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(On record)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay.

OPERATOR: Pardon, this is the operator, I just wanted to let you know on the phones that I have put in the main conference line so that you all may hear what's going on.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

Good morning everybody. I'm just waiting for a couple more Board members to come in.

(Pause)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, good morning everybody. Welcome back to Day 4 of the Federal Subsistence Board meeting. Welcome everyone, it's good to see we still have an audience.

We'll start off this morning with public testimony on non-agenda items. And, Operator, would you please, just if there's anybody on the line that would like to chime in, just let them know what the process is so they can be heard.

OPERATOR: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For those of you who are on the phone who would like to speak, please press star followed by one and I will open your line. Again, that's star, followed by one.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. All right, we'll first call up Jaylynn Martinez.

MS. MARTINEZ: Good morning Chairman and Members of the Board.

My name is Jaylynn Martinez and I'm from Tuluksak, Alaska. I am a senior at Mt. Edgecumbe High School and was given the opportunity to be a part of the UAS policy and procedures, a class that I
previous took. We learned about the Southeast RAC region. Although I am not from the Southeast region I have learned of a lot of things that I was able to compare some of the similarities, for this I am thankful to learn the process and learn how it all works.

First, however, I'm going to tell you where I come from and how my family lives.

My family and I lived in the city until we moved to the village when I was in middle school. Living in the city meant that we could go to the stores and restaurants, such as Costco, Safeway, McDonald's, et cetera. Living in the village is a different type of life that most people wouldn't understand. You see my village doesn't have running water so we have to do a lot of hard work. This means that we have to pack water with five gallon buckets and get wood to insure that we have drinking water and heat to stay warm.

In Tuluksak there is only one store and everything is really expensive. So the food that you would see in our freezers would be a lot of animals that we hunt for, like beaver, moose, caribou, fish and ducks. It's what our elders have taught us. This is our way of life. This is the way we live. The way we were taught by our parents and that they were taught by their parents. Keeping a tradition is important to one's culture.

We work hard on hot summer days to get fish. Over the summer my family and I caught some fish for the winter. But as we were stripping the fish we noticed how there were worms and puss. There was numbers of fish that were ill. As much as we didn't want to throw it away, we had to because we didn't know how it would affect us and that's pretty concerning.

As the elders were talking to us, they said that in the early days that they didn't have to worry about throwing away fish that they caught but nowadays you see fish that are becoming unhealthy. Fish is our main food source. We catch it during the hot summer days and long cold winter nights, soon we might not be able to eat the fish that we love. It's sad to say that this tradition that we have may die off.
I would like some day to show my children and grandchildren the way that I lived. The way that they should live instead of having to hear stories of how we used to do things. Talking about culture. When I first moved to the village, I could already tell that the culture was dying. Most of the kids didn't really want to learn from the elders, whether that was because they were already hooked onto drugs at a young age, and this is a problem almost every village across Alaska deals with. Things have been getting better. I'm happy to know while I'm getting my education from a boarding school, my village is reconnecting with their culture. This really means a lot to me.

You know, sometimes I think to myself that I want to go back home so that I could learn more about my culture but also being here today is giving me opportunity so that one day I could be the change.

Growing up in the city and the village, there's a big difference between the two.

In the village you learn a lot of what your elders and your parents have taught you by going out hunting and being able to put away food for the winter. And while growing up in the city you didn't really need to do that. I really hope that one day I'll be able to show my children and grandchildren how to cut fish and other traditions that I've learned from my family and elders.

That's all I have to say.

Thank you for your time and hearing me out. I really appreciate it.

(Appause)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Jaylynn. That was a well put together presentation, appreciate that. And I hope you continue to educate yourself and enjoy both lives. I think there's some richness in having a little bit of city and a little bit of rural life.

So any questions for Jaylynn.

MR. PELTOLA: Great job.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, good job and thank you and good luck after your senior year.

Oh, we have a question, I think.

MR. PELTOLA: You're doing the Kusko proud.

MS. MARTINEZ: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

Francis Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Honorable Members of the Board. My name is Francis Thompson. I'm from the community of St. Marys.

(In Yup'ik)

Mr. Chairman. I see some ears twitching. And it is the same way with us on this side of the table trying to understand the policies and bylaws and everything surrounding your duties and all the proposals and all the management strategies within the Federal Subsistence Board.

What I said was simple and what you guys know and understand from being there it's all comes natural. I just simply introduced myself, my name is Francis Thompson, I'm from the community of St. Marys. And I come before you, (In Yup'ik) means nervous. But I come before you even if I'm nervous because there's many at home that need their voices heard. And I'm honored to be here too.

Say some few, like when I talk with them to relay to you.

This is a very important meeting looking at the agenda. The most important one was the tribal consultation with the tribes and corporations. When I first came I was looking around for those that I know are from corporations and from tribes from my area but they're not here and I wish they were here. And I'd like to express, maybe, more information or outreach and I know there's been outreach and it's been on the register for a long time that this meeting was going to happen.
A couple of things I mentioned earlier, when I first testified was tribal consultation. Many, like myself, need to understand how we can communicate with you, the Federal Subsistence Board, and the many different agencies within the Council. And there are processes that need to be done in order to go through the proposals, go through many approvals or things that we have concerns about. And we would like to see maybe some format for how we can proceed with the tribal consultation process when we, in the villages, want to submit proposals or want to express our concerns through writing, through the proposal process for you.

