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MR. DOOLITTLE: All the lines should be open for all the speakers, this is Tom. Good morning on this sunny day in Anchorage on April 27th, 2020, and this is to readjourn the recessed meeting of the Board from last Thursday. And before I turn it over to the Chair do a quick roll call to make sure that our Board and State partners and Staff are on line.

And I'll start off with Rhonda Pitka, are you here?

MR. DOOLITTLE: Rhonda, are you on line?

MS. PITKA: Hello.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Hello, Rhonda?

MS. PITKA: Yes, I'm here.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay, good. Just doing roll call. Good morning.

Bureau of Indian Affairs, Gene Peltola.


MR. SCHMID: Good morning, Tom. Dave's on and Wayne Owen will be tag teaming today with me. I have a few meetings, I'm going to have to step out.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay, thank you very much Dave.

Fish and Wildlife Service, Greg Siekaniec.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Good morning, Tom.
MR. DOOLITTLE: All right, Greg, good to hear you this morning.

Bureau of Land Management, Chad Padgett.

MR. PADGETT: I am here, thanks, Tom.

MR. DOOLITTLE: All right, Chad, good to hear you this morning.

National Park Service, Don Striker.

MR. STRIKER: I'm here and Joshua is also on in case I have to step out, it's the big reopen the Parks weekend, right.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Alrighty, Don, thanks for taking the time and good to hear you this morning.

MR. STRIKER: You bet, good to hear you, happy Monday.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, happy Monday.

Charlie Brower.

(No comments)

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay. No, Charlie yet.

Chairman Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, I'm here Tom, thank you.


MR. PEYTO: And Gene's on, sorry about that.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Hey, Gene, good to hear you this morning.

Charlie, are you on yet?
MR. DOOLITTLE: Alrighty. We're still waiting on Charlie.

Ken Lord, are you on this morning?

MR. LORD: I am here, Sir.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Alrighty, Ken.

Mike Routhier, are you on?

(No comments)

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay, we have Ken. Our State partners, is Ben Mulligan on this morning.

MR. MULLIGAN: Good morning, Tom. I'm here and then also just because of logistics today Mark is here but at another location so if I'm not available he will be.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Alrighty, thank you for that. Thank you again, Ben, for being available this morning.

Going into our Council Chairs. Is Della Trumble on this morning.

MS. TRUMBLE: Good morning, I'm here.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Hi, Della. Is Greg Encelewski on this morning.

MS. PERRY: Tom, this is DeAnna Perry, Council Coordinator for the Southcentral RAC.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yep.

MS. PERRY: Greg is unable to join us today but if there are any questions I'm standing by.

Thanks.

MR. DOOLITTLE: All right. Good to hear you this morning, DeAnna, and thank you.

Don Hernandez.
MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, I'm here.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Hi, Don, good morning.

Bristol Bay, is Nanci Lyon on?

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yes, I'm here.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Great, Nanci, good to hear you this morning.

Yukon Kuskokwim Delta, Alissa Rogers.

MS. PATTON: Good morning, Mr. Chair. This is Eva Patton, Council Coordinator. There are no further proposals or closure reviews for the YKDelta region so Alissa Rogers will not be joining us today but I'm available to answer any questions if they arise.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Eva.

Western Interior, Jack Reakoff.

(No comments)

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay, no Jack.

MS. DEATHERAGE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Karen Deatherage, can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yes, Karen, we can hear you.

MS. DEATHERAGE: Thank you. Through the Chair, I'm not sure if Mr. Reakoff is going to be calling in today. There are no other -- or further agenda items for the Western Interior RAC on the agenda.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Karen. Just going through roll call, this is Tom here.
Seward Peninsula, Louis Green.

(No comments)

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay, no Louis.

Northwest Arctic, Mike Kramer.

MR. STEVENSON: Tom, this is Zach Stevenson, good morning.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Good morning, Zach.

MR. STEVENSON: Mr. Kramer is unavailable today. I'm available to speak to matters pertaining to the Northwest Arctic region should they arise.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Zach, and good morning.

Eastern Interior RAC, Sue Entsminger.

MR. STEVENSON: Tom, Zach Stevenson again.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yep.

MR. STEVENSON: Sue is not on the phone right now, she's asked us to contact her if matters arise pertaining to the Eastern Interior region.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Zach.

North Slope RAC, Gordon Brower.

MS. PATTON: Good morning, Mr. Chair and members of the Council. This is Eva Patton, Council Coordinator. Gordon Brower is not able to join us at this time. He may be able to call in later, I'll alert him, again, when we get closer to the final Wildlife Closure Review, 20-31, and I'll be available to read the Council's comments and answer questions if needed.

Thank you.
MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Eva.

Orville Lind, are you on?

MR. LIND: Yes, good morning, Tom. Can you hear me?

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yep, loud and clear.

Okay. Going back to the Board, is Charlie Brower on yet?

(No comments)

MR. DOOLITTLE: Don't have Charlie on. But, Mr. Chair, we do have a quorum at this time with seven of the eight Board members present and at your discretion, if you want to give a few more minutes that's fine, or whatever your direction is, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll give him two more minutes until 10 after and then we'll get started here.

Thank you, Tom.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Alrighty, thank you.

(Pause)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right good morning everybody and welcome back to the Federal Board meeting. I appreciate everyone who's taking the time this Monday to come back and deal with some of the agenda items that we were unable to -- okay, and I just got a message that Charlie will join us in a little bit so we'll go ahead and get started.

Again, welcome everybody.

And as a normal process we usually start the meeting with some public comment on non-agenda items but due to the time constraints, you know, and the overwhelming public comment that we received this week on some pretty critical issues, you know, mainly pertaining to food security, I'd like to take the morning to get started right off the bat without any, you know, objection from the Board, to go ahead and just get started with where we left off with our
business when we recessed.

And with that, I'd open the floor for the Board on the discussion of food security and hope, you know, that we can really drive home some direction for the Staff and for the agencies that need to try to address this monumental need in the state of Alaska and rural residents. And so with that I'm going to go ahead and invite the floor to be open for the discussion of food security with the concurrence of the Board.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, this is Greg.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Greg.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Steve Wackowski with the Department of Interior's office is not available until 11:00 a.m., he has the 10:00 to 11:00 hour that he has to be on a call regarding the Covid-19 with the Department. After that he would be potentially available to join us to have part of this discussion, if you wanted to wait until then, or if not then we can get him caught up as well.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I think Steve's pretty critical to this, I mean as far as -- or that's the office that's going to be receiving the requests; am I correct, Greg?

MR. SIEKANIEC: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, I mean that's 50 minutes from now so I don't see any problem putting it off until 11:00, that would be fine, I think I would have a preference if Steve was on the call and can listen to the conversation that the Board's going to have on this.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Okay. And I will contact him and let him know that we would like him to join at 11:00.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right. Does that work for the rest of the Board?

MR. SCHMID: It works for Dave, thanks.
MR. PELTOLA: BIA is good.

MS. PITKA: This is Rhonda, that works.

MR. PADGETT: Chad, it works.

MR. DOOLITTLE: And, Mr. Chair, that means we put together some fairly quick movement on some other agenda items, some housekeeping items on the wildlife closure reviews, 20-10, 28, 29, 30 and 44, which all deal with Unit 22 muskox and at this time if it would work out I would recommend that we move to that part of the agenda if we have this hour to do that, if we could.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I think that's a good idea, Tom, whatever we can knock out to utilize the time we have today to get the order of business accomplished. So we'll go ahead and call on the Staff to provide the analysis for those proposals.

Thank you.

MS. WORKER: Mr. Chair, Lisa will be presenting the analysis for those muskox closure reviews, but I just wanted to elaborate a little bit on what Tom said, which is these five closure reviews are listed individually in the agenda but they share a lot of material in terms of the presentation and I think the decision points are going to be very similar between them so we decided to lump them for the presentation and then the Board may either act on them independently or as a group.

That's all I have, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. And we appreciate the brevity and the summarizing of those, like you said they're all similar in nature and would appreciate if the Staff did do that, so thank you very much for the thoughtfulness. So we'll proceed with the presentation and then act on the proposals.

Thank you.

MS. MAAS: All right, thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the Board. For the record my name's Lisa Maas and I'm a wildlife biologist in the Office of Subsistence Management. I'll be presenting a summary
of the analysis for closure review WCR20-10 which begins on Page 1010 of your meeting books; WCR 20-28 which begins on Page 1121; WCR20-29 which begins on Page 1138; WCR20-30 which begins on Page 1155 and WCR20-44 which begins on Page 1171.

Wildlife Closure Review 20-10 pertains to the closure of muskox hunting in Unit 22B to non-Federally-qualified users. Muskox were reintroduced to the Seward Peninsula in 1970. In 2001 the Board established a muskox hunt in Unit 22B. The hunt was open to Federally-qualified subsistence users but remained closed to non-Federally-qualified users.

Wildlife Closure Review 20-28 pertains to the closure of muskox hunting in Unit 22D, that portion west of the Tisuk River drainage in Canyon Creek except by residents of Nome and Teller. This closure area will hereafter be referred to as Unit 22D southwest. In 1995 the Board established a muskox hunt in Unit 22D southwest, the hunt was opened to Federally-qualified subsistence users but remained closed to non-Federally-qualified users. In 2010 the closure was rescinded and opened to all users. In 2014 this hunt area closed to all users except residents of Nome and Teller.

Wildlife Closure Review 20-29 pertains to the closure of muskox hunting in Unit 22 remainder, except by residents of Elim, White Mountain, Nome, Teller, and Brevig Mission. In 1995 the Board established a muskox hunt in Unit 22D. The hunt was open to Federally-qualified subsistence users but remained closed to non-Federally-qualified users. In 2014 this hunt area was further closed to all users except residents of the five communities previously mentioned.

Wildlife Closure Review 20-30 pertains to the closure of muskox hunting in Unit 22E except by Federally-qualified subsistence users. In 1995 the Board established a muskox hunt in Unit 22E. The hunt was open to Federally-qualified subsistence users but remained closed to non-Federally-qualified users. In 2010 Unit 22E was open to all users. In 2014 Unit 22E was once again closed to non-Federally-qualified users.

