, Mr. Chair, to -- two Councils, it's a crossover proposal between Western Interior -- or Eastern Interior and the North Slope.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Let's go ahead with your recommendations. And then if Jack is on the phone we'd like to hear from him also.

MR. PELTOLA: Sue.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Sorry, Sue Entsminger. Go ahead, Mr. Brower.

MR. H. BROWER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning everyone.

The North Slope Regional Advisory Council's justification on the proposal, WP14-51.

The Council discussed concerns of the region's needs and noted the other activities to impact access to important resources for subsistence.
Deflection or disturbance of sheep by sporthunters and aircraft flight make it difficult for the community to reach the sheep for subsistence hunting.

The Council noted that the cultural concerns regarding this hunt have been expressed at previous public meetings. Kaktovik has C&T for sheep in this area, so the proposal comes before the North Slope Regional Advisory Council. The Council noted that there were previous -- the previous Chair, Fenton Rexford of Kaktovik, has specifically been very engaged in testimony on Red Sheep Creek area in the past. Council members with connection to this hunt area noted that these sheep are a very important subsistence food shared in the community. Even if the local harvest numbers are not high, effort to reach the animals are considerable and sharing of the meat and organs is widespread and important. They also stressed that these sheep and location have special cultural and medicinal values due to the history and relationship of the community as well as mineral licks that the sheep frequent in this area, which make their meat contain unique qualities.

That's the extent of the comments from the North Slope Regional Advisory Council, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Are there any questions of the Chair from the North Slope.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Is Sue Entsminger on the phone.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay. I understand that Andrew Firmin from the Eastern Interior RAC is on the phone. Andrew, do you have any comments on this proposal.

MR. PELTOLA: Ask him to star one.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: My understanding is that in order to get hooked onto this system, Andrew, you need to hit star one.
REPORTER: Have the operator open the line, we are connected.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Operator, is there an open line that Andrew Firmin can connect to our conference.

MR. FIRMIN: Hello, this is Andrew.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Andrew, this is Tim Towarak, the Chair of the Federal Subsistence Board. We are at the point of asking the Eastern Regional RAC to give us recommendations on Proposal 14-51, the floor is yours.

MR. FIRMIN: Yes. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I believe the Council unanimously opposed this one. But our Council heard plenty of testimony from Arctic Village, Venetie and Fort Yukon and they all were in opposition of this. I believe this is the third time that the State is, or the proponents have brought it to the Federal Subsistence Board in the last 10 years or two cycles. And, our Council -- again, this issue has come up and a lot of this has to do -- a reason a lot of people are in opposition to it is it's a big issue of trespass, you know, user conflict in the area. It's one small area in the entire Brooks Range that's near Arctic Village and this area is also -- it's not that accessible to people in the village but they do access it and it's a hardship for them to go there and when they do get there there's airplanes sitting in their camp spots and, you know, like they said that they scare a lot of the sheep up and away from them and they just have a -- you know, they have a hard time using it when other people are involved in it. So this little window of time for them and opportunity allows them to go and harvest sheep in an area that's, you know, mainly -- you know a lot of it nowadays is from an airplane and most people don't own airplanes so for these people to still harvest and, you know, conduct their traditional activities with their families, to get sheep, it's hard
for them to get around, the air traffic disturbance, and there's been other cases of, you know, trespass and littering and all kinds of stuff on people's Native allotments in the area.

And we've heard so much testimony at our last couple of meetings that this has gone on that our Council is in unanimous opposition to it.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you, Mr. Firmin. Are there any questions of Mr. Firmin.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you for your comments, Andrew. We will then go to the Department of Fish and Game comments.

MS. YUHAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Jennifer Yuhas for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

And I've really behaved myself at your meeting here with my very brief comments but if you'll indulge me today, this is the State's proposal and we're building a legal record here when we're making this vote and it's a very important issue.

It is a longstanding discussion with whether sheep is open or closed in this area. And when I first came on the scene four years ago it seemed very simple, look at the data and saw that there's no conservation concern so you think the answer's very simple. And I've listened to a lot of public testimony and it wasn't okay what we were hearing. It is not okay to go and disrespect someone else's land and to litter and to trespass and all of the things that we heard needed to be addressed.

But we took a look at what we're able to address in this arena, and this Board hears a lot of testimony about pollock, about marine mammals, about things that you can't address in this arena and we do our best, we want to do something for the users.

We heard that the State hadn't listened to the testimony of the people two years ago and we went back and we did a lot of Staff work and I know some people think I might be emotionally invested in
this just because I did a lot of work. That's not the
case. I'm a public servant. I do a lot of work at the
same level that I did on this, that this Board never
sees, that's what we do, we try and lay everything out
for you, the same way the Staff did for the .804
analysis yesterday and you adopt it or you don't.
That's what we do as public servants.

The State still contends that this
decision is outside the Board's authority. And some of
you have the privilege today of sitting in your Board
member's seat and it's very rewarding to make decisions
that affect people's lives. Much of the decisions in
this book are important, but they're fairly
inconsequential to the process, an extra week on the
season here, an extra bag limit there, it's not
consequential to the process but has a great affect on
people's lives after the meeting's over and it's very
rewarding to vote for those things and make a
difference in somebody's life.

We want to make a difference here on
Red Sheep Creek, and coming back to the State, we
looked and said what is within our authority. We're
hearing about trespass, we're hearing about vandalism,
we're hearing about things that aren't okay but what
can we do as a Department. Well, the only thing we can
manage are the hunters going up there so we came back
and said, well, what about an ethics and orientation
class. Two years ago the justification Mr. Jenkins
read into the record was based on not going far enough
because the Board of Game hadn't met to adopt that and
Mr. Haskett also put on the record, we don't know what
they'll do, they're meeting a week after us, there's no
guarantee they'll adopt this. The new information here
is they did. The State adopted this. You've heard
some Staff discussion, well, we can vote to oppose this
and just keep it close because the State doesn't have a
class in place; that's a fairly contrived answer.
There's no incentive for the local people to work with
us when this is what they want, they want people out,
so why would you work with us to reopen an area if the
-- if the condition is, once the class is in place then
it can be reopened, then where's the incentive for
that. No agency is going to expend the Staff time or
the finances to put a class in place the locals don't
want.

There's really no reference here to
conservation, and that's the authority afforded the
While under ANILCA §15, someone brought up yesterday with the Saxman issue, do we really think we'll be challenged on this, who's going to challenge making Saxman rural; that's the truth, who's going to challenge that. You're making decisions here to set precedent to close an area to sheep hunters. The AC Chairman's letter is correct, it doesn't close the area to everyone. It'd be hard pressed to find a National Park, a Refuge, a Forest or many of the BLM holdings that are held in trust for the general public that isn't associated with a place that's special to people near the area. There are ways to address this outside the Board's authority.

If the local people don't want others in the area you can actually go through a rulemaking process and swap out the land. If this has to be held special just for the local people, there's ways to do that. Keeping this area closed to a few sheep hunters, maybe seven a year, just as the AC Chairman's letter stated doesn't keep out the eight parties of other people who walked through the area this year. Rafters, sheep hunters going to a different area. He referred to posie sniffers. But people are using the area who are not sheep hunting. If the contention is we need to keep others out of the area because it's not their culture to hunt with others in the area, this proposal doesn't do that.

The State is petitioning to have the area reopened for possibly seven people who might go there to hunt sheep. Those sheep hunters are much more aware of their surroundings than people who are not hunting sheep trying not to disturb the sheep in the area. Blaming the possible seven people who might use the area for everything else that's happening goes a little too far. So it is a matter of precedent that you're setting here if you close the area for no conservation concern.

We're open to questions, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Are there any questions of the State.

Kristin.

MS. K'EIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Jennifer, I have a question on, was there any discussion or any work on the impact of the airplane
noise on the sheep herds and I -- I ask that because I recall in, I believe it was the 2012 or 2011 RAC meeting in Fairbanks I heard a lot of testimony from residents of Arctic Village and the area that another piece of the concern beyond the trespass on Native allotments and other private lands, another concern was that as hunters and planes were coming in, they would fly over the area and that would actually push the herd further from this Red Sheep Creek, so further away from the local user of Arctic Village or Venetie. Did you have any discussions around that or work on that.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MS. YUHAS: Mr. Chairman to Ms. K'eit.

That question has come up previously. We all know that there are studies that show airplanes disturb sheep in general, I mean, so we know that principle. Currently the area is closed to sheep hunters and airplanes are using the area. We also know that for any State-qualified user the season's very short and that they might use an airplane to get there. For the Federally-qualified users, they have a 271 day season and most of their harvest occurs with snowmachines in the winter when the airplanes are not in the area. They have an extremely lengthy season compared to the possible State hunters who might use an airplane at the beginning of the season. We don't think that that's a factor to closing the area to a possible maximum of seven hunters.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any further questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you for your comments. We will continue then on with the InterAgency Staff Committee comments.

MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair. Just the standard comments for this one as well.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Standard comments, thank you. Tribal consultation comments.

MR. LORRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. A Fort Yukon representative opposed WP14-51 stating there are problems with trespass and litter. Felt a half hour
hunter ethics class was inadequate in dealing with the problems. The caller also felt that non-local hunters flying into the area contributed to sheep moving higher and making them less accessible.

And just a recap of the consultation on Tuesday morning, Sarah James from Arctic Village stated that the Red Sheep Creek valley is a sacred place of the community and the Gwich'in Nation. The red rock mineral licks is like medicine and the sheep in this area are special for this reason. The meat of the sheep is like medicine for elders and it is used in special times and ceremonies. The Gwich'in have great respect for the land and trash -- great respect for the land, and trash or disturbance of sheep is of great concern. Sheep are so respected here that the special ways they are taken care of, traditionally sheep were brought back in the back door of a skin hut. She also noted it takes a long time to be a ram and like the lake trout it can take many years to become mature, up to four years to become a ram. So they take care of and respect in their harvest.

And Howard of Eagle called in and noted the support -- he supports the community of Arctic Village and he understands the importance of the sheep for his community and how far they have to travel to harvest them.

Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Are there any questions of the Staff.
(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: We will then open the floor for any further discussions between the Council Chairs and the State liaison.
(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Not hearing any then I will open the floor for Board action.

MS. JACOBSON: Mr. Chairman. I move to adopt Proposal 14-51 and will provide my justification as why I intend to vote against the motion if I get a second.
MS. COOPER: Second.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The motion has been moved and seconded.

The floor is open for discussion.

MS. JACOBSON: So as we've heard there's been extensive testimony and a long established administrative record on this issue. I understand how important this area is culturally for subsistence harvest of sheep for residents of Arctic Village and Venetie. The importance of this area is also shown by the number and locations of Native allotments, cultural sites and ethnographic studies documenting the long history of use in this area.

I've heard that subsistence users attempts to harvest sheep in this area may have been interfered with by aircraft and other non-Federally-qualified hunter's activities. The message was clear and I'm convinced that the activities in this area by non-Federally-qualified users has resulted in displacement of sheep pushing them out of range which then prevented Federal subsistence hunters from being able to harvest sheep.

I believe that keeping this closure in place will help insure the subsistence use of sheep are continued for residents of Arctic Village and Venetie in the Red Sheep and Cane Creek drainages.

For these reasons I intend to vote against the motion.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any further discussion.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: I also will choose to vote in opposition of it, just based on the cultural significance of the people of the area. You know a lot of times places that are scared to us are continually just managed as if it's just a management area and a lot of times that connection to the land and the resource to the people in the area is generally lost due to trying to provide an opportunity for other people to come in and share that resource in that area.

So I really support the people in their testimony and the long record that they've established
on how important that is culturally to them and just
would like to see that opportunity continue for them.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Steve.

MR. KESSLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I will also oppose this proposal. I
have reviewed this year's proposal and the comments and
recommendations received. I also listened carefully to
the testimony in 2012 from when the Board previously
reviewed this proposal. That testimony seemed very
helpful to the Board in their 2012 deliberation. We
didn't have any public testimony at this meeting
probably, in part, because of our ever changing agenda
and extension of our meeting to today, so I would like
that previous comment to be part of the record.

My vote, based on the OSM analysis and
conclusion, the recommendations of the two Regional
Advisory Council and overwhelming public comment from
all the times we've considered this proposal is to
oppose this proposal.

I justify my vote based on ANILCA
Section .815 paragraph three which allows for a closure
to continue Federal subsistence uses.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Any
further discussions.

Mr. Cribley.

MR. CRIBLEY: Yeah, I just want to also
indicate that I'm going to vote to oppose this
proposal.

Part of it being, I think, that we had
just put it into place, it's only been in place for two
years and I think we need more information to indicate
whether the change that we've made here and the
restrictions we put into place are actually
accomplishing what their intent was from the standpoint
of relieving some of the issues that Arctic Village has
indicated as far as conflicts, but also I think we need
to be very cognizant of the testimony that we heard and
the comments that we heard from those who put this
proposal in front of us and pay attention to that from
the standpoint of identifying if, in fact, this change has been effective and is creating relief for the folks in Arctic Village. We want to make sure that we are respecting the subsistence users and meeting their needs, but we don't want to be putting regulations in place or restrictions in place that really aren't making a difference or changing things.

So I think we need to continue with this, the limitation on -- or restriction only to subsistence hunters in this area but also be cognizant that -- or to make sure that what we're doing here is effective, and we're not putting regulations in place that really aren't doing any good. So I think as the years go on we need to be seeing if we are helping them out or if as, in fact, is being mentioned that there's other uses that are still continuing and whether Arctic Village is seeing this problem continuing regardless of what we do. So I think that needs to be paid attention to in the future.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Any further discussion.

Kristin.

MS. K'EIT: Mr. Chair, thank you.

I will also be voting in opposition of this proposal for a couple of important reasons. Although I hear the effort that the State has made to address concerns that have been brought forward in the past years. I think back to the 2012 testimony, both at the RAC meetings and also at the Federal Subsistence Board meetings and one of the clear issues was beyond the trespassing and planes landing on Native allotments and things left behind, a primary issue was the noise of the planes.

And I can personally testify, I live by Lake Hood, so this isn't exactly a rural area but, you know, I'm about a half a mile from Lake Hood which has a lot of float plane usage and I can be inside my house on the phone and people hear the planes taking off and coming in for landing.

So I really heard and I think I understood the user's testimony about plane noise affecting the sheep and the movement of the sheep away
from the areas that they've traditionally hunted them.

The other thing is there were comments by one of the Fish and Game Advisory Committees that said there were other users in the area, other hunters on foot, hikers, rafters and so-called, as they called them posie sniffers, I'm not sure if there's posies up there but, you know, just to lighten things up, you know, I still contend that a plane coming in and landing in the area, you know, within just a few miles of the hunting area is a lot louder, it's going to have a greater affect on the sheep population.

The other thing is that recalling some of the testimony of local users that I had not heard that they hunt in the winter. My recollection and notes from that time actually describe them pooling their resources either in the fall or the spring, depending on the water heights of the creeks to pick their best hunter, to send them up river by boat, that it was a journey of a few days. One of those who testified described going up there as a child and her parents would prepare them, they'd pack food for a few days -- actually more than a few days because they'd be camping while then the hunter actually scaled up the side of the mountain and the cliff there to get to the sheep population.

So that's what I recall from the testimony about timing of year.

And this is Federal land, Federally-managed land. The Board can vote to close those lands and make them only accessible to Federally-qualified users, both to protect the sheep population but also to meet subsistence needs and provide for that opportunity.

So for those reasons I'll be opposing this proposal.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Any other comments. Go ahead.

MR. ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am, you know, the Southeast Regional Advisory Council's representative on the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission.
And several years ago we started dealing with this issue of trespass on Native allotments and ANCSA Corporation lands. And I found out during, you know, our discussion that we had no authority to control that from, you know, sport people coming in and hunting and they were squatting on the land and leaving, you know, garbage and, you know, trash all over the place, that -- because they are private land that they fell under the jurisdiction of the State. Now, I have to sympathize with the State because there just wasn't enough Troopers in the area, you know, to control that and I think that issue still stands today.

But I throw this out, you know, for future consideration as this issue possibly comes up again, you know, that there is some serious problems there with outsiders coming in and trespassing on private lands and unable to, you know, adequately deal with them.

So just for the record I thought I'd share that with you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. And the State has jurisdiction over private lands, including ANCSA and Native allotments, you are right.

I'd like to point out one thing that unless the Regional Advisory Council's are convinced to change this regulation I personally cannot vote against what the Regional Advisory Council's want and I would suggest to the State that perhaps that's where you need to convince people to change the regulation.

We've been mandated by the Secretary of Interior, who ultimately has the authority over anything that we do to defer as much as possible to the Regional Advisory Councils and it would be hard for Charlie, myself and Tony to vote otherwise from what the Regional Council's are telling us how to vote. So I wanted you to understand that's the position we've taken.