Wildlife Closure Review 20-44 pertains to the closure of muskox hunting in Unit 22D within the
Kuzitrin River drainages except by residents of Council, Golovin, White Mountain, Nome, Teller and Brevig Mission. The closure area will hereafter be referred to as Unit 22D Kuzitrin. In 1995 the Board established a muskox hunt in Unit 22D. The hunt was open to Federally-qualified subsistence users but remained closed to non-Federally-qualified users. In 2014 this hunt area was further closed to all users except by residents of the six communities previously mentioned.

Between 1970 and 2007 the Seward Peninsula muskox population increased steadily peaking out 2,900 muskox in 2010. Between 2010 and 2012 the population decreased but has remained stable at about 2,000 muskox since 2012. Around 400 muskox occupy 22B on average. In 2017 about 550 muskox occupied 22D. And 142 muskox occupied Unit 22D southwest, specifically. An estimated 278 muskox occupied Unit 22D remainder. And an estimated 136 muskox occupied 22D Kuzitrin specifically. Also in 2017 an estimated 306 muskox occupied Unit 22E.

Mature bulls protect calves against predators which increased recruitment and causes selected harvest and mature males to substantially impact population growth. Therefore, while ratios of 20 mature bulls per 100 cows is considered the minimum, ratios of 50 to 70 mature bulls per 100 cows are preferred. Between 2002 and 2017 mature bulls per 100 cows in Unit 22B averaged 41. Recruitment has declined since 2002 and was only 13 short yearlings per 100 cows in 2017. Over the same time period mature bulls per 100 cows in Unit 22D averaged 33. Recruitment was low between 2010 and 2015 but increased to 38 short yearlings per 100 cows in 2017. Between 2002 and 2017 mature bulls per 100 cows in Unit 22E averaged 41 but was only 29 in 2017. Recruitment was low between 2012 and 2015 but increased to 62 short yearlings per 100 cows in 2017.

Muskox are harvested under Federal registration and State Tier II permit hunts. Quotas for individual hunt areas such as Unit 22B are calculated at 10 percent of the estimated number of mature bulls in that area.

Between 2012 and 2017 muskox harvest from Unit 22B has averaged 5.5 muskox per year. Since
2012 42 percent of the Unit 22B muskox harvest has been by Federal permit. Between 2012 and 2017 the harvest quota for Unit 22D southwest has been one muskox per year, and harvest has ranged between zero and two muskox per year. Between 2012 and 2018 the harvests quota for Unit 22D remainder ranged from four to 7 muskox per year and harvest ranged between zero and five muskox per year. Between 2012 and 2018 the harvest quota for Unit 22E ranged from four to 10 muskox per year and harvest ranged between four and 9 muskox per year. Between 2012 and 2018 the harvest quota for Unit 22D Kuzitrin ranged from two to four muskox per year and harvest ranged between two and seven muskox per year.

OSM’s recommendation is to maintain status quo. The harvestable surplus of muskoxen in all of these hunt areas is very low and cannot sustain any increase in harvest. Continuing the current closure is necessary to conserve muskox while providing for subsistence opportunity and a rural priority.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions for Staff.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Appreciate that, thank you. We’ll move on to summary of public comments.

MS. WESSELS: Good morning, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. For the record, Katya Wessels with OSM. We did not receive any written public comments for WCR20-10, 28. 29. 30 and 44.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Katya. And with that we’ll open up the line for public to speak to the specifics of this proposal, muskox closure review.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
hearing none, we'll move on to the Alaska Native Tribal consultation comments, Native Liaison.

MR. LIND: Good morning, Mr. Chair, Board members, RAC Chairs. Orville Lind, Native Liaison for the Office of Subsistence Management. And we did not receive any comments during the consultation -- I'm sorry, no consultation, we did not receive any comments on the Wildlife Closure Reviews.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Orville.

MR. DOOLITTLE: And, Mr. Chair, sorry to interject.....

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Regional Advisory Council recommendations.

MR. DOOLITTLE: .....here -- thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So I'll call on the RAC Chair or designees at this time.

MS. DEATHERAGE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Karen Deatherage with OSM. Speaking on behalf of Louis Green for Wildlife Closure Reviews 20-10, 28, 29, 30 and 44, the Council had the same recommendation, to maintain status quo.

The Council voted to maintain the status quo for all of the Unit 22 muskox closure reviews due to the currently low muskox population in the region. The Council expressed that they are worried about extremely low population numbers, potential overharvest and susceptibility to bear predation. Overharvest could lead to a population decline to the point where the population may never be able to recover.

The Council expressed alarm with the decline in muskox numbers and the lack of herd recovery. The Council would like to see the closure remain in place to protect the remaining population while still allowing for a very small harvest by local subsistence users. Some Council members were open to
closing the hunt entirely to give the muskox population an opportunity to grow.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right. Hearing none, we'll go on to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments, State Liaison.

MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ben Mulligan, Alaska Department of Fish and Game. The Department had no comments on the following proposals -- or closure reviews -- my apologies.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

InterAgency Staff Committee comments, ISC Chair.

MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The InterAgency Staff Committee provided the standard comment for WCR20-10, 28, 29, 30 and 44.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. At this time we'll open it up for Board discussion with Council Chairs and State Liaison.

(Teleconference interference - participants not muted)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, the floor is open for Board action on these proposals.

MR. PADGETT: Mr. Chair, Chad Padgett with BLM.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Chad, you have the floor.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you, Sir. I move to maintain the status quo for WCRs 20-10, 28, 29, 30 and 44. This proposal is shown on Pages 1110, 1121, 1138, 1156, and 1171, respectfully of the Board book. Following a second, I will explain why I intend to
support this motion.

MR. PELTOLA: Second.

REPORTER: Hey, I'm sorry, I didn't hear who that second was, was it BIA?

MR. PELTOLA: BIA.

REPORTER: Thank you, Gene.

MR. PADGETT: Thanks, Gene. My justification is the following:

Muskox populations remain low and may be declining in some areas. The current closure in conjunction with decreased harvest quotas have slowed or stalled the decline in muskox population and this closure should remain in place to ensure that this muskox population has the opportunity to reach healthy levels and to ensure that Federally-qualified subsistence users continue to have the opportunity to harvest this subsistence resource into the future.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Chad. Any discussion or deliberation from the Board on this motion. The motion is to accept all the closure review at once.

(No comments)

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

MR. SIEKANIEC: Question.

MS. PITKA: Question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been called. Roll call, Tom, please.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is in regards to Wildlife Closure Review 20-10, 28, 29, 30 and 44 to maintain the status quo on Unit 22 muskox for each of the respective closure reviews.

I'll start with Rhonda Pitka this
MS. PITKA: I support maintaining the status quo as laid out by the justification by the BLM.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Rhonda.

U.S. Forest Service, David Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: Yeah, I also support maintaining the status quo as with the justification provided by BLM and the deference to the Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory Council.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Dave.


MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Tom. I support maintaining the status quo as justified by the Bureau of Land Management and in deference to the Seward Penn Regional Advisory Committee [sic].

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you very much, Greg.

National Park Service, Don Striker.

MR. STRIKER: I also support the motion to maintain the status quo in deference to the RAC and for BLM's awesome explanation.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Don.

Charlie Brower, are you on?

MR. C. BROWER: Roger. I support as stated above.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Good to hear your voice this morning, Charlie, and I got you for support.
Bureau of Indian Affairs, Gene Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: Bureau of Indian Affairs supports maintaining the status quo for all areas as recommended by the Seward Penn RAC and as articulated by the Bureau of Land Management.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Gene.

Bureau of Land Management, Chad Padgett.

MR. PADGETT: I support as stated.

Thank you, Tom.

MR. DOOLITTLE: You bet, Chad.

Chairman Anthony Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support.

Mr. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. That vote was unanimous on WCR 20-10, 28, 29, 30 and 44.

And it looks like we'll have time to get to the next Wildlife Closure Review, which would be WCR20-19, Northwest Arctic Unit 23 muskox, Page 1267 in your books. Mr. Chair, I'll turn it over to you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, thank you, Tom, for that. And we'll call on the Staff to provide the analysis for that proposal.

Thank you.

MS. MAAS: All right, thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the Board. Lisa Maas for the record. I'll be presenting a summary of the analysis for Closure Review WCR20-19, which begins on Page 1267 of your meeting book.

Wildlife Closure Review 20-19 pertains to the closure of muskox hunting in the southwestern portion of Unit 23 to non-Federally-qualified users. Muskox were reintroduced to the Seward Peninsula in 1970. By 1995 the muskox population had grown sufficiently to warrant a limited hunt and the Board
established a muskox hunt on the Seward Peninsula including Unit 23 south of Kotzebue Sound, and west of and including the Buckland River drainage, hereafter referred to as Unit 23 southwest. The hunt was opened to Federally-qualified subsistence users but remained closed to non-Federally-qualified users.

Between 1970 and 2007 the Seward Peninsula muskox population increased steadily peaking at 2,900 muskox in 2010. Between 2010 and 2012 the population decreased but has remained stable at about 2,000 muskox since 2012. About 205 muskox or 10 to 13 percent of the total Seward Peninsula population occupy Unit 23 southeast on average.

Mature bulls protect calves against predators which increases recruitment and causes selective harvests of mature males would substantially impact population growth. Therefore, while ratios of 20 mature bulls per 100 cows is considered the minimum, ratios of 50 to 70 mature bulls per 100 cows are preferred.

Between 2002 and 2017 mature bull per 100 cows in Unit 23 southwest ranged from 19 to 33 and with only 19 mature bulls per 100 cows in 2017. Quotas for individual hunt areas such as Unit 23 southwest are calculated as 10 percent of the estimated number of mature bulls in that area. Between 1995 and 2011 the muskox harvest quota in Unit 23 southwest ranged from six to 18 muskox. Between 1995 and 2017 actual harvest has ranged from zero to 18 muskox each year. However, since 2008 no muskox have been harvested under Federal regulations. Muskox are more easily accessed on State lands and the quota may be reached before Federally-qualified subsistence users have an opportunity to access Federal lands.