Go ahead.

MS. YUHAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And we certainly understand that deference and understand -- sometimes the State is bound to something that might seem silly to the Board when we have a
certain position and -- and there's legal reasons
times that we're bound to that position.

You have -- the Board does have the
conservation issue as a means for not deferring to a
RAC. And we certainly sympathize with the local area
on what they want. We don't think that we will have
any success in changing the opinion of what people
want. We know what people want. And as I stated
before, people want things with pollock, and they want
things with marine mammals that don't fall within this
Board as well. The State knows probably what's going
to happen with this vote, we understand that. Do just
want to remind the Board that this is precedent setting
because there is no conservation concern and that the
two outs for the vote are conservation concern and not
within our authority. So that is available to you.
But we know how things will proceed.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Any
further discussion. Mr. Christianson go ahead.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: I guess the
foundation of this testimony that we heard is that it's
the cultural and spiritual connection that the people
have with the resource, that's what I'm hearing from
that region. And as I look through here there is no
clear conservation concern, and if you listen to all
the testimony over the last couple of days, the level
of spirituality people have in the act of subsistence,
that's the underlying theme that keeps coming forward
from the residents of the land, is that, they have care
for the resource, they put their heart and soul into
this and it's clearly in this one, the sheep is
something that the people hold in high esteem and my
believe is when you do that, the population reacts to
that care. There's a general feeling in our
communities that, you know, when you give that
reverence to the resource, the resource will pay you
back in return.

And I think we all, generally, as
humans believe that underlying principle. And I think
that it is a testament to why there isn't a
conservation concern in that region is because the
people there care about the resource and they're
willing and have come forward and spoke to that care
about it. And I think there's something to that and
you hear it over and over and over. I've been here for
almost two years now and that's what the people say and
I'm going to have to stick to that. Whether or not there's a conservation concern, I think the resource is responding to the people in the region who care about the resource.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MS. CAMINER: Good morning, Mr. Chair. Thank you so much and I'm sorry to be late this morning.

I was involved in some of these discussions probably eight to 10 years ago. And I'm glad to hear there's not a conservation concern, but definitely a concern of the Board and the RACs is whether this proposal could be detrimental to subsistence users and because of the conflicts, because of this education potential course, I think that's a valid reason for this Board to use.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Any further discussion. Go ahead.

MS. COOPER: Yeah, Mr. Chair. I'd just like to echo Mr. Cribley's concern. It's only been two years, I'd like to see how this is going to play out and work so I intend to oppose this -- this proposal.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any further discussion.

(No comments)

MR. KESSLER: Question.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Question's been called for. Let's have a roll call vote on this one.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

US Fish and Wildlife Service.

MS. JACOBSON: Aye.

(Laughter)
MS. JACOBSON: No.

MR. PELTOLA: National Park Service.

MS. COOPER: Oppose.

MR. PELTOLA: Bureau of Land Management.

MR. CRIBLEY: Oppose.

MR. PELTOLA: Bureau of Indian Affairs.

MS. K'EIT: Oppose.

MR. PELTOLA: Anthony Christianson, public member.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Oppose.

MR. PELTOLA: Charles Brower, public member.

MR. C. BROWER: Oppose.

MR. PELTOLA: US Forest Service.

MR. KESSLER: Oppose.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Oppose.

MR. PELTOLA: Zero in support, eight in opposition.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. We have, what, two more proposals WP14-32 and 14-49; is that it.

MR. PELTOLA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Mr. Brower.

MR. H. BROWER: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you for the action that you've taken to all the Board members and Council and State for providing all the information.

Mr. Chair, I had requested to leave before 10:00 but now it's after 10:30, if I could be
excused at this time I'd greatly appreciate it, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you.

MR. C. BROWER: Wait for me.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I'd like to comment real briefly while we're in kind of a recess and I want to thank the Regional Advisory Council, I know that your time is voluntary to this process and I really respect that and I know that each of you are here because of your interest in the process and doing a service for the people that you represent and it really makes me feel well that we are deferring to you as much as possible and appreciate your participation.

We're going to take a five minute break. We might have Wayne, I think, on the phone and he's got commitments after 11:00 so I'd like to make this a short recess, maybe 10 minutes, at 20 to 11:00 I'd like to put the Forest Service on to discuss the ETG -- ETJ process. So come back at 20 to 11:00 and we'll start immediately.

MR. ROCZICKA: Mr. Chairman. While we're still on the record I just wanted to place for the record for the RAC, since I have to leave as well and the YK Delta RAC as far as Proposal 32, which is one of the crossovers there, we would defer to the Western Interior's position on that.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: I got that.

(Laughter)

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I'd like to reconvene. We're going to call the meeting back to order so we could -- I'd like to make a little switch. We're going to do the extraterritorial jurisdiction issue first. And I'd like to turn the floor over to Mr. Owen who I think is on the phone, and I assume Jennifer's going to participate in this discussion also. I'd turn the floor over to the two.
Is Mr. Owen on the floor.

MR. OWEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Can you hear me.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Yes, we can. The floor is yours.

MR. OWEN: Great. Thank you. I was being outsmarted by my telephone.

So thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the Board for accommodating my schedule. And I'd also like to thank Mr. Kessler for being able to sit in for us while we're attending to other business.

So I think we can do this pretty quickly. Before you in your supplemental binder, one of the latter tabs, it says ETJ, and there is a one-page, two-side briefing. And I'll just go over this quickly.

On the front side on a briefing paper at the bottom, it says December 2013, is the -- is a briefing paper that has been before you twice before regarding part two of the Environmental Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution's recommendations for resolving the issues at stake in the extraterritorial jurisdiction petition, that being economic development within the Community of Angoon.

And I'd like to give just one update on the status of those bullets which are all sort of ongoing. And down towards the bottom, the Kanalku fish barrier modification project. The State Department of Fish and Game and the U.S. Forest Service have been out at that site earlier this week or late last week to evaluate the success in how much foliage has been, and they are right now writing that up. You know, I've seen a little report from the State, and I've seen a report from the Forest Service. And so, you know, we don't know exactly where we are on that, but we have seen a significant change in terms of the leap pool that's there for the sockeye to get back up into Kanalku.

So the question I think before us is, are we going to do anything more there, or does there need to be anything more down.
So that's where we are on that. And that's the only modification to that.

On the reverse of that sheet, the part one of the assessment for Angoon suggested that working through the Board of Fish to propose a series of regulatory changes that would better provide the residents of Angoon with the amount -- the subsistence necessary for them. We have a number of proposals that I'd like to just really briefly touch base with you on, and sort of modify one of the sections that we have there.

So Bert Adams and the Southeast RAC submitted three separate proposals to the Board of Fish on April 10th. They are described there, you know, in some detail for you.

The Community -- or the Angoon Community Association, the tribal government proposed one regulatory change. It is described there for you.

The Kootznoowoo, Incorporated, the tribal corporation for the Community of Angoon and Admiralty Island, they had been working on as many as -- and, you know, I'm not sure if I have the exact number right, but I believe that I saw up to nine separate proposals had been worked on, or were in various stages.

The State of Alaska informs me that in the end Kootznoowoo, Incorporated submitted four regulatory proposals for the Board of Fish. I do not know what those were right now. I have not been able to get that information. We're working on getting that from Kootznoowoo, and Ms. Yuhas has told me that, you know, when that information becomes available in that process, that she'll be coordinating with the Forest Service. So we're grateful for that assistance.

And the community, the city government of Angoon also made two proposals, neither of which are sockeye related, but go to address the larger subsistence needs of the community. And you see those presented there for you.

There's one proposal that we had expected to be submitted that is unaccounted for. We expected Grand Camp to submit a proposal on a community harvest. We're not sure if -- you know, if that
happened, or if that ended up as one of the Kootznoowoo proposals, or where exactly that is, so we're a little uncertain about that. But right now it looks like we have -- it looks like we have 10 proposals that we can account for to the Board of Fish, and the process is now that the Department of Fish and Game will be staffing those. It's my understanding that the Forest Service will have an opportunity to contribute to the 'Staff analysis, and we will go forward with the Board of Fish proposals.

So in a nutshell, that is where we are right now, and I would be more than happy to address any questions directed at me or I'm sure Ms. Yuhas would be happy to respond to any questions that are specific to the Department of Fish and Game.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you, Mr. Owen.

We'll hear then from Ms. Yuhas.

MS. YUHAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I reiterate everything that Mr. Owen said. We've been working very closely together. I don't want to paint a picture for anyone on the outside that it's too cozy, or anything like that, but we've just had very good staff collaboration, keeping each other updated early and often so that we're not surprising each other.

As Mr. Owen stated, we are trying to filter through exactly all of the proposals. The Federal process goes through the same thing when they all come in, and our executive director for our Board of Fish was trying to assist us with that, but they also had a Board of Fish work session the same time you were meeting, and two days prior to that, and so he was trying to do that remotely to get to us exactly what was submitted. So we're not sure if the Grand Camp proposal we were expecting came from an individual, and we can't find where it is on the list.

But I'm very happy to report for the record that we've been talking about this for a few years, there's been a lot of discussion from the RAC and from others that they didn't see what was happening. And at the RAC meeting that Mr. Adams
chaired just a month and a half ago used the analogy
that they've got a lot of plant starts in the window,
too. And they keep watering them, putting light on
them, we don't see anything. Well, we finally have
sprouts, Mr. Chairman. We have sprouts of about 10
proposals. And as Mr. Owen said earlier this week when
we were collaborating, you know, now the work starts.
Now the horses are out of the gate, so you'll be seeing
much more activity, but this does show all those times
I came before you and said, we're doing something, you
just don't see it, here it is.

The other issue was whether or not the
Angoon area had an advisory committee. This process
defers to the RACs and the Board of Fish doesn't
necessarily defer, but provides much more privilege to
the ACs, and just this last week the Angoon Community
Association, which is the tribe representative, voted
to act as the AC, so that body will not be sending more
people around with more hats to more meetings. They'll
simply meet as the tribal association, and be the
advisory committee. So we're in the process of doing
the Staff work to get that on paper for them.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you.

Are there any questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I'm assuming that
both you and Mr. Owen feel that you're receiving all
the support and coordination of the local community
along with the trawlers.

MS. YUHAS: Mr. Chairman. We are
supporting the community, so I would go ahead and just
reverse that, that the Center for Environmental
Conflict Resolution, that was hired by the Forest
Service to be a neutral third party to investigate
things, made the recommendation, and everyone has
agreed with that. The solutions have to come from the
local community.

And so with regards to the trawlers, we
don't interact with them on the same individual basis,
but the working group that is comprised of some of the
commercial fishing interests are aware of the
proposals. They were aware they were being submitted,
and we have not heard -- it hasn't been contentious.
Nothing has surfaced to oppose things at this juncture. The Department is not aware of outrage on behalf any other portion of the community. So we'll just continue to support the local area in the process.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you.

MR. OWEN: Mr. Chairman. You know, referring back to my comments about the Kootznoowoo proposals, you know, as we've been going forward the nature of the proposals within Angoon has been very -- or highly variable over time. There have been lots of things talked about and proposed and thought about, and, you know, honestly we have not engaged the commercial fishing people, because of the volatility of -- well, the -- I don't mean volatility as in something, you know, angry or red, but, you know, in the lack of stability around actual proposals. It is our intention, and I'm sure that it's the intention of Fish and Game that once we have these sort of, you know, the first line vetted, to start communicating this now that we know what the proposals actually are, to get feedback from the commercial fishing group, as I'm sure that would be a natural part of the vetting process. But it is our intention to sort of reach out to those groups ahead of time now that we know what the actual proposals are.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Are there any other -- or any questions from the Board regarding the ETJ process.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Does that conclude your report to the Board, Wayne.

MR. OWEN: If the Board is satisfied with the report, we can conclude this briefing.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Steve.

MR. KESSLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Steve Kessler.

One thing that we do need to do is to provide an update to the Secretaries on this process. They ask for an update every six months on where things were. And what my recommendation is, is that Staff formulate an update based on this briefing paper that
you have and some of the discussion, put that together as an update which will then come under your signature to the Secretaries, if that's okay with the Board.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay. And I'm sure the Staff will follow up on that.

If there isn't anything further, then we will go on to the next agenda topic.

Thank you, Mr. Owen, and Jennifer, for the report. And I'm personally glad that there's some steps being taken toward some resolution in the future. Thank you.

MR. OWEN: We find it very gratifying as well. And thank you for the opportunity to testify via phone. And I will mute and enjoy the rest of the discussion.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. We don't have the option of mute here.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: We will -- the next item on the agenda is -- I think we wanted to finish the proposals, so we'll go back to Proposal 14-49, is it?

DR. JENKINS: It's 49 and 32.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: And 32. And I understand that we have two other fish proposals right after that.

DR. JENKINS: Special actions.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Special action.

DR. JENKINS: And the Stikine River (indiscernible).

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: And then the Stikine River after that. And then we will get into the Secretarial appointments, and I understand Mr. Pourchot would like to be here for that.

So we will get into -- take care of the proposals at this point.
Mr. McKee: Mr. Chair, do you want to start with 32 or 49.

Chairman Towarak: We'll start with 32.

Mr. McKee: Okay. The executive summary for WP14-32 begins on Page 310 of your booklet.

WP14-32 was submitted by Robert Walker, and requests a modification of the Paradise Controlled Use Area boundary in Unit 21E under Federal regulations, which would extend the eastern boundary two miles along the east bank of the Innoko River and along the east bank of Paimut Slough.

The proponent states that transporters and guides are accessing lakes within two miles of the current boundary east of the Innoko River via aircraft to circumvent the present Paradise controlled use area boundary to hunt moose.

The proponent states that the controlled use area was created to protect resources for the villages of Holy Cross, Anvik, Grayling, and Shageluk, and that the proposed boundary changes would lessen the impact of those hunter on the moose population.

The moose population in this portion of Unit 21E has been stable, and limited composition data shows bull/cow ratios have remained fairly high, between 62 and 74 bulls per 100 cows under the current harvest pressure. Calf/cow ratios have met the State management objectives in most years, except for 2009, and twinning rates were estimated at 32 percent in 2013.

Reported harvest by Federally-qualified subsistence users has remained relatively stable while non-local harvest has declined. You can see that on Figure 2 on Page 318 of the booklet.

The proposed modification to the controlled use area would not adequately address the proponent's concerns about non-Federally-qualified users accessing lakes within two miles of the current boundary. The expanded portion of the controlled use area is a mix of Federal and non-Federal lands, and Federal regulations would not apply to approximately 43...
percent of the area.

While the Federal Subsistence Board can technically create or modify controlled use areas under Federal regulations, they cannot modify State definitions. To be effective in areas of mixed land jurisdiction like the affected area, both State and Federal controlled use area provisions need to be in place.

There are no conservation concerns to justify other actions such as a Federal closure.

So for these reasons the OSM conclusion is to oppose Proposal WP14-32.

And that's the end of my analysis.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Are there any questions of the Staff.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: We will then move to summary of public comments from the regional coordinator.

MS. BURKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the record, Melinda Burke, Western Interior Regional Subsistence Advisory Council coordinator.

I also wanted to note for everyone in the room that Mr. Reakoff, the Western Interior Chair is on the phone and ready to participate in the discussion.

We had four written public comments from -- the first one, from the Grayling/Anvik/Shageluk/Holy Cross AC, and wanted to note that the full comments are in your supplemental folder. I'll just give a short summary of each.

The GASH AC did not take any action on this proposal, but did want to pass along that they discussed the implications of having a different Federal regulation than a statewide regulation. And also there was concern expressed, by extending the boundary two miles instead of using natural drainages for boundaries.
The Kuskokwim Native Association supports the proposal modification as outlined in WP14-32. This proposed modification clarifies the original intent of the controlled use area, and would close a loophole within the existing boundary which is contradictory to the original purpose of this area, which is to prevent aircraft from being used to access moose hunting opportunities in the designated area, which is to prevent aircraft from being used to access moose hunting opportunities in the designated area.

Tanana Chiefs Conference supports the expansion of the controlled use area to clarify the original intent.

Native Village of Chuathbaluk has very similar concerns. They support the expansion. The current boundary line allows for aircraft to land right next to the Innoko River or Paimiut Slough for access, and this is contradictory to the original purpose of the controlled use area.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you.

Are there any questions of the Staff, or the regional coordinator.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you.

We'll open the floor for public testimony. And I don't see any requests from within the building, so is there anyone on the phone that would like to testify in regards to 14-32. If you want......

OPERATOR: If you want to testify, press star-one.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I am assuming there isn't anyone on the phone who wants to testify, so we will go to the Regional Council. And is Mr. Reakoff on the phone you said?

The floor is yours, Mr. Reakoff.
MR. REAKOFF: All right. As I stated yesterday before I left, the Western Interior Regional Council feels this proposal would be beneficial to alleviate a user conflict for the eligible subsistence users.