OSM's recommendation is to maintain status quo. The harvestable surplus of muskoxen in Unit 23 southwest is very low and cannot sustain any increase in harvest. Continuing the current closure is necessary to conserve muskox while providing for subsistence opportunity and a rural priority.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, appreciate that. Any questions for Staff.
(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll move on to the summary of public comment.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. For the record, Katya Wessels with OSM. We received no written public comments for WCR20-19.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. At this time we'll open up the floor to the public specific to this proposal.

Thank you.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll go to the Regional Advisory Council Chair recommendation or designee.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Regional Advisory Council recommendation, Chair or designee.

MS. MAAS: Yeah, Mr. Chair, this is Lisa. I can provide that if no one else is on line for that.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

MS. MAAS: The Northwest Arctic Subsistence Regional Advisory Council voted to maintain status quo for WCR20-19. The Council supported maintaining the closure for muskox hunting in Unit 23 for the reasons stated in the OSM justification.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Lisa.

Tribal Alaska Native/Corporation comments, Native Liaison.

MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Orville Lind, Native Liaison for the Office of
Subsistence Management. There are no comments on WCR20-19.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

We'll move on to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments, State Liaison.

MR. BURCH: Mr. Chair, this is Mark Burch, can you hear me?

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

MR. BURCH: For the record, Mark Burch, Department of Fish and Game. The State has no comments on this closure.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Mark. We'll move on to InterAgency Staff Committee comments, ISC Chair.

MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The ISC provided the standard comment for WCR20-19.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

That opens the floor for Board discussion with Council Chairs or the State Liaison.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing no questions we will go to Federal Board action for this proposal.

MR. PADGETT: Mr. Chair, Chad Padgett with BLM.

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

MR. PADGETT: Thank you. Mr. Chair, I move to maintain the status quo for WCR20-19. This proposal is shown on Page 1267 of the Board book. Following a second I will explain why I intend to support this motion.
MR. PELTOLA: Second, BIA.

MR. STRIKER: Second, Park Service.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you. My justification is the following:

The harvestable surplus of muskox is very low and the population cannot sustain increases in harvest. Continuing the current closure is necessary to conserve the muskox population while providing for subsistence opportunity and a meaningful rural subsistence priority.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Chad. Motion's been made and seconded. Any other additional deliberation on this motion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the question.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been called. Roll call, Tom, please.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Wildlife Closure Review 20-19, muskox Unit 23 to maintain the status quo.

We'll start with Bureau of Indian Affairs, Gene Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: BIA supports maintaining the status as quo as recommended by the Northwest Arctic Regional Advisory Council in addition to concurring with the BLM justification.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you much, Gene.

Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: I support maintaining the status quo in deference to the Regional Advisory Council and in concurrence with the BLM recommendation.
Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Rhonda.

Charlie Brower.

MR. C. BROWER: I support WCR20-19 to maintain status quo as stated by Northwest Arctic Borough -- thank you -- or Northwest Arctic Council.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Charlie.

U.S. Forest Service, David Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: Yeah, I also support to maintain status quo for WCR20-19 as recommended by the Northwest Regional Advisory Council and the justification provided by the Bureau of Land Management.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, very much, Dave.


MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Tom. I support WCR20-19 with the justification that Bureau of Land Management provided and in support of the Northwest Arctic Regional Advisory Council.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Greg.

National Park Service, Don Striker.

MR. STRIKER: The Park Service supports the motion for the reasons enumerated by my colleagues.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Don.

Bureau of Land Management, Chad Padgett.

MR. PADGETT: I support as stated.
MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Chad.

And last by not least, Chairman Anthony Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay. WCR20-19, the motion passed for Unit 23 muskox unanimously.

Mr. Chair, that would move us on and we still have time before 11:00 bell strikes, and the next Closure Review on the list is 20-42.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: 20-42, you have the floor, Staff.

MS. MAAS: All right, thank you, Mr. Chair. Lisa Maas for the record. I'll be presenting a summary of the analysis for Closure Review WCR20-42 which begins on Page 1344 of your meeting book.

Wildlife Closure Review 20-42 pertains to the closure of caribou hunting in Unit 12 and consists of two hunt areas which are depicted in Map 1 on Page 1346.

The southwest cross-hatched hunt area was closed to all hunters in 1993 to protect the Mentasta Caribou Herd. This area has remained closed to all hunters. The southeast dotted hunt area was closed to all hunters in 1994 to protect the Chisana Caribou Herd. This area opened to hunting by a few communities in 2012. In 2016 this area opened to all Federally-qualified subsistence users but remained closed to non-Federally-qualified users.

The Mentasta herd population declined from an estimated 3,100 animals in 1987 to less than 1,000 animals in 1993 when the area was closed for conservation concerns. Since 1993 the estimated population has continued to decrease to an estimated 470 animals in 2018. Very poor calf recruitment due mostly to predation is the primary reason for the decline. The bull/cow ratio has generally been well above the management objective of 35 bulls per 100 cows but may be inflated due to mixing with the much larger Nelchina herd. The Chisana herd ranges between Alaska...
and Yukon Territory Canada. It's population declined from an estimated 1,900 animals in 1988 to a low of 315 animals in 2002. Weather, predation and hunting contributed to the decline. In 2003 an intensive recovery effort was initiated and since then the herd has stabilized around 700 animals. Since 2010 bull/cow, and calf/cow ratios have exceeded management objectives.

There has been no targeted harvest of Mentasta caribou since the 1993 closure. However, some Mentasta caribou may be incidentally harvested in the winter when they mix with the Nelchina herd.

In 2012 a hunt restricted to only a few communities opened for the Chisana herd. In 2016 the hunt was opened to all Federally-qualified subsistence users. The Chisana Management Plan prescribes an annual harvest rate of two percent allocated equally between Yukon and Alaska. This translates to seven caribou available for harvest in Alaska. Since the hunt opened in 2012 zero to three caribou have been harvested each year indicating harvest levels are sustainable.

OSM's preliminary conclusion is to maintain status quo due to conservation concerns. The Mentasta herd population remains low and cannot withstand any harvest. The Chisana herd population appears stable and current harvest levels are sustainable indicating no additional restrictions are warranted. The Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve Superintendent has delegated authority to manage the hunt and can respond to yearly conditions. Additionally, the low harvest quota cannot support the harvest pressure that could result from opening the area to all users.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions for Staff.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank you. Summary of public comment, Regional Council Coordinator.
MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the Board. For the record, Katya Wessels with OSM. We did not receive any written public comments for WCR20-42.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. At this time we'll open up the floor to the public, anybody on line who wants to speak specifically to this proposal.

Thank you.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll go to the Regional Advisory Council recommendation, Chair or designee.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Regional Advisory Council recommendation, Chair or designee.

MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, members of the Board. This is DeAnna Perry. I would like the Eastern Interior RAC to give their recommendation first, if they would like.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. Eastern Interior.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Eastern Interior Chair or designee.

MS. MAAS: All right, Mr. Chair, this is Lisa, I can give that recommendation.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Lisa, please do.

MS. MAAS: The Eastern Interior Council voted to maintain status quo for WCR20-42. The Council voted unanimously to maintain the status quo and reconsider when more information on movement, degree of mixing with other caribou herds, particularly the
Nelchina Caribou Herd and population status is available in the future. 10 collars were placed on caribou in the Mentasta Caribou Herd during the fall of 2018 and more are scheduled for deployment during the fall of 2019.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that. We'll listen to the Southcentral now.

MR. PERRY: Okay, thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. Again, my name is DeAnna Perry. I'm the Coordinator for Southcentral RAC and Mr. Encelewski's not available today so I will go ahead and give the recommendation.

That recommendation could be found in your meeting books on Page 1366 and the Council voted to maintain status quo. The Council stated that this population hasn't really grown and that if it could recover, this opportunity should be given to the population to recover. The Council stated that it would be good to have more information on the mixing of the two herds.

That was the recommendation of the Southcentral Council.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions from the Board to the Regional Advisory Councils.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll move on to the Tribal Alaska Native/Corporation comments, Native Liaison.

MR. LIND: Thank you. Mr. Chair, Board members, RAC Chairs. Orville Lind, Native Liaison for the Office of Subsistence Management. We did not have any comments on WCR20-42.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Orville. We'll move on to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments, State Liaison.

MR. BURCH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mark Burch, Department of Fish and Game. The State has no comments on this closure.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. InterAgency Staff Committee comments, ISC Chair.

MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The InterAgency Staff Committee provided the standard comment for WCR20-42.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. That opens the floor for Board discussion with Council Chairs or State Liaison.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, the floor is open for Board action on this proposal.

MR. REAM: Mr. Chair, this is Joshua Ream. I've been asked to represent the Park Service on behalf of Don Striker for this one.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The floor is yours, Josh.

MR. REAM: I move to maintain the status quo for Wildlife Closure Review WCR20-42 thus retaining the closures to the harvest of caribou in portions of Unit 12 due to conservation concerns. Although the closures apply to all caribou, not specific herds, the closure within Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve west of the Nabesna River and Glacier is designed to protect the Mentasta Caribou Herd, and the closure to harvest by all but Federally-qualified subsistence users east of the Nabesna River and Glacier and south of the winter trail is designed to protect the Chisana Caribou Herd.

If given a second, I will explain my intention to support this motion.

MR. SCHMID: Second.
MR. REAM: Thank you. Conservation concerns for the Mentasta Caribou Herd persists despite a moratorium on hunting in Unit 11 since 1998, and in Unit 12 since 1993. The herd continues to exist in low numbers and population characteristics suggest low production, poor recruitment and low survival. Calf production and recruitment remains below the management objective. Mentasta herd caribou typically move into Unit 12 during the fall and are known to travel through the current closure area. These movements coincide with those of the Nelchina herd resulting in mixing of the two herds. Mixing of this herd with the Nelchina herd in the fall makes it impossible for hunters to differentiate between animals of these herds and any incidental harvest of Mentasta caribou must be avoided.

For these reasons Federal public lands in Unit 12 within that portion of Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve that is west of the Nabesna River and Nabeena Glacier should continue to remain closed to caribou hunting for the conservation of healthy populations of the Mentasta Caribou Herd.

The Chisana Caribou Herd population has been relatively stable for the last decade and herd composition in terms of bull/cow and calf/cow ratios is above the minimum thresholds set in the Chisana Caribou Herd Management Plan for allowing continued subsistence harvest. The current season and limited harvest by Federally-qualified subsistence users are consistent with the recommendations and management guidelines in the management plan, and the harvest does not seem to have negatively affected population level. At the same time, however, the small herd size and recommended harvest quota make for very limited harvest opportunity, and in some years the herd composition has been close to the minimum threshold set in the management plan. The potential for additional harvest if the closure were to be lifted would pose a significant conservation concern.

Consequently Federal public lands in Unit 12 that are east of the Nabeena River and Glacier and south of the Winter Trial should remain closed to the harvest of caribou by all but Federally-qualified subsistence users for the conservation of healthy populations of the Chisana Caribou Herd. Maintaining the closures in these two areas in Unit 12 is consistent with the position of the Southcentral and...
Eastern Interior Councils, OSM and the ISC.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Josh. Any discussion on this proposal as presented.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the question.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been called, thank you, Greg. Roll call, Tom.

MR. DOOLITTLE: This vote is on Wildlife Closure Review 20-42, Unit 12 caribou, support the status quo.


MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Tom. I support to maintain the status quo for WCR20-42 as justified by the National Park Service and in deference to Southcentral and Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Councils.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Greg.

U.S. Forest Service, David Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: Support maintaining the status quo for WCR20-42 with the justification provided by the National Park Service and in deference to the Southcentral and Eastern Interior RACs.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Dave.

Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: I support maintaining the status quo for WCR20-42 in concurrence with the National Park Service and in deference to the Regional Advisory Councils.
MR. C. BROWER: I support to maintain status quo on WCR20-42 as stated by BLM [sic] and the Southcentral Advisory Council and the Interior Advisory Council.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Charlie.

Bureau of Indian Affairs, Gene Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: Bureau of Indian Affairs supports maintaining the status quo for WCR20-42 as recommended by the Eastern Interior and Southcentral Regional Advisory Councils, and as articulated by the very thorough justification provided by the National Park Service.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Gene.

Bureau of Land Management, Chad Padgett.

MR. PADGETT: I support maintaining the status quo and in deference to the RACs and as stated by the Park Service.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Chad.

National Park Service, Joshua Ream.

MR. REAM: I vote in favor of my motion, thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you.

Chairman Anthony Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Chairman
Christianson. Unit 12 caribou status quo vote unanimously on Wildlife Closure Review 20-42.

And we've got a few minutes, you know, until Steve's going to be on but I think we could probably push through the last closure review that's on the agenda, WCR20-31 and then get into food security. Does that sound okay, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: That sounds appropriate so we'll call on the Staff to provide the analysis for the last review.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay, thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. MCKEE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Chris McKee, can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, can hear you fine, Chris, you have the floor.

MR. MCKEE: Okay. Thank you. I'll be presenting the summary for the analysis of Wildlife Closure Review WCR20-31 which can be found on Page 1368 of your Board meeting materials book.

Wildlife Closure Review WCR20-31, the closure to moose hunting on Federal public lands in Units 26B remainder and 26C, except by rural Alaska residents of the village of Kaktovik. The current regulation is for one moose by Federal registration permit for the residents of Kaktovik only. The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge manager has delegated authority to determine annual quotas, set open and closing season dates and determine the number of permits to be issued.

State management objectives for each unit are as follows: For Unit 26B it is to maintain a population of at least 300 moose with short yearlings comprising at least 15 percent of the population; Unit 26C maintaining a population of at least 150 moose with short yearlings comprising 15 percent of the population and maintaining bull/cow ratios of at least 35 bulls per 100 cows when hunting seasons are open for both units.
A comprehensive moose survey has not been conducted for Units 26B and 26C but smaller scale surveys have been conducted in areas when moose concentrate to assess population trends. The moose population of the eastern portion of 26B including the Canning River rebounded from low levels in 1998 to 2000 to 335 animals in 2005, but declined to 104 animals in 2015. Since 2016 the population has been increasing. The last estimate was 212 moose in 2016. The composition of short yearlings, which measures recruitment into the population averaged 16 percent from 2005 to 2008 but declined to four percent in 2015 before increasing to 21 percent in 2018.

The central portion of Unit 26C, which consists of the foothills and coastal areas is surveyed every other year by Arctic National Wildlife Refuge Staff. Between 2003 and 2011 the population in the surveyed area has remained fairly stable at around 52 animals.

Harvest on Federal public lands in Units 26B remainder and 26C has been limited to the residents of Kaktovik since 2004 with up to three permits issued annually and a combined harvest quota of three animals. Since 2004 10 bull moose have been harvested with between zero and two animals being harvested annually, no moose have been harvested since 2017. Five total permits were issued in 2017 and 2018 and no moose were taken. The North Slope population in 26C has increased in recent years and is now above 50 animals, which has been the longterm average for this marginal population. As of 2018 the moose population of the eastern portion of Unit 26B including the Canning River has increased but it's still below State management objectives. Current Federal regulations allow management flexibility to the Refuge Manager of Arctic Refuge and continuing to limit the moose hunt on Federal public lands in 26B remainder and 26C is recommended given the small North Slope moose population.

For these reasons the OSM conclusion, which can be found on Page 1378 of your Board book, is to maintain the status quo for WCR20-31.

Thank you, Mr. Chair, that concludes my presentation.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Chris, appreciate that. Any questions for the Staff on that presentation.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing none, we'll call on summary of public comment.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the Board. For the record, Katya Wessels with OSM. We did not receive any written public comments for WCR20-31.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Katya. We'll move to the line, Operator, if there's anybody in the public that would like to speak specific to this proposal now is the time.

OPERATOR: And this is the Operator, would you like them to press star one to have their line open for the call?

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yes, Operator, that's the intent for the public comment, thank you.

OPERATOR: Okay, thank you, just wanted to be sure.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Please excuse me, Mr. Chair.

OPERATOR: At this time I'm showing no questions.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Excuse me, did you say no questions.

OPERATOR: Correct.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. We'll move on to Regional Advisory Council recommendation, Chair or designee.

MS. PATTON: Good morning, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Good morning,
you have the floor.

MS. PATTON: Good morning. I'd like to just check and see if Chair Member Gordon Brower has joined us on teleconference this morning.

(No comments)

MS. PATTON: Okay, he may not be able to join in this morning. This is Eva Patton, Council Coordinator for the North Slope Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. And I will provide the Council's recommendation on Wildlife Closure Review 20-31 which can be found on Page 1382 in your Board meeting book.

The North Slope Subsistence Regional Advisory Council recommends maintaining the status quo for Wildlife Closure Review 20-31 but would like to establish a larger harvest quota of one bull moose by Federal registration permit for Unit 26B remainder and four bull moose in Unit 26C for Kaktovik residents only. The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge manager will set the opening and closing dates as needed, set the annual harvest quotas and limits through consultation with the community of Kaktovik and the process outlined in the delegation of authority letter. Federal public lands are closed to the taking of moose except by Kaktovik residents holding a Federal registration permit and hunting under these regulations.

Currently the subsistence needs of Kaktovik are not being met. Food security is extremely important and the community's needs should be a main consideration in the subsistence management decisionmaking process. While there's not an exact number of how many moose the community of Kaktovik needs, it was estimated that 30 to 50 moose would be needed to sustain Kaktovik annually. More moose would be needed if access to other food resources, such as caribou, were limited. The Council noted that the community should be able to harvest the maximum sustained yield of the moose population. The Council would like the Federal Subsistence managers to better understand the subsistence economy, sharing and traditional practices. These moose are very important to share within the community and may be traded for other subsistence foods.

The Council supports the flexibility
provided by the delegation of authority process and would like to see the relationship with the Refuge manager and the community of Kaktovik continue to grow through ongoing consultation. The Council requests that the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge conduct additional moose surveys in the summer and in fall to better understand population fluctuation and document movements of the moose in Units 26C and 26B remainder.

Kaktovik -- North Slope Council member from Kaktovik, Edward Rexford, Sr., shared feedback from the community that moose hunts in the Kongakut River drainage are a long way from Kaktovik and outside the community's traditional harvest areas. Subsistence activities require a lot of resources including gas, snowmachine, sled, tent, camping gear and food. In addition, they are dependent on the weather, hunter availability, snow conditions, location and ease of access of the moose, a long trip to the Kongakut River requires a lot of gas, which is very expensive in remote communities. Some communities need to pool resources just to conduct an extended hunt and they may have only one chance to harvest a moose.

The Council requests a comprehensive subsistence needs assessment for the community of Kaktovik to ensure that rural subsistence priority is being met.

The Council would also like for the community to be able to harvest moose throughout the year and not just during April when moose are skinny. The community would like more flexibility for the timing of the hunt when the bull moose are fat, in the fall and the ability to harvest moose opportunistically when and if they move closer to Kaktovik.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Eva.

Any questions for Eva.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing none, we'll move on to Tribal Alaska Native/Corporation comments, Orville.

MR. LIND: Thank you. Mr. Chair.
Orville Lind, Native Liaison for the Office of Subsistence Management. We did not have any comments on this proposal -- wildlife closure.

   Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Orville. Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments, State Liaison.

MR. BURCH: Mr. Chair, this is Mark Burch, Department of Fish and Game. I understand that Ben Mulligan's trying to get in but hasn't been able to get through yet, but in the mean time the State of Alaska has no comments on this.

   Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for standing by Mark, appreciate it. InterAgency Staff Committee comments, ISC Chair.

   MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The InterAgency Staff Committee provided the standard comment for WCR20-31.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, that opens the floor for Board discussion with Chairs and State Liaison.

   (No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll.....

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

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

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

There's a couple things I'd like to get clarification on.