As you can see from the local comments, many people in that area feel that this is a growing issue of aircraft access immediately to -- on the eastern and southern edge of the controlled use area, and they feel that the aircraft dropping off hunters that then enter the river, immediately into the river, are competing with local users where the -- you know, the main corridor for the local people is along the river.

And so because of the significant amount of Federal wildlife refuge land, BLM land, the Western Interior Council agreed and feels that the Federal Subsistence Board can restrict non-subsistence uses or regulate them downward, and so we feel that a question for the Solicitor is, it's been stated several times that the Federal Subsistence Board can restrict non-subsistence uses, and we feel that this would be appropriate for this restriction for non-subsistence use.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you, Mr. Reakoff.

Are there any questions of the Regional Advisory -- or RAC Chair. Go ahead.

MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. Jack, this is Judy, and I'm not very familiar with the process of how to change these boundaries, and it sounds like from the preliminary analysis, you know, it's not something the Board has done in the past, but it sounds like this is maybe a little bit of a flag to this Board that perhaps it's worth looking into what it would take to change a boundary, or, as the RAC said, maybe put in a proposal to the Board of Game about it. But maybe some further analysis is warranted here.

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chair. Can you still hear me.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Yes. Go ahead,
Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: While we feel -- the Western Interior Council feels that there would be virtually no chance of expansion with the current Board of Game that we have. There was a diminishment of the Kanuti Controlled Use Area. And we were told that the Federal boundary that was in place with the Kanuti Controlled Use Area was still in effect. That's why we feel that the Federal areas, if they remain in effect for the Kanuti, that this can actually be expanded on the Paradise Controlled Use Area.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Are there any questions of the Chair.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Not hearing, then we will hear from the Department of Fish and Game.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chair. Drew Crawford, Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

The State is opposed to Wildlife Proposal 14-32.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you.

Any questions of the State.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Then we will go to the InterAgency Staff Committee comments.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Standard comments.

Thank you.

Any tribal consultations.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: No tribal consultations.
We're back down to the Board discussions with Council Chairs and State liaison, if there are any further questions. Go ahead, Tony.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: My question is just on -- I see in here that, you know, we're talking about moving boundaries and some statements are made about whether or not the Federal Board has that right to do that, and I thought that's what we just did in the last proposal with sheefish. Similar, but not -- we didn't move lines, but we restricted access to a user group. I mean, that's what this is about is about expanding an opportunity and a boundary, so that the people, like the Regional Advisory Council Chair, can get an increased opportunity for the resource. So I just wanted clarification on that, if there's some type of stipulation that we can't move boundaries to increase the opportunity.

MR. LORD: Mr. Chair. Ken Lord here.

The Board does have the authority to move boundaries of controlled use areas. A controlled use area typically has a flight restriction associated with it. The Board has never done that. The controlled use areas that we have in regulation now were adopted at the time that the program -- the Federal program took over from the State, and they were originally put in place by the State. But that is not to say that the Board does not have the authority to do that. The Board could move those boundaries.

In this particular case, the proposal would move the boundary outside of Federal lands, and it would encompass about 43 percent of State lands as well. That's where the problem is. Even though we move the boundary, this Board has no authority to restrict access onto those State-managed lands. And so even though we have a flight restriction in place on the Federal lands if that boundary were to be moved, people could still land planes on the State lands, and so the impact -- that's basis for the OSM's conclusion that really moving the boundary would not have the positive impact that the proposer hopes that it would.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: So how far is the boundary movable? Is there a description of that? Is there -- I mean, if it moves so far over, is there an area where the State land stops, and that we can suggest maybe an amendment to it to bring in -- no? I'm
seeing no's here. I guess I didn't read the map.

(Laughter)

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Oh, I see, it's a patchwork.

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chair. May I speak to the issue.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Sure. Go ahead.

MR. REAKOFF: If you look at the Federal lands, which you should have this colored map, there's Federal lands closest to the communities. Yukon Delta Wildlife Refuge lands, BLM lands, those patchworks are actually made of corp land. And so gets into another issue, but the bottom line is some of the lands closest to the Yukon drainage that people utilize are actually in this conflict area with all of the lakes ends (ph), and then you get up there by Shageluk, again you get into lots of Federal lands for those communities.

So what I'm stating is that the State-controlled lands are more distant, and the -- from the communities, and the communities have access to Federal lands where this would apply.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any further questions.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: I do, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: I would just ask the Chairman of that Board, there a resounding statement from the people that are hunting that they're not meeting their need. Or is it just that there's competition.

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chair. The main issue here is that there's building competition. You know, there's more and more hunters that are flown in and float. They use air taxis. They get flown in and then they float. These are -- it's a high use area along the Innoko drainage, and so there's becoming a
building user conflict issue. That's what this proposal is seeking to -- it's annoying for people to see a float plane land just off the river, and dumping off boats that then just come right over the boundary and right into the river and start hunting and (indiscernible). They feel that this is a growing problem, and they would like to -- at least our Council members felt this was a way to alleviate that.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Mr. Cribley.

MR. CRIBLEY: Well, I guess I'd refer a question back to the State, and whether they see this as a problem seeing as how they don't support this proposal. Is this not a problem from the State's perspective.

MR. CRAWFORD: Excuse me, I reading (indiscernible - mic not on)

(Laughter)

MR. CRIBLEY: No, I was just curious.

You said you -- the State testified that they were opposed to this, but without any discussion on that. And I'm just curious, does the State not see, well, the problem that the RAC has identified from the standpoint of the competition that this is creating by float planes being able to come in adjacent to the river and drop off clients, and then they're floating into the river. Is that not a concern on the part of the State, and that's why they're opposed. Or what is -- is there a little bit more rationale why you're opposed to this.

MR. CRAWFORD: Sure. I'll be glad to provide that.

We feel that this proposal will do nothing to change the hunter access to any lands in Unit 21E for either subsistence users or other users.

We also feel that this proposal will complicate the Federal regulations and can confuse hunters.

There's other options within that two-50 mile range that they're talking about extending it, but
it's not going to solve your problem.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Tony.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: It seems like then
the conflict is cruising down the river in your skiff
and shooting at a moose. I mean, that's the conflict,
and I think that's a similar conflict we're used to in
our area, of people coming in and riding the roads to
shoot a deer. I mean, it's the same concept where
pretty soon you have 60 cars on the same road shooting
at the same deer. And, yeah, there's enough resource,
but it is a direct conflict between the users on the
land, and maybe the proposal needs to be recrafted,
that sometime -- some language be created that provides
a better opportunity for the local resident to meet
their need and puts a little bit more burden on the guy
flying in on the airplane to walk up the hill a little
bit.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Jack, this is Nanci, and I just am
really curious to see how this one moves forward,
because we've struggled with this in our area as well,
especially with multiple different lands being
involved, as well as we've been cautioned very strongly
by our law enforcement about how difficult it is to
enforce a corridor like this. And I'm just -- I really
don't want to derail this process, but I'm curious to
know if you talked at the RAC level about those issues
and what kind of response you heard.

Thank you.

MR. REAKOFF: My response to the
discussion that the burden would be on the air taxis,
that the certain way those State-controlled lands.
But that then also have to have approval to land on the
Native corp lands. Most of the Native corp lands are
actually closed to non, so they would be trespassing on
the State-controlled lands. Those are corp lands, and
so they would be trespassing.

The reality is it's not the subsistence
user. They're just going down the river, (indiscernible). It's the aircraft, air taxis would have to discern where this additional boundary is and stay outside of that. And the hunters, the sporthunters. This does not put a burden on the subsistence people at all. It just basically moves the sportshunters away from the river corridor which is a user conflict, (indiscernible). Because, yeah, there might be a real high bull/cow ratio, but there's only a certain amount of moose that are bulls that are near the river, and so that's the problem. The problem is everybody's trying to hunt the same river, and so there's more and more of these floaters coming and floating that river. That's become a big -- you read about that in magazines all the time about floating rivers for moose hunting.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Tony.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Yeah. So again I guess we have a couple of proposals we've dealt with over the last couple of days, a similar concept, a lot of resource, a lot of take, lots of user group, no real conservation concern. But we made proposal or motions and passed them as a Board to provide an opportunity for the local resident to meet their need if there's a growing competition for it. I'm not saying today we're going to deal with it, but maybe a proposal needs to be put forth by the RAC that gives a window of opportunity to the local user rather than changing lines and moving this and that, that we skew the date a week here, a week there, or provide an opportunity or a window within a peak season, and then try to alleviate the competition, the concern of the people. Just a suggestion.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Further discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: If not, then we -- I'll open the floor for Board action.

MS. JACOBSON: Mr. Chairman. I move to adopt 14-32 as recommended by the Western Interior Council. And I will provided my justification as to why I intend to vote against the motion if I get a second.
MR. C. BROWER: Second.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The motion seconded by Charlie Brower.

Further discussion.

MS. JACOBSON: The proposed modification to the Paradise Controlled Use Area in Unit 21E would not adequately address concerns about non-Federally-qualified subsistence user accessing lakes within two miles of the present boundary. Federal regulations would not apply on the remaining 43 percent of the expanded area that consists of non-Federal land, which means that moose hunters would still be permitted to land airplanes within the area where the proponent is seeking to exclude them. While the Federal Subsistence Board can create or modify controlled use areas under Federal regulations, it does not have the authority to restrict aircraft access on State-managed land.

There are currently no conservation concerns that would justify a Federal closure to the affected area. The moose population has been stable and limited composition data suggests it can sustain current harvest levels. Reported harvest by Federally-qualified subsistence users has remained relatively stable, while non-local harvest has declined.

Therefore I intend to vote against the motion as I believe the proposal is not supported by substantial evidence.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any further discussion. Go ahead, Tony.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: I'm trying hard to find a way to support the Regional Advisory Council again, going back to deference is supposed to be given on the taking of wild game, and for that mandate alone, I'm going to have to support this, period, because -- whether it causes a problem or not, and potentially we're going to vote it down anyway.

(Laughter)

MR. CHRISTIANSON: That's my position.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Kristin.
MS. K'EIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Although I understand the concerns being brought forward by the proponent, Mr. Walker, and have heard the rationale from Western Interior RAC, I will be opposing the proposal today. I don't see evidence of a conservation concern that would justify this in the affected area at this time. There's been a stable moose population.

I hear the concern of non-local users coming in and accessing the area by the river, but this is a difficult situation were we only have -- you know, we know, we have less than 60 percent Federal land, and more than 40 State. And then we've got the aircraft, you know, the flight areas, flight boundaries for the aircraft.

And being that, you know, there's State-management here, and they would be responsible for law enforcement, or enforcement on the State-managed ANCSA, corporation lands, knowing the lack of resources of that type in this part of the State, I can see it pretty difficult to enforce on that side of things as well.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Mr. Kessler.

MR. KESSLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm sort of bouncing back and forth a little bit on this one, because of everything we've heard. And what I'm bouncing back and forth was, in particular, is that what I hear is to continue subsistence uses, that this would be an important proposal to adopt. So when we think about our closure authority under .815(3), and this is not really a closure, because we're not actually stopping anybody from harvesting; we're just stopping people from using a certain access method there. So it doesn't really fit very well under .815(3), but at the same time, you know, it's a way to help with subsistence uses. So I'm really sort of bouncing back and forth in my own mind how this works.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Mr. Brower.

MR. C. BROWER: Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

I also will support the Advisory Council recommendation to support this proposal 14-32 for that reason.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Mr. Christianson.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: I was just kind of wondering if there was some way, through the Chair, that you look what -- I mean every permit has hunter unit effort I guess you say; is that the term they use? They've got a permit and I went out 10 days and I got one moose. Is there some type of data there that shows that conflict rising? Because I look at the table here and it shows in 2010 that Federally-qualified users and Alaska residents met in the middle. So, I mean, they basically took the same amount of moose in 2010, but considerably high was the other Alaska residents for most of that time. Is there a hunter unit effort, and is that qualified percent -- for the Federal user, is that time starting to go up, you know, because that would be, I guess, substantial data that we would need.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Judy.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you, Mr. Chair

It might also be really useful, I don't know how difficult it would be. I mean, it's one thing to say well, it's 57 percent and 43 percent, but really where are most of these landings taking place? And then maybe there could be a little bit more focus to how to manage this a little bit better.

And also, just looking at the map, it sure looks like, aside from around a couple of the communities, it is Federal land. So there may be some benefit to extending it were we can.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. McKEE: Mr. Chair.
I'd just like to respond to Tony's comment, that this is not a permit hunt, so we really don't have access to the information that you were asking about.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: So I guess really all we have, through the Chair, all we have to go on is that the people are saying it's getting harder and harder and harder to shoot a moose in the corridor. I mean, that's the statement we're hearing from the Regional Advisory Council.

And again up or down with this proposal, I think that opportunity still needs to be looked at and some type of proposal put forth or a recommendation to try to bring that opportunity back to the user.

Thank you.

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman. May I speak to the proposal again.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: go ahead, Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: I wanted to remind the Board that the land, the other lands that are under State-management control are actually closed. You've got to remember that those lands are closed by the corporation. Those are corp lands. And so the reality is the only lands that are currently actually open are the Federal lands for -- that we're talking about here. And so the issue is that the Federal lands that are currently open are actually, if the air taxis are abiding by trespass law, are the only lands that are actually opened currently to them to land and dump hunters out. Because you have to remember that those are corp lands, and they are closed. Doyon closes their land.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. LORD: Jack, this is Ken. A quick question. I assume that some of those lands, or a number of those lands border the river, and in that case, does that mean that the State also manages the river off those lands, even if the corporation closes the land itself. Because is that where planes would
land?

MR. REAKOFF: It's my understanding that the river was within the controlled use area, but I'm not exactly clear on that. But if the State indeed is the river, the entirety of the river has a closure, then the State has also closed the river to -- you know, included it into the controlled use area. But I'm not -- wasn't exactly clear, because we didn't have anybody at our meeting that could -- that I can find that would respond to that question.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. And I appreciate the Board wrestling with this proposal. I appreciate the quandary that this puts you in.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Steve.

MR. KESSLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It shows in our book exactly what the boundaries of the Paradise Controlled Use Area is, so if you look on Page 312 and 313, it indicates that it is on the east bank of the Innoko River, at least the way I read this, near the bottom of age 312. So the river would be a part of that controlled use area right now.

MS. COOPER: Mr. Chair.

I'd just like to state for the record that the Park Service will be in support of the RAC on this one. It seems like this type of land ownership pattern and the complicated nature of it, that you really have to have a knowledge of the land on the ground rather than looking at a map. It's just very confusing at this stage, unless you went out and visited it.

And for that reason, I'll be deferring to the RAC.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Further comment.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I, too, will have to defer to the RAC at least for the portions of the lands
that we have control over. I don't think it could go
beyond that. But I will defer to the RAC with my vote.

Any further discussion.

(No comments)

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Question.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The question's been
called for. I think there's enough reason for us to
have a roll call vote. Roll call vote, please.

DR. JENKINS: Mr. Chair. Yes. This is
for Wildlife Proposal 14-32.

Ms. K'eit.

MS. K'EIT: Oppose.

DR. JENKINS: Mr. Cribley.

MR. CRIBLEY: Opposed.

DR. JENKINS: Mr. Towarak.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I'll support it.

DR. JENKINS: Mr. Brower.

MR. C. BROWER: Support.

DR. JENKINS: Mr. Christianson.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Support.

DR. JENKINS: Mr. Kessler.

MR. KESSLER: Support.

DR. JENKINS: Ms. Cooper.

MS. COOPER: Support.

MS. JACOBSON: Due to the testimony
that I've heard and good discussion by the Board, I'm
going to change mine to support.

DR. JENKINS: Mr. Chair. We have two
no's and six in support of this proposal.
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The motion passes.

Thank you.

We will continue then with -- is it 49?

DR. JENKINS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: 14-49. On Page 323, 322?

MR. McKEE: Yeah, 322. Proposal WP14-49 was submitted by Gillam Joe and requests modification of the fall season dates for the Unit 12 caribou hunt that takes place east of the Nabesna River and Nabesna Glacier and south of the winter trail, and also request the establishment of a winter hunt and a meat-on-the-bone requirement.

The proposal requests that the fall season be changed from September 1 to 30th to August 10th to September 20th, and a February 1 to March 31st winter season be established.

The proponent states that the fall season dates should be adjusted to provide Federally-qualified users an opportunity to harvest caribou before the run. As the rut approaches in late September, meat quality declines significantly.

Additionally the proponent states that establishing a winter hunt would give subsistence hunters more opportunity and easier access to hunt the Chisana Caribou Herd since the affected area is remote and difficult to access without the aid of a snowmachine.

Further the proponent states that a meat-on-bone requirement will ensure that all edible meat is removed from the field.