   One is, glancing through the analysis, I didn't see, unless I overlooked it, the timing of the historical harvest because if the Board goes to true deference to the Regional Advisory Council, in this case it would not only be to maintain the status quo,
but also to establish a quota which currently is
delegated for GMU26B remainder and 26D moose to the
Refuge manager, and also there is a desire from the
North Slope to have a more flexible timing of the
harvest as they put it, you know, other than in April.
So to me that would infer that there's only been a
winter hunt that has been authorized historically by
the Refuge manager.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Mr.
Chair. Any response from the Staff for that.

MR. MCKEE: Yes, Gene, I don't have an
answer for your question in terms of the timing but
from what I recall, just in changing and doing the
delegation letter a couple of years ago, I think the
majority of that hunt does take place during the winter
months, at least the last several years.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, may I
follow.....

MR. MCKEE: And in terms -- sorry.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead,
finish, Chris, and then Gene.

MR. MCKEE: No, I was done, go ahead,
Gene.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you. So, Chris, in
the delegation, does it allow for a harvest if called
for by the Refuge manager, outside those winter hunts,
which have been traditionally offered, do you recall?

MR. MCKEE: It's a may be announced
season, so the season dates, the opening and closing
dates are determined by the Refuge manager. There
aren't any specific dates in regulation.

MR. PELTOLA: Okay. Mr. Chair, one
other followup, if Greg is available, I'm not trying to
put him on the spot or anything, but I was wondering
what has been utilized in the criteria to offer a
winter harvest as opposed to a fall harvest.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.
MR. SIEKANIEC: Hey, Gene, this is Greg. I do not know the answer to that but if I remember correctly when we just recently redid the delegation letter that the may be announced dates and that the Refuge manager did make some changes to the window of time but I don't have those off of the top of my head.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Greg. And I was just trying to show that there is the flexibility there by the Refuge manager to offer such.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any further discussion on this, questions for Chairs or State Liaison.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing no further discussion, we'll go ahead and open the floor for Board action.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, Greg, with the Fish and Wildlife Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg, you have the floor.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yeah, I would like to move that we maintain the status quo for Wildlife Closure Review 20-31. The wildlife closure language is shown on Page 1369 of the Board book. Following a second, I will provide justification for why I intend to support my motion.

MR. C. BROWER: Second.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you. Currently the moose populations in Units 26B and 26C remainder are small but increasing slowly. Since the establishment of a Federal hunt in 2004, only 10 moose have been harvested with an average of one moose per year. Given the small number of moose that can be harvested from this population, it is appropriate to maintain this closure to only Federally-qualified users of Kaktovik to provide them a subsistence harvest priority. Current regulations allow management
flexibility by the Refuge manager of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to determine sustainable harvest levels based on the status and health of this small moose population. Maintaining this closure supports the North Slope Regional Advisory Council's request to provide a subsistence harvest priority for residents of Kaktovik who depend on a variety of subsistence resources for food security.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Greg. Any discussion, deliberation on this proposal. (No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the question.

MR. PADGETT: Question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, question's been called. Roll call, Tom, please. Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Wildlife Closure Review 20-31 is a closure review that reviews the closure to the moose hunting in Units 26B remainder and 26C except by the residents of Kaktovik. The vote is to maintain the status quo.

I'll start with Bureau of Land Management, Chad Padgett.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you, Tom. I support maintaining the status quo as stated by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Chad.

National Park Service, Don Striker or Josh Ream.

MR. REAM: Hi, this is Joshua Ream on behalf of Donald Striker. National Park Service votes to maintain the status quo for the reasons outlined by the Fish and Wildlife Service.
Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Josh.

U.S. Forest Service, David Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: Yes, support to maintain the status quo for WCR20-31 with the justification provided by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Dave.

Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: I vote to maintain the status quo as laid out by the National Park Service [sic]. Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Rhonda.

Charlie Brower.

MR. C. BROWER: I support to maintain status quo for WCR20-31 as recommended by North Slope Borough -- Advisory Council.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Charlie.


MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Tom. I support as stated. Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Greg.

Bureau of Indian Affairs, Gene Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: Bureau of Indian Affairs supports maintaining the status quo as recommended by the North Slope Regional Advisory Council, in addition to the additional request from the North Slope Council, where the most part can be addressed via the delegation of authority of the Refuge manager of Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in addition to the justification provided by the Fish and Wildlife Service.
Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Gene.

Chairman Anthony Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay, the motion for the status quo on WCR20-31 passes unanimously.

And that moves us on, Mr. Chair, to food security discussion.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right. Thank you, Tom, for that appreciate it. And, again, I'll ask Greg if Steve was able to join the call.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Steve Wackowski, were you able to join, I've been texting with him and he was trying to log in here probably about seven or eight minutes ago so maybe he's on line.

Steve.

MR. WACKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, I can hear you Steve. Thank you for signing on today, I was just making sure you were available to listen to the discussion today, appreciate you taking the time to call in.

MR. WACKOWSKI: Yes, Sir. Mr. Chair, may I be recognized.

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

MR. WACKOWSKI: Thank you, Sir. First, I want to thank all of you. I know you put in a lot of hard last week and I want to apologize, wearing my other hat as the Secretary's Field Special Assistant, I actually have an emergency management coordination role so I've been on a lot of video conferences with FEMA
throughout the week and during the day, and unrelated
to that my wife blessed us with our third baby boy born
a couple of weeks ago so I've been trying to balance
telework and paternity leave.

That being said, two weeks ago OSM
provided the Secretary's Alaska Office with a
memorandum describing a potential special action in
light of a Covid response posture to use the public
safety trigger in ANILCA and the regs promulgated from
that to open up certain spring hunts to address
specifically supply chain disruptions, and critical
food shortages. Then OSM had recommended a generic
delegation of authority letter to our field managers to
address the crises response.

We understand that this is an
extraordinary situation, a unique use of our authority
as the Office of Subsistence Management and the Federal
Subsistence Board to address response.

After reading through the memos we
realized there was a need for FEMA and State EOC
coordination when we look at taking action to address
these supply chain disruptions and critical food
shortages. That coordination was done primarily last
week and over the weekend before last. After we
coordinated with them, the Office of the Secretary,
Alaska's Office had asked OSM to provide an advisory
memo that more clearly defines what our authorities are
and what the public safety triggers we're going to use
along with a new round of draft delegation letters. I
expect an immediate review of those delegation letters,
in those letters we want to give our field managers
some coordination tools written into the delegation
letters so they can coordinate with FEMA and EOC. And
it's important to note that this is a critical tool
that we've viewed that can address some potential
problems for rural Alaskans in this unprecedented times
who are faced with a very unsettling situation with a
lot of historical trauma involved.

Pending any questions, Mr. Chair, I'm
available.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, any
Board have a question or want to have a discussion with
Steve, the floor is open.
MR. PADGETT: Mr. Chair, this is Chad,

with BLM.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Chad, go ahead.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you. Steve, so you
mentioned -- I might have misheard it, but you
mentioned there might be a letter or memo, has that
been disseminated to the Board, and I just want to make
sure I understand kind of what space we're in here.
Because I don't recall seeing something, but maybe I
missed it.

MR. WACKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, may I be
recognized.

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

MR. WACKOWSKI: Thanks, Chad, great
question. We have not gotten the advisory memorandum
out. We were hoping to have the Staff work through it
this week but obviously we're still in Board meetings.
I expect that we'll be able to -- we absolutely will be
able to share the memorandum and then -- since you're
going to be taking action on the delegation letters,
you'll, of course, see those as well.

My hope is that we can get something
done -- we talked to our -- Ken Lord, I think he is
going to work with the Staff to get something out and
I'm hopeful that, you know, it'll be in like days
timeframe.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Hello, Steve, this
is.....

MR. C. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Mr. Chair.

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

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yes, and, you know, for
Steve's information and everybody is that on Friday I
did review that memo, Sue also, you know, did -- Susan
Detwiler, the ARD, so we have gone through the final
edits and review of that memo and we're going to put
that on letterhead today or at the very latest tomorrow.

MR. C. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, go ahead, Charlie, you have the floor.

MR. C. BROWER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Steve, so we're waiting for this memorandum to come out, so do we need to discuss the food security now or is it a go, who is to make recommendations on this procedure.

MR. WACKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, this is Steve.

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

MR. WACKOWSKI: So I think the -- we didn't ask for a decision memo to the Secretary, I think what we -- I don't think, I know, what we would like is just since this is a new use of the authority in an innovative way, it's never been used like this specifically, the OS in DC just wanted a review of it, so I don't expect any positive action to be required, it's just if they've got concerns or questions, the OSM Staff may have to review it. And I expect that once we get the memo ready for submission to DC, that'll be at the point when you all can review it, but I'm -- maybe there's not an expectation that you need to act on the memo, I think the action we're looking for from the Board is the delegation -- draft delegation authority letters that will accompany the memo.

Did I answer your question, Charlie.

MR. C. BROWER: Yes, thank you. So in light of everything, we're just waiting and see -- are we going to do some kind of vote on it if it comes in within a couple of days or so, so this food security won't be on hold, but as special requests are considered, or coming in, can we direct the field managers to okay them or what?

MR. WACKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, this is Steve.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Steve.

MR. WACKOWSKI: I think once we get this cleared and my understanding is that typically delegation of authority letters, the Board can do it electronically and just concur with -- but once those go out I think our thought is that they go through the normal process, so -- and that I don't know, does the Board, maybe Mr. Peltola, or Mr. Chair, if you can answer that, does the Board typically weigh in on in-season managers once that delegation of authority has been promulgated?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Tom.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, this is Tom, Steve, if you would like me to -- through the Chair, would you like me to interject?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, I wanted you to answer that question for us, please.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah. The in-season, you know, delegation that's given to a specific field manager, let's say it's on the North Slope, Charlie, and it's to the Refuge manager at Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, and there was a specific community that had a special action, that specific community would go through that Refuge manager that has the full authorities of the Board, through the letter of delegation, and then they would make a decision on whether to provide or not, the decisionmaker in that case, will be the field manager, it will not be the Board. And so that allows the fields, statewide, to those that have existing letters of delegations to either provide an amendment to their existing letter of delegation or if the Board decides to provide new letters of delegation to specific individuals where we have gaps in coverage around the state, then we would do that also.

The Board did look at the original letter of delegation, that was in generic form, and approved the process and then, again, after discussion with the Department, was making sure that that decision is made on safety, that they have consulted the right food security personnel within the State of Alaska and Alaska Department of Fish and Game prior to any
decisions. So the memo is supportive to the letter of
delegation reaffirming the side bars that the
Department feels is critical to making the decisions in
the field.

So hopefully, Mr. Chairman, Board
Member Brower, I answered some of those questions.

Thank you.

MR. C. BROWER: Thank you, Tom.

Thank you, Steve.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Tom.

MR. PADGETT: Mr. Chair, Chad Padgett
again.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Chad, you have
the floor.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you. So Steve I
want to make sure I'm clear. So are you asking us to
take a vote today on delegation of authority prior to
seeing the memo or direction from DOI, I just want to
make sure I got my head wrapped around what we're doing
here.

MR. WACKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead,
Steve.

MR. WACKOWSKI: No, Chad. Again, the
expectation is when the advisory memo goes to DC, you
guys will get a copy along with the delegation of
authority letters and then you'll take action after
that.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you for the
clarification. Through the Chair, thanks.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Gene, you have
the floor.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So
what I understand -- tell me if I understand this correctly. Is that, we're potentially looking at a whole new set of delegation of authority letters based on food security; is that correct?

MR. WACKOWSKI: Yes. Sorry, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead, Steve, you guys can have a free discussion.

MR. WACKOWSKI: Okay, thank you. Yeah, Gene, this was -- OSM had approached the Department saying that, you know, this is in light of Covid response mechanisms so we framed the problem through that response, right, and the problems identified were critical food shortages -- or supply chain disruptions and critical food shortages so, you know, I think this will be good to have in our hip pocket in the future as we get floodings or earthquakes, but this was viewed as a new tool to exercise the authority under the public safety trigger.

Does that make sense, Gene.

MR. PELTOLA: Yep. And the difference would be under this -- under any action taken under these proposed delegations, there would be a new coordination requirements which did not exist.....

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Hey, thank you.

MR. PELTOLA: .....to our delegation of authority.....

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Hey, thank you.

MR. WACKOWSKI: Gene, yes. You know since the Stafford Act has been invoked and the emergency declaration in Alaska, there's some pretty delineations on authorities now, I'm not saying that the authority still doesn't rest with us, the request is that we, in fact, coordinate. And just a perfect example of that is, if we do, in fact, take a special action where there is -- where the criteria are met and there's a harvestable surplus, that may -- you know, the EOC wants to know about that because that may change their calculus on other activities when they're delivering supplies, or cleaning supplies and such.
They've got a whole math care group stood up (phonemuffled) and so I think we felt it be important to be coordinated with the first responder community.

MR. PELTOLA: But, Mr. Chair, I'm just throwing this out there. As opposed to one thing I'd like the Program to consider is, instead of providing a whole new delegation letter, we currently have numerous delegations out there with regard to wildlife and fish, one thing the Board might want to consider is looking at where those gaps are and most likely those gaps might be with regard to some authorities within the field regard to particular species, or are those areas where the delegation of authorities been issued to the ARD of OSM, and if we use those existing delegations with a temporary modification to cover the gaps, we wouldn't be exerting a new authority, but also we could extend that new coordination out there and I think that might be just as expedient and if we were to do so then if we had a temporary modification up until the end of the regulatory year which ends June 30th, 2021 or something like that, that might be more expedient than issuing all new delegations throughout the program.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. WACKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, this is Steve. I would -- yes, it's important for us to know what outreach tool we have in our tool kit available and if OSM can give us a rundown of what is out there and existing, but, again, the view from the Department level is we're responding in a unique way in light of a public safety crises, you know, and I think we should have the discussion is there, you know, can, if we reinvoke those delegation of authority letters that are existing, you know, can we give our field managers some guidelines for the coordination, if that's fair.

Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And I think, was that a question for Ken, Steve?

MR. WACKOWSKI: Maybe, Ken or Tom, I -- yeah, maybe Ken or Tom, I guess.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay.

MR. WACKOWSKI: I'd like to understand.
And it would be good to know what we already have out there and I agree with Gene, I mean we need to be expedient in our response. So it would be good to know what tools we have in the tool kit to address some of the important concerns rural Alaskans have raised.

MR. DOOLITTLE: This is Tom, Mr. Chair.

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

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yes, I mean there's a good list of field managers that already have existing letters of delegation in wildlife that we have. And -- but a good example would be, on the roll out, it would be easy to amend those with similar language that we have in the present generic letter of delegation that the Board has previously looked at and what the Department has looked at, but a good example for discussion would be take the Koyukuk/Nowitna manager that does not have delegated authority for wildlife, and there's a gap, using that as an example, versus those that -- those other managers where it would be an amendment, how do we -- you know, how does the Board envision handling those gaps. And to me, my one suggestion was that we use this generic letter to fill that gap when needed, or if there's another process, you know, be more than open to understand how that could be rolled out.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

MR. WACKOWSKI: Mr. Chair. You know, what I ask again, and the view from the Department is that we're exercising our authority, or the authority that the Secretary has promulgated down to the Board, in a unique and very important way that is kind of new to the Board and, hence, you know, the importance of proper coordination.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, appreciate that. Any other Board discussion.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Yeah, Mr. Chair, this is Greg.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg, you have
MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you. Thanks, Steve, for joining the call. I don't see this as being too complicated. You know, we already have a draft of the delegation of authority letter for the new people, we have some existing ones, I think once we get the memo that has some coordination obligations identified in it, that we could pretty easily incorporate those into the delegation of authority letters to kind of move this forward. I don't anticipate that being too much of a timely issue, especially if we can get this memo cleared rather quickly.

Another question, though, Steve, I think you and I have maybe talked about one time, though, is how do we bring in the Secretary of AG into this, given that it's Department of Interior and Department of Agriculture relationship here in this Federal Subsistence Board, have you given any more thought to that, or maybe Ken, do you have any thoughts on that?

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

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Ken, you have the floor.

MR. LORD: Yeah, copied Dave and Jim Ustishefski from Department of Agriculture on the draft memo and I just assumed we would continue a process like that as we move forward.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, this is Greg.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg, yes.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, thank you, Mr. Chair. So, Dave, if you're still on line, I don't know if you were on or not, but do you see anything that we need to do in addition to just coordinating with your legal Counsel?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chair, this is Dave. And to get back to Greg, no, I think we've been coordinating here from the beginning and been involving our Office of Governmental Counsel and above there, so I think the coordination is adequate at this point.
MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Dave. Yeah, because we were hearing a lot of requests both coming from the Southeast, which would certainly involve a fair amount of Forest Service lands, as well as Interior lands and elsewhere.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Greg.

MR. C. BROWER: Mr. Chair, one final question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor.

MR. C. BROWER: Steve or Dave, so, once this memorandum comes out and I know we have a lot of special requests on food security piling up now, so once these approve will the Refuge managers, or whoever is being delegated to do it have the -- to proceed with the special request proposals?

MR. WACKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, this is Steve -- or Charlie, this is Steve, through the Chair. Yes, they will be empowered to act as soon as we can get these letters out, and we expect coordination to be happening pretty rapidly, the coordination triggers, very rapidly.

MR. C. BROWER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other Board discussion, questions for Steve or Staff.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, this is Greg.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg, go ahead.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you. So just to make sure and I think everybody's maybe thinking somewhat we're all on the same lines, is that, a special action request comes in to a delegated in-season manager, there's still going to be an obligation to do all of the coordination around the community, the State, you know, Fish and Game, with OSM, with the offices for which they are working with, the Refuges,
the fisheries, and there still has to be some level of an analysis done, and that analysis is what's going to be done to support whether or not the special action request would be approved, and/or then we've satisfied all the coordinations, so there's still going to be a fair amount of work to be done so, you know, I'm expecting Tom, and Sue at OSM, you know, that they're going to be making themselves available from the Staffing standpoint to support, you know, the in-season managers and, you know, figuring out, you know, how they're going to facilitate and do their analysis of the requests as would be, I would expect, you know, Staff and the Refuge management program, as well as fisheries so, with the same level of coordination that always needs to go into the special action request will have to be done, they're just going to have some additional coordination, but we need to make people available because they cannot languish if they're a special -- an emergency or a special action request.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Greg.

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

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Ken, you have the floor.

MR. LORD: Yeah, I would add to that that we'll have to make it clear to the managers that they're going to have to draw a distinction between the potential or the fear of a future problem as opposed to an imminent immediate problem with food supplies and food security. The first may not be ripe for action yet, or won't be ripe for action yet, whereas the latter is what they really need to be focused on, whether there's an immediate actual problem now.

MR. PADGETT: Ken. Sorry, Mr. Chair, Chad Padgett.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Chad, speak, go ahead.

MR. PADGETT: Sorry about that. Ken, can you speak to how this pares up with the State statutes on emergency take of wildlife? As I...
understand it there is provisions for that, so can you
maybe speak on how that's going to pare up. Because as
I understand it there's already an authority under
State statute to take if there's a problem with food
security. So I'm trying to figure out where we're at
here.

MR. LORD: What the State statute
allows is if you are -- basically if you are starving,
you can go take an animal and you can -- you have a
defense against -- if you are charged or, at least the
State hopefully won't charge you in the first place.
What this does, I think, is removes a layer of
complexity there by opening a hunt and people know
where they stand legally and knows they're able to --
you know, because there is this problem that might be a
community problem with supply rather than any one
individual who is starving who needs to go out and, you
know, hunt for his or her family, this allows sort of a
clearer approach and maybe one that serves the
community at large rather than the individual who is
having a problem, or having a group of individuals who
all are in this boat and go out and hunt individually
rather than having the super hunter go out and take a
moose for everyone.

MR. PADGETT: Okay, Ken, if I heard
that right, you're saying that we do have the authority
to open a harvest?

MR. LORD: Well, like Steve said, this
is a novel approach but the law clearly states -- or
the regulations clearly state that we can open for
reasons of public safety so if there's a demonstrated
public safety problem, yes.