A five-year management plan for the Chisana Caribou Herd has been developed through a cooperative effort between the Government of the Yukon, ADF&G, White River First Nation, Kluane First Nation, the Park Service, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The plan was finalized in October of 2012, and provides a framework for monitoring the caribou population and criteria for implementing a hunt through 2015.
In addition to a stable and increasing population trend, the plan also requires the observe bull/cow ratio to be no less than 35 bulls per 100 cows, and with a three-year calf/cow ratio above 15 calves per 100 cows. If the population falls below these guidelines, no harvest will be allowed. If population goals indicate a harvest is sustainable, the plan calls for an annual bulls-only harvest not exceeding two percent of the estimated population with the harvest being equally distributed among the Yukon and Alaska.

The Chisana Caribou Herd increased through the 1980s and reached a peak of 1900 caribou in 1988. Beginning in 1990, the herd experienced a decline in population size. Concerns over the decline led to implementation of an intensive captive rearing program in Canada, which was conducted between 2003 to 2006 by the U.S. Geological Service and the Canadian Wildlife Service.

Past declines were attributed to poor calf recruitment and high adult mortality associated with adverse weather conditions, poor habitat, and predation.

Results from the 2010 census show the Chisana Caribou Herd population was stable with an estimated herd size of 682 animals. The three-year average bull/cow ratio of 43 per 100 is above the minimum 35 per 100 ratio stated in the management plan. The number of calves in the herd increased in 2010, but decreased again in 2011 and 2013; however, the three-year average calf/cow ratio of 18 per 100 is above the minimums set in the management plan.

A population estimate for 2013 is not yet complete, so the use of four-year-old data to make management decisions must be done with caution. However, I understand the estimates should be available before the start of the hunt in the fall.

Between 1990 to '94, the -- 43 percent of hunters participating in hunting this herd were non-residents, and they took 58 percent of the harvest. Local subsistence users accounted for nine percent of the harvest during that time period.

At its January 2012 meeting, the Federal Subsistence Board authorized a limited harvest.
of this herd consistent with the management plan. The Board delegated authority to the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve superintendent to open the season, announce the harvest quota, the number of permits to be issued, and the reporting period, and to close the season.

Based on the estimated population size and the guidance in the management plan, the harvest quota for 2012 was set at seven animals. Nine permits were issued, and two were harvested in -- two animals were harvested in 2012. In 2013 nine permits were issued and three animals were harvested.

The latest data on the Chisana Caribou Herd indicate that the population is stable. In addition, bull/cow and cow/calf ratios are above the minimum thresholds established in the management plan for the herd. However, the most recent population estimate is four years old and management decisions should be conservative in nature.

Moving the fall season dates to earlier in the season would satisfy the proponent's concerns about quality of meat so close to the rut.

A winter hunt would provide easier access to hunters, and thus increase hunter success; however, establishment of a winter season is not advisable at this time due to the lack of more recent population estimates, and the potential for additional stress to the herd during a time when they are under nutritional constraints.

So the OSM conclusion is to support WP14-49 with modification to change the fall season dates to the dates requested in the proposal, but not establish a winter season. The modified regulation can be found at the end of the analysis on Page 329.

There is the issue of the meat-on-bone requirement that we did not remove, since that was part of the intent of the original proponent. We understand that the Eastern Interior RAC met on this and they decided to remove this meat-on-bone requirement, so we don't really have a problem with that from a conservation standpoint.

So that's all I'm going to say on this analysis.
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any questions of the Staff.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Do we have a summary of public comments from the regional coordinator.

MS. PATTON: Mr. Chair and members of the Board. Eva Patton, Council coordinator for the Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council.

We have several written comments from the public, one in support, one opposing this proposal, and one neutral to the proposal, but providing comment. We have statements from Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission, and additional public comment that's in your supplemental materials from a resident of the hunt area.

On Page 323 you will find written public comments, one is from AHTNA, Incorporated Customary and Traditional Use Committee. AHTNA, Incorporated writes in support of Proposal 14-59 [sic]. We support proposal 14-59 [sic] to modify the season dates for Unit 12 caribou hunt that takes place east of Nabesna Road and Glacier and south of the Winter Trail, with a fall season from August 10th to September 20th and adding a winter season from February 1st to March 31st. Changing the Unit 12 caribou season dates in this area will provide for subsistence needs. Federally-qualified subsistence users will be able to access hunting areas to harvest a caribou during the winter months. Snowmachines could be used to hunt with during winter months to harvest Unit 12 caribou in this remote and inaccessible area. Again that is a proposal from AHTNA, Incorporated in support.

We have a proposal submitted by Jessie Braga of Ptarmigan Lake, which is also within the hunt area. Jessie Braga states she's neutral on Proposal 14-49, but requests that if the proposal submitted by Gillam Joe recommending an additional winter hunt period is adopted, that the language similar to WP14-45 be added which includes all qualified residents of the hunt area in any future hunts.

We have one proposal in opposition to WP14-49, and this is from Jim Hannah of Chitina. Jim
Hannah states there should not be a Chisana Caribou Herd harvest for the following reasons. There's limited biological data, and the current caribou hunt in Unit 12 should not take place. The recent lack of -- the lack of recent bull/cow or cow/calf ratios does not support a harvest, let alone a proposed winter hunt.

The past history of poor calf populations, adverse winter weather conditions, limited winter habitat and calf predation do not support this hunt with limited biological data.

He states, the continued harvest of Chisana caribou would reduce the current small population. And he notes there has not been any caribou hunting since 1994 due to the declining population, and that Canada First Nations have stopped harvest.

Harvest information indicates that most of the past harvest was taken by non-residents. And he further notes the proposed winter hunt is questionable with only three-year-old data, and that a winter hunt may potentially displace the caribou from their winter habitat.

If proposed hunt takes place, AHTNA Native members should be given priority for customary and traditional use of caribou, similar to the First Nations people in Yukon territory.

And that's Jim Hannah, Chitina.

We have another comment in your supplementary materials from Adam Smitholum (ph) who lives in Chisana. He writes that he disagrees with the proposal to change the season dates to August 20th to September 20th -- pardon me, August 10th to September 20th for two reasons.

First, it would be more difficult for subsistence users to keep meat, seeing that they don't have a freezer, and, as well, in August it would not keep in the meat shed for a very long time.

He cans his meat to preserve it, and eat as much as he can while it hangs fresh. If anything, a later season would allow them to keep meat
in the shed without having to can it.

Second, changing the dates to align with the sheep season, even if that was not the intent, would encourage more trophy hunters, not subsistence hunters to hunt the herd. He says, as he has said in other comments, if you have a charter plane and rent horses, you are a trophy hunter, and not a subsistence user.

He further notes he disagrees with the proposed idea to this season or create a second one from February 1st to March 31st, noting that there are so few animals to be allowed to be taken, he doesn't see how the permits could be split up. Which season would come first if the fall quota was met, and which season would be canceled.

So he questions how a winter hunt would be able to be arranged.

And that is from Adam Smitholum writing to oppose 14-49.

And we have submitted written comments from the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission. And the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park Subsistence Resource Commission unanimously supports the proposal with the following modifications:

(A) The fall season would be opened on August 10th and close on September 30th;

(B) The winter season would not be adopted; and

(C) The meat-on-the-bone requirement would not be adopted.

Expanding the fall season would provide additional subsistence opportunity, and hunter who prefer to hunt during August, well before the rut, would be able to do so. Hunters for whom meat storage is easier later in the season when the weather is cooler, could hunt in late September.

Establishing a winter season is not supported at this time due to the small harvest quota and lack of good data about where the animals are during the winter.
Regarding the meat-on-the-bone requirement, there's no evidence of a meat spoilage problem, and SRCs members agree that individual hunters should be able to decide whether or not to keep meat on the bone. Hunters who make use of the bones or otherwise prefer to keep the meat on the bone would have the option to do so, but hunters who harvest meat in locations that require long distance packing would have the option of leaving some bones behind.

They thank the Board for the opportunity to comment, and again this is Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission.

Thank you. That is all.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you.

Are there any questions on the public testimony. Comments

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Not hearing any, then we open the floor for public testimony.

DR. JENKINS: Mr. Chair. Gloria Stickwan indicated she would like to address the Board on this proposal. I don't see her here however.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Excuse me, Mr. Chair. She did have to leave yesterday afternoon/evening.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay.

DR. JENKINS: Is she on line? I don't know.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Is there anyone on line that would like to testify on 14-49. Hit star-one if you want to testify.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Not hearing any, then we will continue on with the Regional Council recommendation. We have the Eastern Interior Regional Council. Jack are you still on? Oh, Andrew. I'm sorry.
Andrew took on that last proposal and I'm taking on this one.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay. Go ahead, Sue.

MS. ENTSMINGER: All right. Thank you.

The Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council voted to support the proposal with the following modifications, which are also recommended by the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission.

And I wanted to tell the Board that I serve on that Subsistence Resource Commission as a RAC appointment. And I will let you know that we met prior to the Eastern Interior, that being the Subsistence Resource Commission, and met with the proponent of the proposal and spent a lot of time with him and agreed -- and he agreed with our following recommendations.

And one is, the fall season would open August 10th and close September 30. The winter season would not be allowed. And the meat-on-the-bone requirement would not be adopted.

And I would say the Chisana Caribou have been one of the most talked about subjects since it's been open that I've been involved in both with the Eastern Interior RAC, with the SRC, and with the local advisory committee.

The Council supported extended fall hunting season opportunity since the total harvest is controlled by limiting of the permits. But the hunt area is very difficult to access, and the extended season would support local hunters taking a caribou in cooler weather, but it's still before the rut.

The Council also expressed concern that a winter hunt would cause additional stress to the caribou during an already difficult time of the year, and concurred with the Park Service that loss of antlers in the winter makes it even more difficult to determine male and female.

The Council also expressed concern over the small population size of this herd, and the ongoing
conservation efforts in both U.S. and Canada.

There is an ongoing caribou management plan for the Chisana Herd that has been going on for a long time, and these numbers that have come up with are recognized within that management plan.

The Council also feels that individuals should be able to decide whether to keep meat on the bone, and should not have to be required to do so. There's not been any meat spoilage, and any record of it. And the animals are large, and the remote location would be difficult, because this requires a lot of packing for the person who is successful.

So that would be the end of it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you.

The Southcentral region.

MS. CAMINER: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and our coordinator reminded me that Gloria did read into the record before she left yesterday her comments from AHTNA Subsistence, and those will be consistent with what the SRC and both of our RACs recommended.

Just a brief note on subsistence resource commissions, any parks or monuments open to subsistence have an advisory board like this Board, like the RACs. Subsistence resource commissions, as Sue mentioned, the RACs appoint a person, and so we've appointed Gloria and Southeast has appointed Bert to the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission.

So the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council, and we do pay attention to what the commissions say, supported with modification based on the Subsistence Resource Commission modifications, to make the fall season August 10th to 30th. There would be no winter season, because we felt that was a conservation concern. And there would be no meat-on-the-bone requirement.

The proposed regulation certainly would be beneficial to subsistence users. Conservation of the herd is not a concern for adding those few days in the fall. As I mentioned, we did not support a winter portion, and that by not supporting that winter
portion, that takes away any conservation concern there
might have been.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any questions of the
Chairs. Go ahead.

MR. KESSLER: Well, just a question for
the Chairs. I think as far as I can tell, that Eastern
Interior and Southcentral recommendations are the same.
Is that what everybody else has figured out.

MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair.

MS. ENTSMINGER: That's correct.

MS. CAMINER: Yes. Thank you, Sue.
You're correct, Steve. And as was mentioned, it does
differ from the OSM recommendation which was in the
book, which was I think before all of our Councils got
together, so we'd just have you look carefully at that
meat-on-the-bone requirement, please.

MR. KESSLER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: And the Staff did
report that they didn't see any conservation issues
with the meat-on-the-bone question.

Any further discussion from -- with the
Chairs.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: If not, we'll get
the Department of Fish and Game comments.

MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, Mr. Chair. Drew
Crawford, Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

The State's recommendation for Wildlife
Proposal 14-49 is we support with a modification to
change the fall season dates as requested, but do not
adopt the winter season. We are neutral on the meat-
on-the-bone requirements, but feel it is not necessary
for sustained yield management.

I can also support Sue Entsminger's
statement that there have been no reported instances of
meat spoilage in the field.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Are there any questions of the State.

MR. KESSLER: Just sort of the same question. I think that the State concurs then with the two Councils, that's my understanding. I know that it is neutral on the meat on bone, but it seems like you concur with their recommendation.

MR. CRAWFORD: Correct.

MR. KESSLER: It sounds like consensus to me.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: No more discussions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay. We will go on then to the InterAgency Staff Committee comments.

MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair, the standard comments apply.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Standard comments. No tribal consultation comments.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Is there any further discussion between the Chairs, the State liaison and the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: If not, then the floor is open for Board action.

MS. COOPER: Mr. Chair. I would like to make a motion.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, the floor is yours.

MS. COOPER: I move that we adopt WP14-49 as modified by the Eastern Interior RAC, the Southcentral RAC, and the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission. After a second, I
will speak to my motion. Mr. Chair.

MR. BROWER: Second.

MS. JACOBSON: Second.

MS. COOPER: Both relevant RACs as well as the Wrangell-St. Elias SRC supported the same modification to the proposal. The Eastern Interior RAC recommendation is found on Page 331, and would result in the following three things:

The fall season would open on August 10th and close on September 30.

Secondly, the winter season would not be adopted.

And, third, the meat-on-the-bone requirement would not be adopted.

The extended fall season would provide additional opportunity for local hunters to harvest a caribou. Maintaining the September 30th closing date, assuming the quota has not yet been harvested, responds to concerns about being able to hunt later in September when the weather is cooler and meat storage is easier for those who live off the grid.

This is a new hunt on a small herd. While the herd size appears stable, it is close to the minimum population parameters for holding a hunt, and we do not believe a winter hunt is advisable.

We're not aware of any issues regarding meat spoilage and do not see a need to impose a meat-on-the-bone requirement at this time.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Further discussion.

(NO comments)

MR. KESSLER: Question.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The question's been called for. All those in favor of the motion say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any opposed say nay.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The motion passes unanimously.

I think this concludes the non-consensus agenda proposals. And.....

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Chair. Is this the time where we would just make a motion to approve the consensus agenda items as presented by the Staff.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: It would be appropriate.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Okay. I guess I was jumping quick, and the Staff brought me a thing to make sure that we add to the consensus agenda for the record 08, 36, 41, 27, and add the changed recommendation for 14-44 to support, the word was object on the bottom of that proposal.

MR. C. BROWER: 8, 36, and what, 48?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: 08, 36, 41 and 27, just -- yeah. And that's to mirror my original proposal at the start of the meeting to make sure we move those from one agenda to the next.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Is that your motion?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: That's my motion.

MR. C. BROWER: Second.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: You heard the motion and the second. Any discussion on the motion. Steve.

MR. KESSLER: I guess I would just like to thank everybody for working on these and seeking consensus on so many of these proposals, you know, working among the RACs, the Staff, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. I think it's a great thing.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: We also need to
point out that Proposals 24 and 25 were removed from the -- was it the non-consensus?

DR. JENKINS: No, the consensus pending the outcome of the.....

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The consensus, pending the outcome of I think it was 21. For the record.

DR. JENKINS: From the outcome of 23.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: From the outcome of Proposal 23. Correction.

We have two.....


CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I'm sorry.

MR. C. BROWER: (Indiscernible - mic not on) I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Was the question called for?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Oh, I was just talking to him, to get it -- and then he started talking. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay. The question's been called for. All those in favor of the motion say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any opposed same sign.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Motion passes.

Is it okay if we just continue and conclude the meeting; work right through lunch, or would people like to take a break for lunch and come back? I'd prefer to just go through it and get it done and go home.
(Council nods affirmatively)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay. We will continue then as quickly as possible.
We've got two special action proposals. Can we have the Staff report, please.

Thank you.

MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
George Pappas, and also from the Office of Subsistence Management, Kay Larson-Blair, one of our razor sharp fisheries biologists.

You said quickly as possible. I can accommodate that.

So Federal Special Action No. 14-01. Dave Cannon on behalf of the -- it's also in your supplementary book under the tab FSA14-01, near the back.

Dave Cannon on behalf of the Kuskokwim Salmon River Salmon Management Group submitted this special action, petitioning the Board to add dipnets as legal gear to harvest salmon in the Kuskokwim River with an effective date of the 24th of May. Also part of the request is the inclusion to require all king salmon caught with a dipnet must be released alive to the water.

The Working Group is requesting the use of dip net to be allowed to target other salmon during times when the Work Group described as this critical period when king salmon numbers are at all time lows. The tail end of the Chinook salmon run overlaps with the first part of the chum and sockeye salmon runs to the Kuskokwim River, and authorizing dipnets will help facilitate Chinook salmon conservation.

Historically people living along the Kuskokwim River drainage harvested fish using methods including gillnets, fish spears, fish traps, fishwheels, and dipnets. Currently people use dipnets to harvest fish at particular times and places where dipnets provided to be an advantage over other methods. And as you heard from the RAC member Trapper John yesterday, people commonly report using dipnets to take smelt during the springtime runs. And additionally
dipnets have been documented for harvest of whitefish 
from behind fencelike weirs.

In 2009 some of the elders from the 
Lower Kuskokwim River recalled that in their youth 
salmon were harvested primarily using dipnets and set 
files. The elders explained that the traditional -- 
they traditionally used dipnets, because the Kuskokwim 
River was much smaller -- or narrow at that time near 
their fish camps and were much more abundant, and they 
could take them in near-shore waters.

I'll skip the biological background 
that Don presented yesterday. Bottom line everybody 
here understands that the Kuskokwim Chinook salmon 
returns are low right now and conservation is 
necessary.

Additionally, the Alaska Board of 
Fisheries met in March 2014 and approved the use of 
dipnets to harvest salmon in the Kuskokwim River 
drainage for 120 days in 2014. The Board of Fish also 
authorized the Commissioner of Fish and Game to allow 
dipnets in the future during times of conservation 
concern. So right now it is a legal gear type in State 
regulation.

The Office of Subsistence Management's 
conclusion is to support this Special Action FSA14-01 
with modification, to specify that all Chinook salmon 
caught in a dipnet be released immediately. And then 
it also contains the regulatory language.

And justification for this position, it 
is projected that the 2014 Kuskokwim River Chinook 
salmon run will not provide a significant, if any, 
harvestable surplus, and a directed Chinook salmon 
subsistence fishery will likely be not to take place 
this summer. And allowing the use of dipnets for 
Federally-qualified users will provide some additional 
harvest opportunity for sockeye and chum during times 
when Chinook, sockeye, and chum are in the river a the 
same time, and requiring the release of incidentally- 
captured Chinook salmon from dipnets will also help.

Also, dipnets have been utilized 
historically to harvest salmon in the Kuskokwim River 
drainage, and are currently legal type to harvest non- 
salmon species of fish in Federal regulations.
Additionally, two proposals have been submitted to the Federal Subsistence Board to authorize the use of dipnets, and that's going to be entering this regulatory cycle, and you'll be hearing this and deliberate on it next year.

And that's what I have for you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you.

And is there a summary of public comments from the regional coordinator.

MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Well, let's open the floor first for questions from the Board.

MR. KESSLER: George, I guess I have a question. I'm looking at the language on Page 7, which is the OSM preliminary conclusion, and it says, you can take fish by all these different methods, and then it says, you may also take salmon by dipnet in the Kuskokwim River drainage with the provision that all Chinook salmon caught with a dipnet must be released immediately to the river.

And so this doesn't stop anybody from using those other methods, right? So how does this -- is it that we give the in-season manager the authority to cut out all those other methods and just keep the dipnet, or how does that work? Because those other methods aren't cut out.

MR. PAPPAS: Correct. As I understand it, this would add a tool to the toolbox for the in-season delegated manager who has the authority, a delegated authority to regulate methods and means, and if, as we discussed yesterday as part of the fisheries scenario for the upcoming season in FSA14-03, if it's determined that conservation is necessary and we potentially could allow -- the managers identified could allow additional harvest of other species, you could restrict the fishery to this methods and means. So just because the tools are all -- all these tools are in the toolbox doesn't mean all of them will be used at once.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: If I may, just for Mr. Kessler's benefit, currently it is my understanding dipnets are not allowed to be used in this fishery. And it was identified yesterday as potentially another tool that could be used. So basically what they're doing is putting that -- making that tool available to users.

MR. KESSLER: Well, thank you. I understand that; I was just trying to figure out how this operates, and my understanding now is that the in-season manager would have the authority to not allow those other uses, other methods, and could have just only the dipnet method if the in-season manager thought that was appropriate. But that if it goes to only dipnet, then it can only be used -- then the Chinook would have to be returned immediately. So it's sort of a method that's got a caveat to it.

MR. PAPPAS: Through the Chair.

Mr. Kessler, that is correct. The idea is to have a non-selective gear type -- or, excuse me, a selective gear type available in comparison to a gillnet which may be non-selective. To have that option.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Are there further questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: And for the record, these special orders are considered emergency, so they have not gone to the Regional Advisory Councils yet, but the Board is allowed to take action on them.

MR. PAPPAS: Correction, Mr. Chair. The Western Interior Regional Advisory Council discussed this action at their February 25th and 26th meeting in Aniak. The motion to support the request did pass from the Western Interior RAC.

The Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Subsistence Regional Advisory Council discussed this FSA 014 during their March 5th and 6th meeting held in Bethel, and no
motion was generated, so the Council did not -- was neither in favor of it nor against the request.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Steve.

MR. KESSLER: And I guess another question for us, is this an emergency action or a temporary special action. So is it for 60 days or is it for the rest of the regulatory year.

MR. PAPPAS: Thank you for that question. The proponent was contacted, the proponent clarified looking for up to 60-day action, so it would be an emergency special action beginning May 24th, and it would go for two months -- or excuse me -- yeah, two months, which would cover the entirety of the vast majority of the Chinook return to the Kuskokwim River.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. RABINOWITCH: This is Sandy Rabinowitch of the Park Service.

Just to make sure I understand the recommended OSM preliminary conclusion when I compare it to the proposed language on Page 3, and I look at the conclusion on Page 7, would I be correct to think that the OSM modification focuses on the word immediately.

MR. PAPPAS: Correct. The proposed language, must be released alive to the water, it's a very minor detail, but released immediately to the water, if you end up with a fish in your dipnet, it gets roughed up and died, the regulation requires you to release them immediately to the water -- excused me, to the water alive. If you have a dead king in your dipnet, somebody could interpret that as, well, it's not alive, so I'm going to take it home. That's not the intent. It's very minor.

We don't have State regulation crafted. There was -- it should be published very soon. I don't know exactly how they're going to put their language in, but the conclusion was immediately. As soon as you get them, the least damage as possible, least stress as possible to prevent any type of spawn detractors or injuries, because it will cause stress.
Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. KESSLER: I understand. Thank you.

DR. JENKINS: Mr. Chair, let me ask George a couple of questions here.

In this special action, it has a date of May 24, an effective start date, and I think yesterday the Board delegated the authority for the start of the -- to the in-season manager for any kind of Chinook dates. So I'm wondering about that provision in this special action.

And also yesterday the Board did talk about 25 fish, Chinook, available possibly for 32 villages, but in this special action it says that all Chinook caught must -- with a dipnet must be released immediately back to the water. And I'm wondering how that 25 fish provision for each village would be affected under this special action.

MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We've had several meetings recently with folks in Bethel, you know, with the public hearings. We've had a lot of sidebars with folks here. That was brought up. What if you allow the use of dipnets to potentially target those 25 Chinook salmon for the 25 fish cultural practices special Federal permit.

Very little discussion, but some of the answers I received was, well, if this is a cultural, you know, practices, since dipnets would be fairly new, and a lot of folks probably do not have them, have not used them before, you know, maybe the Board at a future date might authorize those for such use, but at this time, these are specifically for non-Chinook salmon.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: So my understanding on this then is just for the Board to pass a motion to approve this special order 1. Is that the right process.

MR. LORD: Yes, Mr. Chair.

But also there's the other part of David's question which is the start date of May 24th. My guess would be that the Board would want to have
that run concurrently with yesterday's special action, but that's something we should clarify on the record.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: I think really the in-season manager pretty much has all the authority to say yes or no to how something happens, whether, you know, he's going to open it or close it. And those 25 fish may or may not be available, and how they catch them, I don't know, is really of concern, whether they set a net or use a dipnet or anything, I think that in-season manager has the authority to say yes or no to the harvest of the fish. I think -- which probably won't occur, but I don't think it really matters. And probably using a dipnet would be a way to make sure that you don't catch more than 25, because you could drift your net down there and catch 100, and they're dead.

MR. PAPPAS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. PAPPAS: I was brought to my attention a recommendation to address exactly what you pointing out there. If you put at the end of the proposed modified language a comma, and write unless authorized under federal permit. That would allow using dipnets during the 25 fish, during the community harvest. It would be more selective than the 50-fathom gillnet, very good point. So if you wanted to meet that idea, you would want to put a comma, unless authorized under Federal permit. So that could be a permit stipulation the in-season manager could put on the community harvest permit, the traditional practices permit. That would possibly -- an authorization, and that would keep another tool in the toolbox. It doesn't mean it has to have all the time, but it would be available.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Are there any objection to adding the language.

(No comments)
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Not hearing any, we will include that language.

Any further discussion. I guess there isn't a motion that were -- it's all informational. I am bone tired, guys.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I've been given the impression that we don't need to follow the process. That it's just a special action by the Board, and it will just be for whatever time period the instate -- the manager feels it needs. Is that right.

DR. JENKINS: Well, I think it's wise to ask the Department of Fish and Game under these circumstances, and I think the special actions require the Board to actually consult with the State, and if possible with Regional Advisory Councils.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay. We will ask the Department of Fish and Game and then we will revert to the Regional Councils, if they are available.

MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, Drew Crawford, Department of Fish and Game. I've been advised that we are okay with these fishery special actions and the modifications that I've heard -- standby.

(Laughter)

MS. YUHAS: It's not an official position. It's just a Staff note that I was leaving the room and would be back that we're -- yeah. One of them simply validates the Board of Fish's recent action, the other one is unnecessary due to yesterday's action.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay. And I don't think we have anyone from the -- this refers primarily to the Kuskokwim so I don't think we have anyone available from the Regional Advisory Council -- go ahead.

DR. JENKINS: Mr. Chair. Perhaps I can just give you the language for an emergency special action. It says:

If the timing of a regularly
scheduled meeting of the
affected Regional Council so
permits, without incurring
undue delay, the Board may seek
Council recommendations on the
proposed emergency special
action.

Such a Council recommendation,
if any, will be subject to the
requirements....

And then it cites 242.18(a)(4).

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. And we
were given word from the Staff that they did discuss
this and that they approve of the special action.

MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
Western Interior RAC approved it with the
justification, replacing of gillnets or non-selected
gear it would definitely help. And the Yukon Kuskokwim
Delta -- YKD RAC did not make a motion, they did not
take action on this so we cannot say if they're in
support or opposing it. Public testimony included it's
not a traditional means for some folks. Also keep in
mind that at the mouth of the river where it might be a
couple miles wide, 90 feet deep, a dipnet may not be
functional, while other folks said it might. So there
was -- didn't actually make a solid decision.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Any
further discussion or any other comments by anyone in
this room or on the phone.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Not hearing any,
then the floor is open for Board action.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: I'll make a motion
to support the special action as presented by the Staff
with the modified language to leave that authority in
the in-season manager's -- at his discretion.
MR. C. BROWER: Second.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: You heard the motion and the second. Any further discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Question's been called for, all those in favor of the motion say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Those opposed, say nay.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Motion passes unanimously.

We have No. 2.

MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. George Pappas again. This is a non-action item so this will be easy. This is under FSA 02 tab -- 14-02 tab there.

The Kuskokwim Management Workgroup submitted a request to the Federal Subsistence Board to add gear restrictions -- allow a gear restriction to allow 25 fathom length gillnets to harvest salmon in the Kuskokwim River drainage only when the need for chinook salmon conservation warrants such restriction as determined by the in-season Federal manager.

It was determined by our solicitor, the current delegated authority to the in-season manager, he or she does have the ability to use something less than 50 fathoms.

The framework established by the Board was up to a 50 fathom net but if it is deemed necessary for conservation it can be shrunk down somewhere lower than that. Additionally, the Alaska Board of Fisheries did adopt this proposal allowing the in-season manager to have a net of 25 fathoms. And the affect of this would slow down the fishery, potentially reduce some chinook salmon harvest and the harvest power of the
subsistence fleet.

So this is just a for your information only, no action is necessary.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Are there any comments anyone want to make on it.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: That concludes then the special actions.

We have the Stikine River comments on the agenda next. Who -- who is leading that -- oh, I'm sorry, Robert Larson. Robert.

MR. LARSON: Good afternoon. My name is Robert Larson, I work for the Forest Service. There is a summary of current events regarding management of the Stikine River, it starts on Page 667 of your Board book.

As background, Stikine River is a subsistence salmon fishery that was first implemented under Federal rules in 2004, that was for sockeyes only. There's the chinook and coho fishery that were added in 2005. If the Board wishes to change regulations there's a process and it's initiated by action of the Board to make a proposed change. That proposed change is -- the words are in -- in cooperation with the Pacific Salmon Commission is what they've normally -- is what we have done in the past. So the Board's action is reviewed by the TransBoundary Panel and subsequently any actions are adopted by the Pacific Salmon Commission, and ultimately then the Pacific Salmon Treaty is changed.

So the subsistence fishery is contained in Annex 4 of the Pacific Salmon Treaty.

In 2013 the Board closed the subsistence chinook salmon fishery prior to the start of the fishery. In that case there was a forecast of 22,400 large chinook salmon. I would like to note that regarding the TransBoundary rivers which is the Aseik and the Taku and the Stikine, we only deal with large
chinook salmon, those are salmon that are greater than 30 inches in length. The in-season manager was given authority to reopen that fishery and he opened that fishery on June 15th when there was an in-season forecast of 24,635 fish. Last Friday the Board closed the season again in 2014 when the preseason forecast was 26,000 large chinook salmon.

The subsistence fishery, according to the Pacific Salmon Treaty is only allowed when there is a preseason forecast of 28,100 large chinook salmon or when the in-season estimate is 24,500 chinook salmon.

Let me just touch base on the sockeye salmon, we'll talk about the deferred proposal in just a minute.

The proposed forecast for this year is 152,000, which gives the US allowable catch of about 44,000 fish.

2013 there was 124 households, they harvested two large chinook salmon during the chinook salmon season, 1,457 sockeys and 174 cohos. In the context of discussions of the Treaty we only talk about those fish that are within the season of the directed fishery. So there is more fish, of course, taken in those -- as incidental fish. For instance, last year there was 59 chinook salmon taken but during the directed fishery there was only two.

If you look there's -- one of the Treaty provisions is that we, meaning me, write an annual fishing summary report and provide that to the TransBoundary Panel. You can see last year's report on Page 670 in your Board book. So that gives a historical summary of catches and a little more detail about conduct of the fishery.

At their March 2013 meeting, the Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council sent a letter to the Board asking for assistance in changing the chinook salmon subsistence fishery to a fishery that's defined as something other than a directed fishery. The issue there is, unless there's an allowable catch there is no directed fishery. So that doesn't mean that there's no fishing going on, the mid-season -- or the mid point of the escapement plus 7,100 other fish is the requirement for starting at zero. So you have to have the mid point of the
escapement and it changes preseason or in season to
account for the imprecision of that estimate, but the
7,100 is called the base level catch. And because we,
meaning the subsistence fishery, occurred after the
calculation of a base level catch, we're not included
in that. So we have to only conduct our fishery after
the base level catches and escapements that are above
the mid point of the escapement range.

There are two subsistence fishery
proposals that have been submitted that ask for changes
in the management of the Stikine River subsistence
fisheries. The Board will meet in Wrangell where most
of the permittees reside, meet October 21 and the
Council will deliberate those two proposals. And they
include changes in how to identify and account for
guideline harvests, whether there should be daily
fishing periods, whether or not nets should be closely
attended. There's a range of varieties that both the
Council will see this fall and the Board will see next
January.

The post season meeting of the
US/Canada Bilateral TransBoundary Panel of the Pacific
Salmon Commission occurred this year in Portland,
Oregon on January 14th to 16th. I represented the
Federal Subsistence Program at that meeting. This is
the annual meeting where the US and the Canadian
fisheries managers get together and discuss conduct of
the fisheries. So I would like to note that although
we have three TransBoundary rivers in Southeast Alaska,
and we're not speaking to the other TransBoundary
River, which is the Yukon River, so we're only speaking
to the Alsek and the Taku and the Stikine, there's a
very small fishery on the Alsek, there's no subsistence
fishery on the Taku, it's actually closed, and there is
an only -- subsistence only -- Federal subsistence
managed only fishery on the Stikine River. So there's
no State subsistence fishery there.