MR. PADGETT: Thanks.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Gene.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
One thing I'd like to point out and I don't mean any
disrespect by it, but I recall during last week's
public testimony on non-agenda items, I recall at least
one proponent of a special action request stipulated
that they had gone through the State system and they
didn't get -- they were declined so they were coming to
the Federal system. So I just wanted everybody to keep that in mind as well when we deliberate these options.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, this is Greg.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Greg.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you. So, Tom, I think, if you don't mind, I think Ken brought up a couple of points but one of them made me start thinking about the validation of these special action requests, is that still a role that OSM will likely be playing?

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, and the validation of requests that -- we do have an opinion on that but, again, when letters of delegation go out, the purpose of that is to encourage -- and when we have a proponent, is to turn over that decision, you know, to the field. So the idea of the letter of delegation would be rather than going to OSM, traditionally -- would be a good example, in many of the fishing letters of delegation, unless it's a specific action that the proponent wants the Board to take, then we go through it, but the encouragement will be for those communities to go through the in-season managers for the process.

And if I could also make a point of clarification relative to -- OSM is more than willing to be and it has a traditional job in the in-season process of helping coordinate the in-season process, but in doing the actual analysis, we are normally not the entity that does the analysis but, of course, we can review that, you know, for folks, and these are decisions that are supposed to be quick and timely, not some of the sorts of analysis that you're looking at in the last week or today that are extremely extensive. The key is, is that they should be short and deal with an emergency situation.

Thank you, through the Chair and to Board member Siekaniec.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, this is Greg again.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for
MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, this is Greg, one more time if you don't mind.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Not at all, Greg, go ahead.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Okay. So, Tom, thanks for that. What I guess is rattling around for me is this idea of this is a new approach, we're invoking the public safety aspect of it, we've not done that from what I understand, and I think we need to have a certain level of consistency thought around this because of the, you know, the requirements that we're going to get, so some additional coordination and communication, so I still see the OSM's role as being very key here in helping us, you know, maintain that consistency that's going to be needed for this.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any other questions for Steve or Staff.

MR. WACKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, Steve.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Steve, you have the floor.

MR. WACKOWSKI: Mr. Chair. I just want to thank the Board for all their dedication and hard work and you have my commitment for expedient review and response on this critical issue. I know the public testimony last week was heart wrenching, you know, and I think that we've got a critical tool that we can use, I just want to, again, make sure that we, in using this authority in a new way, we do it well, not a manner, that, you know, avoids any potential for long term damage to the Program.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, well, I thank you for that, Steve, and I'm glad that the Department is taking up a role to expedite this process, you know, like you said, hearing overwhelming testimony to the needs of rural Alaskans and I think especially with this food security issue and I look forward to the memo coming out and a process that would
be fast for our delegation of authority to go out and start to make available some reprieve for rural Alaskans. So I appreciate the diligence done by your office and the Staff to get this to the point it is and hopefully, we can, in the next week or two start to see this letter come out and the appropriate steps taken to fulfill some of these SAR requests to people who are in need.

So definitely thank the Department for their time, and, you, for calling in today, Steve, and all the Board members for your critical questions today that define a path towards us providing this opportunity for rural Alaskans.

So thank you guys again, and the floor is open still if anyone has any further comments.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Gene.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So one thing I'd like to point out is that the existing delegation of authority letters are for emergency special actions less than 60 days, and then also and the role that OSM has played, I can attest that in-season managers have sent their justifications to OSM for assistance for review and I know that the Wildlife Program, and I believe the Fisheries Program has vacancies at this time, so such -- and if that is the case, if OSM requested, the Bureau of Indian Affairs would be more than happy to provide assistance from our subsistence Staff here at the Bureau to assist OSM, albeit OSM will still have the final authority on what's going out the door.

So, thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that offer, Gene, appreciate that.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chair, Forest Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Dave, you have the floor.

MR. SCHMID: Yeah, just, one, I would thank Mr. Wackowski's leadership here in trying to
coordinate this, it is new territory, I think that
we're venturing in. And the only comment I would have,
it'll be interesting to see where we land here in terms
of coordination, it's critically important that we do
coordinate, but how you define coordination and define
that consistently as we look across the state, I think
will be important, it means different things to
different people.

So thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Dave.

Any other Board discussion or comments
for Steve or Staff.

MR. C. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

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

MR. C. BROWER: Yeah, I also would like
to thank Steve for the work that he's doing and keeping
us informed as things progress, so, thank you very
much.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, so
it sounds like we're winding down. Any other Board
member wanting to make a statement or comment to food
security.

MS. PITKA: This is Rhonda Pitka.

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

MS. PITKA: I would very much be
interested in reading this memo. I think it's
premature to me to be asking questions on something
that I haven't read or reviewed yet. So if we could
make that available, I'd really appreciate it.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Rhonda.

MR. WACKOWSKI: Mr. Chair. We will
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that response, Steve, appreciate it.

Any further discussion, questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I just want to thank, again, the Board too and steering, again, us in a direction and a path towards trying to find some resolve for this critical issue. So thank you guys.

I think that marks the end of our food security discussion.

MS. TRUMBLE: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead.

MS. TRUMBLE: This is Della Trumble. I was waiting to see if you were going to have any questions from the RAC Chairs, is it appropriate to ask a question at this time.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Della, you have the floor.

MS. TRUMBLE: Thank you. My question is, in listening to this discussion, and I know that Dean Gould had put in a special request to extend the caribou season to April 30th, which is almost over, and how this is going to play out at this point, and he just left here, because beyond April 30th we're not going to want to go and try to harvest any caribou because they most likely -- the females, will hopefully be pregnant, and so I guess my question in looking at this process of sending in a special request in very early April and not hearing anything from anybody and understanding the issue around the Covid and people are working out of their homes, I really think -- I'm not sure what the process will be in the future but I think this is kind of sad in a way because, you know, I had requests from False Pass and from King Cove and I'm not sure what the answer is at this point, but it is a little disheartening.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Sorry, I did apologize on us having a lag in this process due to it just being unchartered territory and like I said I hope this can find some resolve through that and I'm not sure on how we would extend that to those special action requests like you're saying that have a midnight date of like this week and providing that opportunity. And so hopefully there's a way that we can also look at those and maybe adjust them, but also be mindful of some of our cultural practices that may keep us from doing what we need to do to provide for our families so that's also something we have to consider.

So thanks for bringing that up Della.

MS. TRUMBLE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other Board discussion, question, comments.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing none, Tom, I would ask you what other agenda items do we have on the table before us. I know there's the Fortymile Caribou.

MR. DOOLITTLE: And then there's the report for the request for reconsideration 15-01. And then we were going to talk about RAC appointments also as other business is what I have on the list.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: On other business. Okay, well, right now it's 10 to 12:00, I anticipate what it'll take an hour or two?

MR. DOOLITTLE: I would hope that the Fortymile Caribou would be pretty quick and considering the RFR is a report, I would believe that would be fairly fast also and then it's review of our 2020 summer work session and -- but some of that we've already sent out polls for that and also to discuss the winter public meeting, but we don't necessarily have to hit that right now. But I know on other business, that the RAC appointments were of interest to the Board.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, Tom,
well, I think, you know, maybe what we'll do right now
without any opposition is take a 40 to 45 minute break.

MR. C. BROWER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

MR. C. BROWER: I might be a little
late this afternoon after the break because I have some
stuff to do so.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I appreciate
you making the time this morning, Charlie, to get in on
that important conversation so I thank you for that.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, this is
Greg.

MR. C. BROWER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Greg.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Yeah, Mr. Chair, thank
you. Tom, is there any way we could possibly do a few
of these actions just via email because they're kind of
like, I think they're updates, I don't believe they
require any Board action. You know, the Fortymile
Caribou Plan we all have, you know, I guess the one
discussion with the RAC Chairs potentially but we're
operational -- or excuse me, not the Chairs, but the
RAC appointments, but we're operational for now, so I'm
just looking for a way with other people who are
obviously expressing that they have other commitments
because we brought this into, not just another day, but
another week, if we can shorten this up some way.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Through the Chair, this
is Tom Doolittle.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Tom,
you have the floor.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, the one action
item -- the remaining action item is the Fortymile
Caribou Herd harvest plan. So if we did take care of
that, even right now, we could reschedule the other
items for discussion and into the future, Mr. Chair,
and to respond to Board Member Siekaniec.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Well, why don't we entertain the Fortymile Caribou presentation at this time.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay.

MS. WORKER: Mr. Chair. I think one of the ADF&G folks were going to introduce the Fortymile Caribou Harvest Plan, Mark or Ben, are you prepared to do that or do you have Staff on line?

MR. MULLIGAN: Hi, this is Ben Mulligan. Yeah, just I'll give -- we've got area Staff that can come on line to describe it in more detail, if the Board so wishes. This is just something, you know, that came to our attention. The harvest plan that has a lot of players involved including the State, Federal agencies, the RACs, and there's been a history of bringing this harvest plan to both the Board of Game and the Federal Subsistence Board to get, I mean, for a lack of better terms, signed off on. So the Board of Game heard our presentation earlier and kind of gave it its blessing and we're here to do the same thing in front of the Federal Subsistence Board and so we appreciate the opportunity, and I believe Jeff Gross should be on line to describe it in a little more detail than I can give.

I'm trying to coordinate that right now, so I apologize.

(Pause)

MR. DOOLITTLE: Operator, is Mr. Jeff Gross on line.

OPERATOR: Certainly, let me open his line.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you.

OPERATOR: And, Jeff Gross, your line is open.

MR. GROSS: Hi, this is Jeff Gross with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game in Tok.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead, Jeff, you have the floor.

MR. GROSS: Yeah, I don't know if Jim Herriges is on the line, he's our BLM management partner for the Fortymile Herd, and Jim oversees all the Federal aspects of this plan and the Fortymile Herd management. I guess I would offer to Jim, if he'd like to introduce the plan. I did it with the Alaska Board of Game for the State side of things.

Anyway, I think he's on line.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, we'll give him the floor.

MR. PADGETT: Mr. Chair, this is Chad.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Chad.

MR. PADGETT: Just want to let you know it looks like Jim is trying to dial in now, I just got a message on that so he's trying to dial in.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, we'll just give him a moment.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you.