So the Canadian sections has an
interest in the conduct of fisheries that target
Canadian bound origin salmon and in this case their
interest in the US subsistence fishery consists
entirely upon accountability of the harvest that are --
those fish that are killed in conduct of this fishery.
The Canadians, and especially the Canadian Co-Chair,
Mr. Steve Gotch (ph) made a point of complimenting us
on our abilities to provide accurate and verifiable
data regarding the number of fish that are actually
1 retained in the fishery. Their interest is in fish
2 that may not be retained but are part of fishing
3 mortality and that's specifically fish that may be
4 harvested out of nets by seals or fish that may drop
5 out of nets after they die and they're not retained.
6
7 So we're not talking about allocations
8 between user groups, we are part of the US allocation,
9 but in this context it's confusing where we do not have
10 a directed fishery allocation that's different for
11 cohos and sockeyes the same way we do for king salmon,
12 king salmon we have this base level harvest that needs
13 to be accounted for and it becomes a little confusing.
14
15 In 2013 we met with the tribe prior to
16 closing the fishery. The tribe sent a letter to the
17 Board, actually it was after the fact that the Board
18 received it, it was some time after the fact, it was
19 unclear where this letter was for a month or so, but
20 they did end up getting a letter to the Board and they
21 recommended that the Board not close the subsistence
22 fishery. We attempted to meet with them prior to this
23 meeting and prior to closing the fishery this year and
24 it was not part of their schedule. We're scheduled to
25 meet with them on May 20th and we'll have a more in-
26 depth and detailed briefing for them and be soliciting
27 their opinions about management of subsistence
28 fisheries as a whole, but specifically about management
29 of the Stikine River.
30
31 So that brings us back to deferred
33
34 So during our last fisheries cycle the
35 Board wanted to provide us an opportunity to coordinate
36 with the Pacific Salmon Commission and look at the
37 effects of what this proposal would do and what would
38 be appropriate action. We have done that and it's our
39 recommendation that Proposal 13-19 be deferred again
40 until the regular fisheries cycle, this time next year,
41 and we feel there's several good reasons why this is a
42 good idea.
43
44 First is that there's more proposals
45 dealing with exactly the same subject that will be on
46 the Board's agenda for next year.
47
48 The other is, is that we've been told
49 by our Alaska Commissioner that it's very unlikely that
50 the Pacific Salmon Commission is going to take up this
kind of an issue, meaning the guideline harvest level out of their cycle. So the idea is that -- what we've told them is that without regard to what the guideline harvest level is if we have a US allowable catch, then the subsistence fishery will not be restricted and that seems to be fine for where we are at this point in time. So if there's no harm, there's no foul, let's put this into the right schedule so they can be addressed at the appropriate time and now the appropriate time is -- this is a protracted process. The US Section will be developing their positions in 2017. There will be negotiations directly with the Canadian government in 2018 and then the Treaty will be rewritten and implemented in 2019.

So, furthermore, engaging in the US/Canada process is hugely important to this to make sure that not only do we have the State managers involved but we have the stakeholders which make up the members of the Panels involved, but we also involve the Canadian stakeholders and fisheries managers, so they understand what's happening on our side of the border because they have to agree.

And I think that is probably what I have to -- I can answer questions and we can get into as much detail as you want to but I think that's adequate for now.

(Chair microphone interruption)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Woke me up.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Are there any questions of Bob and the Stikine -- regarding the -- go ahead.

MS. K'EIT: Mr. Chair. Thank you. Just to clarify, so if the Board takes no action on this deferred proposal at this time will the season be closed until the in-season manager determines we've met our allowable catch and we can open it. Escapement -- if we meet our escapement.

MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. The preseason forecast and we're speaking to the deferred proposal, which deals only with sockeyes, that preseason forecast is 152,000 fish, which, you know, by the way is --
that's about 40,000 below an average, but it still allows for 44,000 fish to be taken by US fisheries, and we are part of that group. So we will have a normal opening and a normal prosecution of the subsistence fishery for sockeyes.

If you take -- whether you take action to defer this proposal again or take no action, which tables it, and it just goes away, is really immaterial, because there are proposals -- there's two proposals that you will -- that have already been submitted that we will be considering at our fall RAC meeting and at the next January meeting.

MS. K'EIT: Okay.

MR. KESSLER: I just want to make this comment, I'm not sure I agree with what Mr. Larson said, because I do think we need to take some action and eventually I'll make a motion to defer this longer. But I think that's respectful of the RAC, this was the Southeast Regional Advisory Council's proposal originally and I think to be respectful of that we need to continue to defer this and consider it as we consider all the other proposals next January.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MS. K'EIT: Mr. Chair, follow on question, thank you. So I still need some clarity around the chinook salmon fishery because I'm looking at the report in our Board book and there is reference to the preseason terminal run size forecast for large Stikine River kings at 26,000 and then further on in that paragraph it states, if the Board closes the fishery, the in-season manager should be given authority to rescind the closure if the in-season abundance estimate results in an allowable catch. So is that -- what action, if any, does the Board need to take on that portion of the fishery.

MR. LARSON: Through the Chair. It's my understanding that the Board has already acted and the -- I think the important concept here is that during preseason, the mid point of the escapement goal range plus the base level catches require that there be a 28,100 large fish return to the river in order to have a directed fishery. Our preseason escapement
estimate is 26,000, however, in-season harvest estimates that are greater than 24,500, they allow an allowable catch, a US allowable catch. So very likely as soon as we're able to generate an in-season estimate there will be sufficient fish for an allowable catch.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: And now is that for sockeye or is that for the king salmon.

MR. C. BROWER; Chinook.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: For chinook.

MR. LARSON: It's -- that action is for chinook, yes.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: What's the wishes of the Board.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: I just have one more question.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: So your recommendation is just to defer this until the next cycle and then the proposals will come forth on what it is that the Regional Advisory Council really wants to do.

MR. LARSON: It is our recommendation that the Board defer. This is the Council's proposal. I think that it's proper that the Board give adequate time to discuss the Council's proposal and not rely on someone else's proposal that deals with the same subject. Now, the practical aspect of that is that no matter what you do you're still going to talk about the allowable -- not the allowable catch, but the guideline harvest level, you know, a year from now. But it's our recommendation that you defer so that the Council's proposal is before the Board next January.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Tony.
MR. CHRISTIANSON: Then I would go ahead and make that motion to accept that recommendation that we defer this proposal.

MR. C. BROWER: Second.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: You heard the motion and the second. Any discussion on the motion.

Steve.

MR. KESSLER: Just one thing that I think we have to defer to time certain so maybe we can make sure that it's deferred to the January 2015 Board meeting.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Yeah. Mr. Chair -- through the Chair. I think that's what the recommendation states here, so following the recommendation listed in the book here, it states the timeline in there.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: And the second agrees with that.

MR. C. BROWER: (Nods affirmatively)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any further discussion.

(No comments)

MR. KESSLER: Question.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Question's been called for. All those in favor of the motion, say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any opposed, same sign -- or say nay.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Motion passes unanimously. So where -- what.....

DR. JENKINS: Secretarial appointments and Pat Pourchot is here.
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Yeah. The next item on my agenda is the Secretarial appointments and we've got a couple of things we want to do. I guess we'll get the same report from the Staff first -- or -- okay, go ahead, I guess, Carl Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

You confused me. Carl Johnson, I'm the Council Coordination Division Chief for OSM.

And one of the things that things that I spend time on probably every single month out of the year is our annual nominations process. As you know we have 109 seats on the 10 Regional Councils and every year roughly one-third of those at a time are up -- expire and are up for appointment or reappointment, so we have a process that's been in place for some time where we undergo an annual outreach that begins in the fall, goes through the winter meeting cycle. We have InterAgency nominations panels that meet and conduct interviews and come up with recommendations, InterAgency Staff Committee, who then makes recommendations to the Board. And this process carries on through, in theory, appointment letters being issued on December 3rd each year by the Secretary of the Interior with the concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Now, that's how things are supposed to work, but if we can go to the next slide.....

Over the years some problems have developed.

And most recently, in the last two meeting cycles the appointment letters have not issued on December 3rd, as they should have been. For the 2012 cycle the first letters were not issued until January 5th and were not completed until May 3rd. So that would be six months later than they should have been.

For the 2013 cycle we did not receive the first letters until January 15, and this was only just for two regions, they've been staggered out throughout that whole time and we are still, at this time, waiting to hear the appointment decisions on four individuals from four different regions.

Another.....
MR. JOHNSON: And this issue, particularly, has been raised by the Western Interior Council, and this is in your supplemental folder under Council appointments.

First the Western Interior Council issued a letter on May 6th of last year addressed to Secretary Jewell raising concerns about the late appointments and how it impairs the Council's ability to do their work for this program. A second issue -- letter was issued by the Council this year, on February 12th with an attachment of its May 6th letter from last year, again, to Secretary Jewell, raising concerns about these late appointments.

In addition to that, right now we have a system in place with the annual appointment cycle where, while in the fall, when we are beginning to conduct outreach to invite people to apply for the Regional Advisory Councils we are still waiting to hear back regarding the appointments from the previous cycle. And in several cases this leads to confusion, not only of new people from the public who are interested in applying for the Councils, but sometimes even the sitting Council members themselves, who are confused about whether or not they need to apply this year or next year or what the status is in the cycle, and even in good years when we actually can issue a press release in December announcing the new Council members we still have an appointment cycle -- a new recruitment cycle that's ongoing and some people then assume, well, I don't need to apply they've already announced the decisions for the Council appointments. So that creates a lot of confusion.

Additionally, we do not currently have a system in place where we have alternates that are appointed to the Council. How we currently do things is we submit names, based on the recommendations from the InterAgency Staff Committee and the Board for individuals who are identified to be vetted as alternates but they are never notified that they have been considered and vetted as alternates and, therefore, kind of exist in this limbo state where they don't know that they're on deck to possibly be appointed to the Council, but they will be in the event of an unanticipated vacancy. And even with this system in place, typically in the past couple years where we
have actually had to call upon these vetted names to appoint alternates it can take as long as two months to get an appointment letter issued on a candidate who's already been vetted as an alternate. So that takes time and as a result sometimes even miss them participating in a meeting cycle.

But, finally -- now, I bring this up as an issue because this was expressed to me as a problem from DC, that sometimes it's challenging for them to handle, at the same time, a charter renewal as well as an appointments package. So what I have come up with are some suggested recommendations on how we can deal with these problems.

You can go to the next slide.

One is let's change how we do our appointment cycles.

The first suggestion is to change to four year terms instead of three year terms. And for this to make sense, we would also want to change to a biennial cycle instead of an annual cycle.

Now, how will this help.

Well, it definitely address the second problem of the confusion, the overlapping of the appointment cycles. Secondly, it will allow more time to conduct outreach so we can have more people participating in the process because in the last decade there has been a steady decline in the number of applications that we have received from the public for these Regional Advisory Councils. And, that, combined with, you know, a lot of the different concerns people have about public participation in subsistence management, it's a bad combination of factors. So this would allow us to have more time in between recruitment cycles to conduct some public outreach.

And another issue, now this was recommended, actually by the Western Interior Council, and that is to address the specific problem of the appointment letters not being issued on December 3rd, would be to amend the charters to provide for carryover terms. That is, in the event an appointment letter is not issued on December 3rd, if there is a person who is currently on the Council and their term was set to expire, they would remain a member of the Council until
an appointment letter is issued, either reappointing them or replacing them with someone else.

Now, what I have indicated in here is one of the mechanisms that will be in place that we would have to use in order to make these changes. And if you'd refer to the recommended changes memo, the red text refers to the mechanisms we would have to use in order to implement these changes. So, for example, changing to four year terms, that is in part B of the regulations so that would have to be a Secretarial regulation change, but it's also in the charters, so we would also have to amend the charters to reflect that change.

Changing to a biennial cycle, that is something that's entirely an internal process. It's not driven by statute, regulation or charter.

And then, finally, amending the charters to provide for carryover terms, that would have to be stated in the charter and it would also have to -- I would suggest, be in the appointment letters as well. Say, for example, when the appointment letter is issued your term will expire on December 2, whatever year, except as otherwise provided in the charter, and then that way it could -- those two documents could interrel -- interre (makes sound) -- inter react with each other.

So that's that part of the piece.

The next recommendation would be to actually conduct and request the Secretary appoint formal alternates to the Councils.

One problem we do have, every meeting cycle, is the potential of not establishing a quorum. And we actually have heard reference to this at this meeting as result of the government shutdown. The Western Interior had some problems with establishing quorum and had to defer to the YK Delta Council on some of the wildlife recommendations. So if we had formally appointed alternates, they actually would receive a letter from the Secretary appointing them as an alternate to the Council, and the intention would be that they would not actually physical travel to the Council meeting unless they were needed to preserve a quorum for the meeting, but they would otherwise interact with OSM Staff as a regular member of the
Council. They would receive any emails or correspondence directed to the Council. They would receive meeting materials. And they would be asked to participate telephonically in the Council meetings so that they could keep in touch with the Council's business, be aware of what's going on and will be ready to step in and assist the Council in its decisionmaking process, if necessary.

Now, an additional benefit to this, aside from insuring that we have quorum for each meeting is that we now have an expanded pool of individuals who are in touch with what is going on with the Regional Advisory Council, who are participating in subsistence management and who are also now, additional, very active points of contact in their communities, that can now interact with the Federal Subsistence Program, on a meaningful level.

And then, finally, this again goes back to the problem that DC noted, having the charter, and the appointments occurring at the same time would be to alternate the years so that we do not have charter renewal going on at the same time as appointments. Currently, charters are renewed on odd years and we have an annual appointment process, so there's an appointment process every year. It was actually expressed to me that one of the reasons why DC was late in the 2012 appointments was because it was a Presidential election year.

So my recommendation to alleviate that concern from DC would be to shift so that the charters are renewed on even years and appointments are conducted on the odd years. So that would relieve that problem, and also would be beneficial to OSM, as a Program, because currently we deal with fisheries regulatory proposals on odd years, they're introduced in even years but they are implemented in odd years and that would, you know, possibly fit well within that.

Now, just as kind of a visual of comparing an annual cycle with a biennial cycle, I created a handy graph that shows currently how things operate in a four year cycle with an annual appointment process.

If we could go to the next slide.

Now, if you note we have at the very
top where it says nominations appointment process year
zero, that's essentially a previously existing,
previously started nomination cycle, with the news
releases of those appointments being issued in
December. But if you note we've already started the
next year back in August, so we're starting already
application period for year one and that continues on.
And you can see how those overlap. And if you look for
a two year process, under the annual cycle, in two
years we have 88 open Council seats, 130 applications,
62 agency Staff involved, and $40,000 expended for
outreach about those nominations process. And on the
right is essentially the current schedule about when we
go through this process throughout the year. But if
you compare that with the next slide, which is how it
would look under a biennial process.....

If you can get whatever that is out of
the way.

(Pause)

OPERATOR: This is the operator, Jack
Reakoff's line is open.

MR. REAKOFF: Hello. Yeah, I'm
standing by, I'm just listening to Carl. I tried to
comment on the dipnet thing and I was starred out,
so.....

MR. JOHNSON: Okay, well, as much as I
-- you can find this graphic actually in the back of
your handout so we'll just go to that in lieu of the
technical challenges here.

As you can see there's a clear dividing
line between the two cycles. There's a lot of open
space there where there would be no confusion. The
news releases for one appointment cycle would be issued
in December and we wouldn't begin the next appointment
cycle until 8 months later. So there's plenty of clear
difference between the two appointment cycles, no
confusion.

You also look at the two year bottom
line. The cost and the time and the actual expense of
outreach is cut in half over a two year period.
Additionally, there is less -- there are fewer seats to
fill, fewer applications to process over a two year
period. Now, granted it may be a larger lump at one
time compared to the annual process, normally we have around 42 or so, seats, to fill during the annual cycle, we would have roughly 55 or 54 in a biennial cycle, but by shifting, as you note on the schedule, by shifting the timeline to where we get things to DC roughly six weeks sooner, that would give them more than enough time to process that. And, really, that, in the scheme of things is really our biggest problem, is doing whatever we can to make it easier for DC to complete their process in time.

And we've been very busy and Pat Pourchot is here and we've spent a lot of time, you know, since November going back and forth with DC on how to make this process better.

One of the things we've heard is if we can get the materials to them sooner and there was a suggestion from the White House liaison, who is the person in the office of the Secretary, who is primarily responsible for vetting and approving Council applicants, who suggested that we submit these to them in a staggered way over a period of time, but, quite honestly if they actually did start processing these packets when they were received they could complete this on time. Even under -- you know, this last 20 years we've been doing this they were able to accomplish thee appointments in a timely manner up until recently, so it's not like it's difficult to be done and, quite frankly there's still a mystery to me as to how they do things.

But the point of this presentation is to make some recommendations to the Board on steps that we can take that would improve it, not only for the applicants, the people who are interested in applying to this Council, it will improve things for the Councils themselves so they don't have to worry about whether or not they can conduct business. It would improve things for all of the Staff who are involved, because, again, this is a burden that's put on the five agencies year in, year out and I think that everybody would probably appreciate not only having a year off from this process but if we start earlier then we don't run into concerns of starting to impede on the beginning of field work seasons for a lot of the agency Staff who are doing work out in the field.

So my recommendation is to seek Board approval on taking these recommended changes and
submitting them to the Councils for their input. And I know that there are several of these things that are recommended, that several of the Councils have already expressed opinions on, one of these changes comes from the Western Interior Council, the Northwest Arctic Council has expressed an interest in longer terms for appointment. I've already had discussions with Fish and Wildlife's personnel in DC who handle FACA issues and they have essentially given pre approval to many of these changes, not only to the charter but also that there would be no objection from the Secretary about expanding to four year terms. So really the big piece is to just get the go ahead from the Board to take this to the Regional Advisory Councils and to hopefully get their approval and maybe -- probably even some additional recommendations. I do note one thing that the Councils have expressed interest in is having something like a mentorship or a youth seat on the Council. And one idea I came up with as to how this could be accomplished would be, you know, much like this Board has, by regulation, the designated members as well as designated liaison and one thing could be to have like a youth liaison to the Councils. But it would take some interest from the Councils to do that and figuring out what the mechanism would be required in order to make that change.

But timeline, what we're looking at is -- I've been informed it would take roughly a year to accomplish the Secretarial regulatory change. The next appointment -- the next charter amendments or charter approvals, the timeline for that is the charters currently in place expire December the 2nd, 2015, so if, for example, we were actually to get recommendations approved by the Councils at this fall meeting cycle, we can move forward with the process and by the time the current charters expire we could have these changes in place to ready to implement moving forward.

One additional thing to note, as far as my presentation, I've already had conversations with the relevant people in the know, that the Western Interior's recommended change to provide for carryover appointments could be implemented immediately as charter amendments, the charters would still just have to be renewed on schedule on December 2nd, 2015, in addition to that. But those charter amendments could be accomplished rather quickly, they would not have to wait, you know, another year and a half to be
completed.

And that's the essence of my presentation and I am now open to any questions.

Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Board.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MS. YUHAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was hoping that Staff might be able to speak to how unpredicted vacancies would be handled in an off year. They occur. We lose people unexpectedly and would that vacancy have to wait two years to be settled.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. And, through the Chair. Ms. Yuhas.

So the current process in place is we do have individuals who are vetted and if we do have an unexpected vacancy, our current process does allow us to request the Secretary to issue an appointment letter for that individual. But as I mentioned, that takes about two months. So the intention would be, if we have formal appointed alternates, then the, in order of their priority of alternate, designation alternate number 1, alternate number 2, they would automatically step in to permanently replace any unexpected vacancies on the Councils immediately rather than having to go through a process of requesting a new appointment letter be issued by the Secretary.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I'd like to maybe hear from Pat, if we could.

MR. POURCHOT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the record, I'm Pat Pourchot, Special Assistant to the Secretary of Interior in Anchorage.

I would say that, greatly appreciate all the work and the comments that Carl's made, I certainly agree with all of them. And I also want to apologize to the RACs and to OSM that have been really struggling with this problem, next to the RACs and OSM, nobody's been more frustrated than I on this whole appointment process and I appreciate Jack Reakoff and the Western Interior RAC's letters to the Secretary. I can't disagree with any of that. I've had numerous conversations, both by telephone and in person in DC
with leadership in our department on this issue.

Two years ago, or last year we had
thought and Carl referenced this, that earlier
submission of nominations, maybe some pre-vetting work
here in Alaska using the court system access -- record
access might help and speed up the situation. As Carl
mentioned, I don't think that had any affect at all on
this last year's appointment process. If I were
characterizing the problem I would say it's a capacity
issue right now in the Department, there just aren't
more than one, or one and a half people working on this
and when they're out, as they were last year, nothing
gets done. I would also say that, like many of you, I
look at the world pretty small, just around Alaska and
I'm reminded when I'm back there, that the same people
are involved in appointments all over the United States
throughout our Department, bureaus, advisory boards,
and those tend to clog up the system late in the year
and our nominations put right up in that same process.

I would also say -- and I was hear when
Jack mentioned perhaps this ought to be delegated to
me, I've been also reminded that the process that we
have in the Department of Interior is no different --
it's a White House driven process and it applies to all
departments throughout, as far as how vetting is done,
who does that vetting, it's a fairly formalized
controlled process and even though I've offered on
occasion to help, if we can do the vetting, and that
has been rejected out of hand, as not part of the
overall governmental process. So as much as I'm
sympathetic to that, that probably is not an option.

So I think that these alternatives,
these options that Carl's laid out are all worthy of
pursuit.

I'm less knowledgeable about the
charter approval process, I don't believe that that's
done by the same people that are doing the vetting of
our nominations. That's been kind of the focus of my
efforts but I think all of these make sense, should be
pursued.

I have talked with the White House
liaison person about possible changes in process, she
has been very open to suggested changes. I think as
the Board looks at these and the RACs look at these, as
they become more specific, I would want to take those
back and run them by again to answer the basic
question, will these help your work and, I think,
that's what we want to kind of measure these approaches
towards.

In the interim, I think that the
suggestion by the Western Interior RAC that Carl,
again, mentioned, of trying to affect charter changes
to have people continue in their jobs until, or their
appointments until new appointments are made is an
excellent one. Certainly would avoid perhaps some of
these critical quorum and travel arrangements that have
to be made, you know, in December for January and
February meetings, which is what we ran into this year.
I think that's excellent. I do worry about Secretarial
Part B regulation changes, just in terms of the length
of time, but sooner that would start the more it would
be in effect.

So, again, all those, I think, are
worthy of pursuit and to quote the cliche, the system
is broken now, it's not working and we got to do
something and I think in just approaching it from all
directions is warranted at this point in time.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Are
there any comments from the Board.

MR. C. BROWER: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Sandy go ahead you
had your hand up first, I think.

MR. RABINOWITCH: We're all trying to be
gentlemen to each other.

I have four things. Three are
statements and one's a question.

So NPS appreciates the effort. We
certainly agree with trying to both adapt and improve
the process. I think that's a good thing. And
appreciate OSM's efforts to move that along.

That's good.

I also think your suggestion about
sending this out to the RAC is a good idea and support
Let me now throw my question out. Was this shared with the InterAgency Staff Committee, this presentation, have they seen it.

MR. JOHNSON: Through the Chair. They have not seen this as a committee, as a group. I -- I -- this specific memo. I did roughly in last May or so mention this because this -- this originally came from a memo I submitted to the acting ARD last April, as in April 2013, and I highlighted some of the things that I wanted to bring to the ISC and I always envisioned this to go through the ISC first before the Board but I can just say that probably in light of the recent, yet, again, delayed Secretarial appointments it was decided that we'd move forward with this at a more expedited process.

MR. RABINOWITCH: Mr. Chairman, if I might continue.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. RABINOWITCH: Okay. So two final comments.

One on the concept of carryover appointments, if I'm understanding what you're suggesting, I would share that this is something -- and I'm sure you know this Carl, that's been done with NPS Subsistence Resource Commissions for decades. We've had carryover, they're in our charter. We've found it's worked very, very well, and I think that's a great idea, because you don't end up with those vacancies. When someone drops off they continue on until there's a new appointment. So we've had great success with that and I think that would be a good addition.

And so then my last quick comment is, I would suggest that this loop back through the Staff Committee. I don't know whether they'll have any suggested changes or not, but I think there's a lot of minds that are familiar with the Program and I think it'd be a good idea for them to look at this and see if anything additional comes up.

With that said, I don't think that needs to delay getting this out to the RACs in the fall, at all, so I think those things could be
accomplished. It's probably a pretty minor step.
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Tony, and then Charlie.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Well, he has a response to that.

MR. JOHNSON: Just a quick response to that. The timing would actually work very well if we could do that with the ISC, when the ISC meets to discuss this year's appointments, recommendations to the Federal Subsistence Board and that would hopefully be in June, that's been my request, but I don't know if that's actually been discussed. And then that would give us plenty of time to then have it ready to go in the meeting books for the first meeting that occurs in August.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: They kind of answered my question. I was just going to make that statement, the ISC would be looking at it anyway. After the RACs vet it through their process it's going to come back, here's the RAC recommendations, which is what we've heard here exactly, all the RACs saying, hey, we need to do something about these seats and these appointments and I think most of these recommendations do a good job at addressing the issues that we've heard brought forth by the RAC and by the Staff that have to deal with these appointment issues. So I would look to just direct Staff to move forward, get this to the RAC, and the ISC could vet it and make these recommendations to whoever needs to make this process run smoother.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. C. BROWER: I was just going to say, do we need a motion to proceed with the recommendations.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Let's do it in a motion, yeah.

MR. C. BROWER: I would so move to that effect, Mr. Chair, that I made a motion to proceed with
the recommendation changes to the nomination
appointment process for Regional Advisory Council
members.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: I'll second that motion with the idea that they also look to amend the charter as soon as possible so that they can try to alleviate some of the concerns of the Regional Advisory Council.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: You heard the motion and the second. Is there any discussion.

Go ahead.

MR. RABINOWITCH: I'll vote in favor of the motion. It's my understanding that it would go through the Staff Committee before it goes out to the RACs just to see if there's any additional thoughts to be added.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Is there any objection to that.

(No objections)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: If not then that will be the process.

Any further discussion.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Question.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Question's been called for. All those in favor of the motion, say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any opposed, say nay.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Motion passes unanimously.

Thank you.

Okay, go ahead.
MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to thank the members of the Board for their contributions to this process and I want to stress that, you know, there are a lot of very high profile things that the Federal Subsistence Management Program does, but I think that reaching out to the communities and finding people who are passionate about subsistence, who want to serve their communities by being on the Regional Advisory Councils is one of the very important things that we do. And I think that whatever we can do to improve that process and get more people actively engaged is important work. So I just want to thank you.

And I will note that, just as kind of an administrative point, I still think that we should put the charter amendment the Western Interior Council has suggested to the Councils at this fall meeting, but my intention will be to submit that for essentially pre approval from DC so that if the Councils all agree on that, then that can be ready to be implemented before the December 2nd deadline for the expiration of current terms.

So, thank you, again, members of the Board and Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Pat, you've got the floor.

MR. POURCHOT: Thank you, very much. I just wanted to add one thing, as the RACs and as the Staff Committee may be looking at this and looking at other options, fundamental to the problem from the DC approval standpoint is the pure numbers of applications or nominations coming in and it should be noted that even a two year cycle, you're actually on that two year cycle, are probably going to have more nominations that particular year coming in and so looking at the numbers, I think, is important in the review on -- and if there were ways of reducing the pure numbers of nominations seeking approval that would be helpful and that would, of course, apply to the numbers of potential standby people -- alternates, you know, alternates add to the numbers.

And I hate to -- you know, this is probably highly controversial but some of the -- the Councils have lots of people on them and maybe that's something to look at too, is just the number of people
on each Council. I mean that -- just things to think about as the review proceeds.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: That's where Pat comes in.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: No, we will -- we will take that and consider that. We've got a couple of other things to do before it -- go ahead.

MR. ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before we go on any further on this issue, I would like to bring up the problems that Councils have been getting in receiving their final payments on their per diem, sometimes months go by before we get them. I forgot that I had one coming here, so several -- a couple three months ago when I got an email from my coordinator saying that the per diem from your last meeting is on its way, and we experience that, you know, quite often. So I think, you know, we need to be reminded we are volunteers. And, you know, I don't have any problems, you know, with surviving without it but I think it would be good business sense to make sure that those per diems, you know, were issued in a timely manner.

Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I think that could be -- should be administratively and I think the Staff has heard that.

We've got a couple of other things to -- go ahead.

MR. JOHNSON: I just want to make a quick note that largely a lot of that has been a result of us switching the different systems we use, both for accounting and travel within the Department of Interior, but I can say that a lot of that backlog has been cleared and moving forward, we are -- we have been, starting with this last meeting cycle, been very successful in processing vouchers fairly quickly. So I would like to say that moving forward the Councils can look for vast improvement in that process.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. We have a brief report on the affects of the government shutdown.

DR. JENKINS: Mr. Chair. Beth Pendleton asked us to prepare a briefing on the affects of the government shutdown for the Federal Subsistence Program, and the short answer is that the government shutdown threw the Federal Subsistence Program into chaos.

(Laughter)

DR. JENKINS: The longer answer and it will only take me about 60 seconds to go through this.

As you know on October 1st, 2013 with no spending legislation enacted, the Federal government was forced into a partial shutdown and one result was a 16 day furlough with a total of 6.6 million furloughed days. The government was reopened on October 17th. Consequences for our program included the following:

Federal employees were furloughed in the Office of Subsistence Management.

Importantly the shutdown generated confusion for subsistence users about whether they could continue access to Federal public lands.

Six Regional Advisory Council meetings were cancelled and had to be rescheduled.

60 Council members were affected, their travel and accommodation arrangements had to be cancelled and rebooked.

Regional Advisory Council meeting venues had to be rebooked, often in inferior locations.

Staff from State, tribal and ANCSA and other programs who participate in RAC meetings had
to adjust to the rescheduling of all of those meetings.

Six public hearings on the rural review process were cancelled and five were rescheduled.

An extension to the public comment period on the rural review process had to be published in the Federal register.

The Western Interior Council was unable to establish a quorum because of the rescheduled meeting and had to schedule an additional telephonic meeting.

The shutdown pushed back the completion of Regional Advisory Council's fall agenda by about six weeks, thus greatly reducing the time needed to prepare for the winter meeting cycle.

The shutdown pushed back the completion of the summary and analysis that the public, RAC, tribal and ANCSA Corporation comments on the rural review process, thus greatly reducing the time needed to prepare for this meeting, which we managed to do.

And, of course, I should mention that our court reporter had to completely readjust the schedule of court reporting to accommodate the confusion that we were thrown into.

And then, lastly, one of the consequences is that we ended up meeting here instead of our usual venues.
Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any questions or comments.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Just a comment. I'd just like to say good job Staff.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I'd like to commend the Staff, too, for -- even with all of the backlash of the shutdown, you know, I think we are getting the job done and -- and it's because, I think the Staff has been working some long hours, to my understanding. So I would like to convey that, congratulations to the Staff for keeping up with the missteps of the Federal government.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: I got one more, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Yes.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: And I was just going to apologize that we're past our 1:00 o'clock early out and I know that's a sensitive issue being a government employee myself, tribal government, but when you get out at 1:00 it's a special thing. Sorry guys.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: And I won't say it but.....

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I'd -- I'd like to use this as a last comment, our next.....

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Jennifer has a comment.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Oh, go ahead.

MS. YUHAS: Not attempting to waste
time, Mr. Chairman, just wanted to add one piece to that report that is important and the State also compliments the Federal Staff, but there was a piece that affected the ETJ. We had planned to travel jointly with the Forest Service out to Angoon for one of our trips and they were prevented from coming, their Staff was even prevented from coordinating with us, the two days prior to that trip, so there was one more affect for that report.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: That brings to mind, too, that we wouldn't have to go through this process if the State would take over.

(Laughter)

MS. YUHAS: Every meeting.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay. I think the only other thing that we've got is executive session but I'd like to give this opportunity for Board members to make comments to the Staff while they're here, and I'll start.

Jack Lorrigan has been with us for a couple of years but he just got reappointed to a different position with the Federal government so we're going to have to find a replacement for Jack and I've appreciated all the work that he's done for, especially myself, but he's done a lot of good things, I think, for the Board also. We appreciate all the work that you've done, Jack. We'll miss you but we understand your reasons for moving on.

MR. LORRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: I'd like to echo that, Mr. Chair. And, again, though I would like to say to the Staff, Jack has been a vital part of the lack of support that the rural members have. I mean we do have a lot of support here at OSM, but Jack has served basically as that liaison or that person that we have contact with that's calling us and bugging us and making us get on the email and answer the special actions and all the other stuff that comes with our -- the off site work that comes with this position, and I only hope that we can fill that sooner than later so that we stay abreast of the concerns and wishes of the
public.

MR. C. BROWER: I would echo the same thing, Mr. Chair. But he'll be closer up there in the North Slope, so he'll be fine.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. KESSLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just thought it was a very good meeting, an excellent meeting. We had a huge agenda, especially considering rural and taking -- and making those recommendations to the Secretaries on how to move forward and I think that's a big step. I was a little concerned that we wouldn't have time to do that at this meeting but it's been done. And I think there's been a lot of very good actions taken by the Board.

I don't know if I'm going to be at the next Board meeting, next January, because I may be retired by then.

So, thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MS. K'EIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I don't have too much to add. I think I expressed my support and thanks to Staff at OSM and our InterAgency Staff Committee yesterday and just continue that support. I do want to express my surprise at hearing Jack is leaving and I'll be meeting with him later to find out more about that.

(Laughter)

MS. K'EIT: And, you know, anything that the Bureau of Indian Affairs can do with outreach for that position when it's advertising we're happy to help with that.

Thank you to our rural Board members who are a really important addition and key to the Board and really glad to have them as well.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Cindy.