Operator: This is the Operator, I do apologize, and what was Jim's last name?

MS. WORKER: It's Herriges.

OPERATOR: Thank you.

OPERATOR: I'm not seeing that he's joined yet.

MS. WORKER: Okay.

OPERATOR: I did, however, have somebody that did press star one awhile ago and you didn't take public comment, I didn't know if you wanted that line open at any point.

MS. WORKER: I don't think so.

(Pause)

MR. PADGETT: He should be dialing in now.

(Pause)

MR. DOOLITTLE: Operator, is Jim on line yet?

OPERATOR: I'm not seeing that Jim has dialed in.

MR. HERRIGES: I am on line.

MS. WORKER: If he's.....

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yes, all right.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, Jim, you got the floor.

MR. HERRIGES: Okay. So you guys haven't discussed this yet?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We were waiting for you to provide the summary of the plan so no we haven't discussed it yet.

MR. HERRIGES: Okay, great. Well, this is basically just an update for a plan that's -- it's probably the fifth update of this plan since the mid'90s and in essence it lays out a framework for management of the herd including how to allocate harvest between Yukon Territory and Alaska and it has been focused in the past -- the difference from the past versions, in the past it's been focused pretty
much on herd growth, with that objective of trying to increase the herd and expand the range to -- into more of the historical range into the Yukon especially. And so in this version of the plan the -- there is a bit of a shift because the herd has grown from 22,000 and when the planning process was started to this, the most recent estimate was 84,000 two summer ago and the objective that was set and is still set in this herd -- in this plan is between 50 and 100,000 and so along with that, some of the indices of nutritional condition that Fish and Game has been monitoring especially pregnancy rate in three year old cows has been kind of on a steady decline and so there's some concern that the herd is potentially reaching carrying capacity and could go into a decline. And so this herd -- or this plan maintains an objective of a slower level of herd growth but also lays out options for kind of frameworks for other alternatives, in other words if something indicates it needs to be really drastically indicated, there's kind of like options in there or it needs to be -- harvest needs to be cut way back because it is crashing, that's in there as well.

It doesn't strictly lay out the management in how subsistence management occurs, other than recommending that we continue with the joint Federal and State registration permit as a way to manage this hunt, which has been something that the planning teams have recommended all along. And so the -- but it does have a few objectives related to subsistence, which basically is to continue to maintain the -- both the -- well, provide reasonable opportunity for Alaska subsistence uses and manage Alaska hunts to allow opportunity for non-subsistence hunters while staying within the constraints of the other goals.

So the way that we have maintained a subsistence opportunity in this herd up to now has mostly been -- in some years there's been an early start to -- the State season has been delayed until the end of August and the Federal season opened on August 10th. That ended a couple of years ago when the State needed to expand the season more to get adequate harvest. But often the State season will be closed after a few days, sometimes, when the herd is next to a highway system and the quota's been met and the -- and then we'll normally leave the Federal season open usually for the rest of the season, at least -- it's probably been five or six years since we have closed
the Federal season early rather than just leaving it open. And that quota system is kind of one of the main aspects of the plan.

So this plan has been, for the past -- the past four or five versions of it has been the planning team has requested that both the Federal Board and the State Board endorse this plan and so that is what is basically on the agenda here.

And with that I'll see if you have anything you want me to add or address or any questions.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, this is Greg.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg, yes, go ahead the floor is yours.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Yeah, thank you very much for the introduction and the presentation. I'm trying to understand a little bit more about the relationship between the subsistence and potentially non-subsistence user, or rural residents and non. Is there going to be asking for a Federal in-season manager to provide some rural priority by extending perhaps the front end of the season, you know, when the herd obviously can support it and when there's enough numbers or location and various things; I'm trying to figure out if that's part of what you were trying to describe or not?

MR. HERRIGES: The WP20-48 that was in the consensus agenda basically allowed us to set seasons outside of the dates that we are currently at and the Eastern Interior RAC suggested that we do open the season early on August 1st to give some early season opportunity to Federal subsistence hunters and with the approval of that we'll have the ability to do that.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And thank you for that reminder that WP20-48 was also associated with this and that that makes the relationship much clearer for me.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any other additional questions for Jim.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, I appreciate that, Jim.

Tom, was this one we're looking for a motion for?

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yes, it's just to have a motion to approve the cooperation of the Board with the Fortymile Caribou Management Plan.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The floor is open for the motion.

MR. PADGETT: Mr. Chair, Chad Padgett with BLM.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor, Chad.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you. I move to endorse the proposed Fortymile Caribou Plan as submitted by the Harvest Management Coalition. This proposal is shown on Page 1427 of the Board book. Following a second I will explain why I intend to endorse this motion.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Second, Fish and Wildlife Service.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you, Greg. My justification is the following:

This harvest management plan will be the framework to guide management of this important international herd to maintain abundant and wide ranging caribou. Balancing the herd health with caribou abundance and range expansion is the conservation which makes a cohesive management framework critical. This management approach is supported by substantial empirical evidence, it has resulted in a population increase from approximately 22,000 to 84,000 animals in about 25 years. The plan will support subsistence opportunity and continue customary and traditional uses of caribou. The
management plan will not unnecessarily restrict other
users and will improve subsistence opportunity for
Federal and State subsistence users and Yukon First
Nation users.

Thank you, and appreciate everybody's
patience while we got Jim on the phone.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
thank you for that Chad. Any Board discussion or
deliberation on the motion.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the
floor.

MR. PELTOLA: With regard to discussion
I'd like to point out that endorsement of this plan by
the Federal Subsistence Board does not necessarily
constitute removing the obligation to provide for a
rural preference or a priority consumptive use for
Federally-qualified users on Federal lands in the areas
of question.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Gene. Any other Board deliberation, discussion,
questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll call for
the question.

OPERATOR: We do have a question on the
phone lines if you'd like to take it.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Is it one of
our RAC members?

OPERATOR: I apologize, it's from Wayne
Owen.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, we'll go
ahead and take that, Wayne.

OPERATOR: I'll open that line at this
time.

MR. OWEN: Sorry, Mr. Chair, I was just beeping in because Mr. Schmid has taken a break and I'll be voting for him instead for the Forest Service. Sorry for the interruption.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And that's fine, thank you for taking the time to sign on and sit in for him. So any other Board discussion or deliberation on this proposal.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll call for the question.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Question, Fish and Wildlife Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been called. Roll call, Tom, please.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Did we lose our Staff here, Tom, are you available to do roll call?

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yep, I'm here, I had to switch phones, sorry about that.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: That's fine.

MR. DOOLITTLE: This is for the approved cooperation by the Federal Subsistence Board for the Fortymile Caribou Herd Management Plan.

We'll start with Don Striker, National Park Service, or Josh Ream.

MR. REAM: Hi, Tom, this is Josh, Tom's trying to call back in, he just got dropped, so if we could come back to us, that'd be great.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: That's great.

Fish and Wildlife Service, Greg
MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Tom. I support the motion to endorse the Fortymile Caribou Management Plan with the justification provided by the Bureau of Land Management and thank people for getting on the phone with this kind of short notice.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Greg.

U.S. Forest Service, Wayne Owen.

OPERATOR: One moment, please.....

MR. DOOLITTLE: U.S. Forest Service.....

OPERATOR: .....would you like his line open at this time?

MR. DOOLITTLE: Mr. Owen's line's not open?

OPERATOR: It is not open at this time, we'll go ahead and open it for you.

MR. OWEN: .....as presented.

OPERATOR: His line is open.

MR. OWEN: Hello.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, hi, Wayne.

MR. OWEN: Okay, third time, great.

The Forest Service votes affirmatively to support the Fortymile Caribou Herd Management Plan as briefed.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you.

Bureau of Indian Affairs, Gene Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: Bureau of Indian Affairs votes to support the endorsement of the Fortymile Caribou Plan, also we'd like to articulate that
accepting the framework does not necessarily remove the
obligation of the Federal Subsistence Program to
provide for the rural preference and priority
consumptive use on Federal lands.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Gene.

Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: I support endorsement of
this plan for the reasons as stated by the BIA.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Rhonda.

Charlie Brower, are you still with us?

MR. C. BROWER: I'm still here. I
support the Fortymile Caribou Harvest Plan with BIA's
statement.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Charlie.

Bureau of Land Management, Chad
Padgett.

MR. PADGETT: I support as stated,
thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Chad.

National Park Service, Don Striker.

MR. REAM: This is Josh Ream, Don
Striker did ask me to vote for the National Park
Service on this issue. We do vote in favor of
endorsing the Fortymile Caribou Herd Management Plan.
We would like to emphasize the need for the Federal
manager to consider the rural priority extension on the
front end of the season and we also want to mention
that Yukon-Charley Staff do intend to be more involved
with the coalition in the future.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: And last but not least,
Chairman Anthony Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support the plan as presented.

MR. DOOLITTLE: The motion to support the Fortymile Caribou Harvest Plan is unanimous.

And, Mr. Chair, Staff said we could put off the RFR description until this summer, and the only thing that you have left is the motion to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Tom. Again, I want to thank everybody for calling in and taking the time to come back on Monday.

I'd like to thank all of the public that called in. I know there was yearning today to do some type of public testimony but I would just like to apologize to everybody, you know, I wanted to make sure we were able to get to the order of business and allow our Staff some time to go ahead and start to produce the documents and get those things started that need to get started for us to go ahead and make this opportunity available for the public.

I want to thank all of the Staff for doing a good job and doing diligence and the work that we accomplished in the last week and thank you to all the Board members for being expedient in the work that we do.

So thank you guys, and with that I'll open up the floor to a motion to adjourn.

MR. C. BROWER: So moved.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Second.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion's been made and seconded, any opposition to the motion to adjourn.

(No opposition)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion carries unanimously.

(Off record)
(END OF PROCEEDINGS)
CERTIFICATE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )
)ss.
STATE OF ALASKA )

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

THAT the foregoing pages numbered through contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the
FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE BOARD, VOLUME V taken electronically on the 27th day of April;

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

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 26th day of May 2020.

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