MS. JACOBSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
This is my first day being here at the table but I have been observing over the last couple of days and very impressed with the Staff and how professional and knowledgeable and what a great job they're doing supporting this Board. I also want to thank the Board for being so kind to me today, my first day, so thank you.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Could you tell us what position you hold with Fish and Wildlife.

MS. JACOBSON: Currently I'm the acting Deputy Regional Director but my regular job is Assistant Regional Director for Science Applications.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. CRIBLEY: Well, reinforce what everybody else has said. Thanks to Jack for everything he's done for us and also to everybody else who helps support the Board and making these meetings happen and making us productive in making decisions and such. And also just, particularly to the Staff and to the Regional Advisory Council members. The work we're doing here is very, very important work, it's critical work. We have, I guess I feel a privilege to be able to sit on this Board and get involved with these issues and be able to help influence that and help the rural residents of Alaska to maintain their lifestyles and stuff and appreciative of everything that goes into it, their efforts and the Staff's efforts to make us productive and making good decisions here and stuff. I look forward to continuing to stay involved with it.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My congratulations to Jack for, you know, moving on, I'm sure he'll -- as already expressed will be missed here but also, you know, good luck in your new job. I've known Jack, you know, for some time now so I know of his commitment to the work that he engages himself in. And to, Gene, you know, I'd say welcome to the fold here. As I mentioned to you earlier, you know, it's good to see more of our people getting involved in this process.

And to you, Tim, you know, thanks for
hanging in there with us all these years, it's been, you know, a learning experience for you as well as it is for us. So -- and thanks to, you know, to the Federal Subsistence Board.

I think two major things have occurred here this week.

Number 1 is Saxman, you know, going back to retaining its rural preference -- I mean as a rural community.

And then the issue that I heard yesterday, you know, with king salmon on the Kuskokwim River.

I thought those are two major things that I will remember as I move on.

My term, you know, is expiring here, you know, pretty soon. I reapplied but there's, you know, no telling whether I'll be reappointed again or not. I hope I will. But -- because it's been a pleasure working, you know, with all you people all these years, it's been a neat experience for me. And then sharing some of the thoughts that I have, you know, has been very, you know, enlightening to me as well.

I'd like to pay tribute to one of our Council members, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Floyd Kookesh, as you may well know, had been battling cancer for a long time and he walked into the forest, you know, a few weeks ago. We were appointed on the Regional Advisory Council about the same time and we always used to sit together, you know, during Council meetings and then when I got appointed Chairman, you know, we never sat together. But, you know, as we sat and listened and talked and made comments and so forth, as Board members, we noticed that there were people, you know, coming to testify from Staff and so forth who had doctors degrees, you know, it was doctor so and so and doctor so and so and doctor so and so and so and he asked me -- edged me one time and he said, Bert, do you have a degree and I said, yeah, I -- I went to college, I got a degree and he says, well, what's your degree in and I said, well, I got a bachelor of science, you know, and he thought there a while and he mentioned the fact that everyone, you know, that there were a lot of doctorates, people who have doctorates, you know, in
the system here and he said, okay, ladies and

gentlemen, and this is on record, from here on out we

want you to know that Mr. Adams is going to be known as

BS Adams.

(Laughter)

MR. ADAMS: So Mr. Chairman with that I

would like to just, you know, use that and share some

stuff with you that I think that, if I'm not here next
time, then for posterity purposes I'd like to leave a

principle with you.

When I was going to college I got -- I

went to a junior college, or a two year college first

and then there was about a 10 or 12 year intervention

before I went back again and I got accepted to go to a

university and this university had a very good Indian

education program and so I enrolled in Indian Ed 101.

And our instructor was a Native American so showed up

for my very first class and up until that time, you

know, I was pretty much of a behind the scenes type of

person. I didn't get up and talk very much, you know,

you'd never know it now.....

(Laughter)

MR. ADAMS: .....but I was always the

one who would always sit in the back room so that I

wouldn't get called on, you know, to do anything or to

make a comment.

So there I was sitting in the back room

and here our instructor came in and he wrote his name

up on the Board and then he says from here on you need

to refer to me as Professor, I can't remember his name

now, so and so, and I want you to stick to that, and

then the first thing that he did is he wrote the word

nature on the board and then he drew a circle around it

and he gave us, you know, 15, maybe even 20 minutes to

think about that and he wanted our responses, you know.

Everyone had to make a response. And like I said, you

know, I always used to sit in the back of the room

because I didn't like to get called on if I sat in the

front. So we all thought and pondered upon that thing

that was on the board there and then he said, okay,

we're going to open it up for your opinions now and he

said we're going to start in the back room. And so

there I was, you know, dumbfounded, and I was thinking

about that, that I really didn't have an answer but I
just did the best I could. Okay. And then he went
through -- there was about 40 of us and every one of us
had an opportunity to share our thoughts about that.
And then after everyone, you know, gave their thoughts
on that he says, okay, this is what I want you to know
and understand.

He says, a long, long time ago we
people, as Native Americans, lived within that circle.
We lived with the natural laws. Because we lived with
the natural laws, we understood the natural laws.
Because we understood the natural laws, we obeyed the
natural laws. Because we obeyed the natural laws, the
natural environment provided us with everything that we
needed to sustain our lives.

And the next thing that he did then,
and there was more discussion about that, is he wrote
another -- drew another circle on the board, he drew
arrows that pointed to the outside of that circle and
he says, okay, take a few minutes and try to figure out
what that means. And, of course, you know, the
comments that came back were pretty much on, meant that
those arrows were the outside influences that were
looking in and they wanted to get in and they wanted to
cause turmoil. And he said eventually that did happen.
You know, no fault to, you know, Columbus or anyone
else who came over to our country, you know, to inhabit
it, but the Native American people, because they lived
within the natural laws thought that those people came
over here to learn how to live according to the natural
laws and so, you know, they welcomed them with open
arms. We all know the story of Plymouth Rock, the
first winter here and everything, and how, you know,
the Pilgrims were able to survive the winter because of
Native American's knowledge of the area and today we
celebrate that as Thanksgiving, you know.

So after that discussion he went on and
he says, you know what you're going to spend the next
16 weeks learning how we can live according to the laws
of nature. And he said, you know, some of you will
have a hard time, you know, grasping on to that, others
of you will catch on right away, some of you it'll take
a lifetime for you to begin to understand, you know,
what this is all about. It's taken me almost 30 years,
ladies and gentlemen, to really learn, I'm a late
bloomer, okay, and it's taken me maybe 25 or 30 years
to come to a real good grasp of what those laws are.
And I wish I had more time to explain it to you but those are laws that I think that we have been drifting away from over the past couple hundred years. Now, take a look at the founders of this Country's vision or what they expected America to be like and it says so in the very first paragraph of the Declaration of Independence that we should live according to the laws of nature and nature's god.

It says that.

They believed in the natural laws as well.

And much of it they learned from Native Americans and other, you know, ethnic groups.

And so my mission throughout all of these years then was to be able to try to understand that. And let me say that, in short, that the natural law is the Creator's order of things. And because it's the Creator's order of things then it is correct reasoning and correct reasoning is true law and true law has to be based on the natural laws. Okay. And so he also said -- I also learned from a professor at the university that I went to that the natural law is wisdom. When you come to an understanding of what the laws are all about it is wisdom. And then when it is referred to government it means justice. And so, ladies and gentlemen, that's what we, who are sitting around this table here, are trying to do is to provide justice to the environment, to the people that we serve, and to make sure that, you know, everyone's subsistence needs are met. My compliments to you in being able to try to accomplish those things. I think we have made some real great strides over the past few years, particularly.

So I have written a book about the natural laws and you can find it on Amazon.com, and download it into your Kindle device, or I even got it into my computer, but if you would like to look it up, you know, it's easy to find.

Anyhow, I wanted to share that with you folks because I think it's really important, and if you don't see me next time then, you know, just think when things don't go right, where are we going wrong. And it's because of disobedience from the laws of nature.
Gunalcheesh, and thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you, Bert.
I'm glad you didn't get an MBA.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead. Continue.

MR. CRAWFORD: Kind of a tough act to follow here.

(Laughter)

MR. CRAWFORD: My name is Drew Crawford. I'm with the Department of Fish and Game, Federal subsistence liaison team. I've worked for the Department since 1976. I worked as a fishery biologist for the Department since about 1980. Most of my career was spent as a commercial fisheries research biologist working with salmon and herring and I've worked on the Yukon River, the Susitna Hydro Electric Studies, I've also worked in the Prince William Sound area and I was there when the Exxon Valdez went on the rocks. And I spent the latter part of my career with commercial fisheries in the Bristol Bay area. I started with the Federal liaison team, oh, about two and a half years ago, to help with the last fisheries cycle and I saw that through and then they kept me on for the wildlife cycle. I do have a degree from the University of New Hampshire in wildlife management, so I enjoyed getting back into some of that for this last -- for the wildlife cycle, which we've just completed.

It's an interesting process and I'm constantly learning and I enjoy hearing new opinions and I appreciate your work.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MS. YUHAS: We all know Drew does really good work, no, you can't have him, I'll fight too hard to keep him.

For the record, Jennifer Yuhas with the Department. I'll be brief.

The Department has a non-voting seat
but it does have a seat on the Board, and I really want
to express my gratitude to the Chairman and to this
particular Board for the interaction that we have here.
There's a lot of history to this program and there's
been different ways that this seat has been treated
over the years and I'm very grateful that we use a
little bit of humor, rib each other about some things
that maybe we have an impasse on but that this Board
treats me very professionally when I'm here in this
seat and makes it easy for the State to fully
participate in the discussions. We don't always get
our way on a proposal and that's the way it goes.

But I just wanted to express that
appreciation, Mr. Chairman.

Jack, they better find somebody who is
as professional and classy as you to replace you. So
I'm going to express a little disappointment that
you're leaving.

(Laughter)

MS. YUHAS: That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
And I just want to say that I really appreciate your
words, Bert, that I -- I think they were very
appropriate and I hope everybody takes them to heart.

I also would ask the Chair if it's okay
at this point, I'd also been asked by the Southcentral
person to express some of their comments that they had
and I'll try and just combine them in the interest of
brevity with my own because a lot of them coincide,
would that be an okay thing to do at this point.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Okay. They felt that
the room was not adequate here this time to accommodate
the crowd and I agree, I think that it was difficult to
find and access the room alone. With the table setup
it seemed to prevent the public from seeing members as
well, and I know that I was uncomfortable having the
public to my back, I didn't feel I was being very
respectful to the people who were sitting behind me and
not being able to speak directly to them.
They also felt that maybe we had too ambitious of an agenda and we should have either added a day to our meeting or split it into two different meetings. I feel that it did create a lot of stress on members that were forced to leave early due to prior engagements and what not and that because of the overrun in the meeting and some of them not being able to complete the items that were pertinent to their areas with them being directly in attendance at the meeting.

With the RAC appointments, the Southcentral RAC made several recommendations in their annual report, which will shortly be going to the Federal Subsistence Board so I am assuming that was just a message to let you know that those were on their way.

Again, they also expressed the desire for RAC members to receive their per diem promptly. I think we've already heard that.

And they also felt like government reductions were hurting this Program, and I think I had expressed that earlier as well. It is frustrating to be asked to work with the biology of things in your area when you can't get current biology reports or anything substantial. So I'm just echoing that again.

I just want to say hello to those of you who I've seen for so many years. As a personal note, I've sat on our board for a great number of years and almost every one of those I've been as vice Chair and that's a perfectly fine place for me to be. I feel we have elders in our area that represent us very well and I'm very grateful to Dan O'Hara before myself, and Randy Alvarez and now Molly Chythlook who normally sit in this seat and I think they are very good people for our area.

But I will say that I feel like I know when this was originally started, as you stated earlier, the State should be, you know, taking over this, it was supposed to be temporary and I would just say that I think it should be looked at very strongly that the seats are in large to a four year capacity, it's obvious to me having come in only a short number of times because I am vice Chair, that I see the same people sitting next to me and around the table on the RAC positions, as I did the first time I came in here,
and just noting that, I think it would be very appropriate to elongate appointments for those who can fill them. And, again, that's 'just a personal note. And I appreciate everybody's welcoming of me to this Board again and appreciate all the work that you all do and thank you very much for that.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I've been in this position now for eight to nine months. One thing I've come to learn is that the Regional Advisory Council and the Federal Subsistence Board with regard to OSM Staff has a very dedicated passionate Staff behind them. And some of the issues that we have been addressed with, especially with regard to this meeting, we only had weeks, and sometimes days to address. And I was very demanding, as the boss, on the Staff, but, not because I felt that they needed to have motivation to get something done but because I felt they were very dedicated, they had the skill set and ability to accomplish those tasks on time. And so I would like to say thank you to the Staff that we have for the effort that was put forth prior to this meeting, and occurring.

Secondly. One thing that we've heard, I've heard, I've been trying to attend as many RAC meetings as I could in addition to the work sessions and stuff, commenting that I've heard is that government Staffing, budget situations may be affecting the Program. Like I said, we have a very dedicated Staff but also we're down up to 14 positions at one time. And we have received the support within the agency which we are seated with to start filling those and we're going to be filling a majority or a significant portion of those positions. So, hopefully, we can get things to the point where like at RAC meetings, we don't know who to go to. Because we've had so many vacancies we have had to rely on temporary details, shuffling people around, in order to keep the wheels turning. Hopefully at this time next year I won't be saying, well, we're down 14 positions, we're down six positions, we're down eight positions. Hopefully we'll be at the point and I have confidence we'll be at the point where we get a majority of those positions filled and will clearly delineate, if you have a question about fisheries, who do you go to; if
you have a question about a report, or some proposal,
you'd have definitely a path to follow to get to the 
right information.

I'd just like to reiterate from myself to the OSM Staff, thank you very much and you're greatly appreciated and a very professional and caring Staff.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you, Gene. And, with that, I'm going to end our public portion of the meeting by announcing that this is the.....

MR. CHRISTIANSON: The Park Service.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: .....winning.....

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: .....children's art program, student art contest. The winner's name is Eileen Fernandez, she is nine years old and attends Sitka grade school, Keet Gooshi Heen from Sitka and her teacher is Kay Beckeris and we will be sending her a letter and I can't remember what the prize is for -- it gets printed, I guess, in our documents.

MR. PELTOLA: On the cover.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: On the cover of the next proposal book so.....

(Cell phone interruption)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Would you care to address the Board.

MR. LORD: Are you talking about the executive session or just -- oh, the comments.

(Laughter)

MR. LORD: Well, briefly. Gene, how many people at OSM at right now.

MR. PELTOLA: According to the Staffing chart 44.

MR. LORD: No, how many people actually at OSM right now.
MR. PELTOLA: Probably about a little over 30.

MR. LORD: Okay. A little over 30. When I came here 10 years ago I think it was 54. So that's what a 30 percent drop and, yet, look at this, I mean that is a real tribute to the professionalism and hard work the Staff put in here, there's no dropping of quality at all in this book and I'm just so impressed with all of OSM and the work that went into this meeting. Without it, who knows what would happen here, so I just want to say again, thank you, and echo Gene's comments.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: And I want to reiterate again and I think I've said it before, but the people that we represent appreciate the work that the Federal Subsistence Board is doing, and everywhere I go I receive comments about people being thankful for the approach that the Federal Subsistence Board is making in addressing rural issues and rural needs, and I want to convey that to everyone.

With that, is there a motion to go into execu -- go ahead.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: I just had one more statement, just to support what he's saying. I had a couple of people texting me that were on line and they said this was probably the best Federal Board meeting they have ever listened in on, so if that's a little bit of feedback, I don't know if we're not fighting or kicking around or something that used to happen but maybe even what Ms. Yuhas is stating, you know, there's a high level of respect I think between the people here and it's just nice to sit around a bunch of professionals and have that level of respect be passed between each other.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you.

Then.....

MR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman. Last.....

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. ADAMS: On behalf of the Regional Advisory Council Chairs, I want to thank Nanci for hanging in here with me and I'm sure she wants to thank me for hanging in with her.
(Laughter)

MR. ADAMS: So it's been, you know, good getting to know these people and, again, thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: You forgot the Park Service.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Oh, I thought we -- I thought we started from you.

MS. COOPER: No, it's not, no, we.....

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I'm sorry.

MS. COOPER: Deb Cooper, Park Service. I'll just echo the thanks to the OSM Staff, it really is just a huge effort to pull this off and you did a fantastic job and really appreciate it. Really appreciate all the analysis, all the work that went into this. And -- and it's not unnoticed. It may feel like it at times, I don't know, but it is not unnoticed, thank you so much.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: With that, is there a motion to go into executive session.

MR. C. BROWER: So moved.

MS. K'EIT: Second.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Moved and seconded to go into executive session. Is there any objection to that.

(No objections)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Motion passes unanimously.

(Off record)

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)
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