The other testimony I made the other day was on trade and barter for cash for salmon. I know trade and barter is broad, but to be particular, salmon, because right now the -- the chinook salmon, because right now we are in times of shortage and we're managing -- we're having strict management all over.

On the Yukon it happened a long time ago. We were not able to fish commercially for chinook salmon when the abundance was below all the, like escapement goals, satisfying the amount needed for subsistence, and those we barely met. And the treaty, the obligations with Canada.

Right now, trade and barter for cash for salmon is hindering management strategy, in my eyes, in many of our eyes at home. So, therefore, I'd like to ask the Federal Subsistence Board to review and to understand the issue of trade and barter because, like I said, it's hindering management and we're trying to rebuild our stocks for chinook salmon in many areas.

On the tribal consultation, I know there was a reference to RAC, Regional Advisory Council, they are appointees to give you guidance and recommendations. They are -- if you talk with the RACs that is not consulting with the tribes.

Another subject I heard throughout the meeting which was a big discussion was .804 of ANILCA. How many times have tribes and people from the affected areas approached the Board or the State and asking for preference, but each time there was a request -- not each time, but many times, when there was a request for .804 Alaska Native preference, we were told that there is not enough resources to allow for ANS, therefore,
Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board, I would like to suggest that it's going to be -- it's going to take time but you have workers to establish a trigger point above and beyond, for example in Yukon, Canadian obligations, subsistence and escapement. The trigger point would be something, maybe a number that's used for subsistence which on the Yukon is 50,000 chinook salmon, that's just on chinook, but there's a larger number on chum, when do we trigger giving preferences to the people that need the resources, so we need a trigger to establish some kind of trigger point, so when we come up and ask -- we know when to come up and ask that we need preference for those that need the resource.

In many of the organizations that I've been in we had a conflict of interest provision and I'm sure you have. And we need to be careful when we do have that conflict that we remove ourselves from discussions that would benefit us, et cetera, et cetera, so I wanted to bring that point up, and the other points.

Mr. Chairman. Members of the Board.

That concludes my testimony.

Good morning.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Good morning, Mr. Thompson. And so I think there was a couple of questions in there. But as far as the consultation process and how you trigger that, I would offer up Orville -- I think he's in here -- and that request comes through your tribal council or your ANCSA corporation and triggers that consultation process and so that's available per request. Then we've also added, as part of our policy to have tribal consultation available prior to Board meetings, so we can capture as much of the testimony that we possibly can recognizing that sometimes not everyone can get to Regional Advisory Council meetings. And so we developed a policy and so if you'd like a copy of that I am pretty sure Orville can make that available to you so you can be aware of how to engage with this Board on that level, and so there is a policy and we can make that available to you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Can I make a comment.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Tom has an addition.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, also, yeah, Mr. Thompson. As you know with Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge being your neighbor, is that, also the in-season manager for many of the fishery issues is nearby but also Fred Bue, from the Yukon, is also available to talk to about many of the fishery issues. But the Refuge can also entertain consultations as well in an informal way and sometimes in more formal ways. But, you know, think about, you know, what venue you would like for consultation that you're interested in, more localized or through the OSM process.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The second part I heard that you stated, there, Mr. Thompson -- sorry, did you have something.

MR. THOMPSON: When I was thinking about the process, I was thinking about an orange. When you look at an orange it's a ball, when you peel it, there's 10, 15 little sections within that one ball. That's how I see in many of the agencies, that when we ask for something we are directed to different agencies, you know, and that's good. On the tribal consultation policy manual, I know it's been submitted out to the various tribes and corporations and whomever it may go to, maybe resubmitting and reminding folks that this policy is here. And define the process. I've been going to a lot of panel meeting. And I went to a Jesuit school and they taught us the A, B, Cs and a lot of times they say process, you know, going to the different meetings, when you go up to Canada and listen to them and, you know, it's the process up there and then when I come down this way I want to say process.

(Laughter)

MR. THOMPSON: So, anyway.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Process. Well, I also had another discussion I'd like to bring up about the trade and barter because I've heard it a couple of times this week on the chinook and the perceived commercialization of subsistence on the Yukon, and, obviously that would be a concern for
anyone who's in management with a conservation concern in place. We've seen proposals from the area before on limiting cash sales down to doing away with it. So I mean there's a broad range of proposals, I think, that have come before the Board. But you stated, you know, I kind of like barter and trade to a degree, you know, I think for rural residents to try to meet their needs, but, again, when you said it for salmon or for chinook, just to be specific, would you like to see maybe chinook pulled out of the barter/trade system or would you like to see all of the salmon pulled from that, and then there would be a proposal process also that you'd have to submit that to. But I just wanted to get your thoughts.

MR. THOMPSON: It would be those ones that are -- the species that are struggling. And to be specific, chinook salmon, right now.

There's a lot of areas that are conserving, not fishing, or have limited fishing opportunity, so be particular at this moment, because of the crisis with chinook, I'd say the chinook salmon.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. And I know that's your species of concern and you asked a question and I'd have to probably refer to a manager here about what is the trigger point that we would probably go to a restricted fishery there and then the next step, which I think you asked, is, when would an .804 analysis be triggered. And so if somebody here would like to answer that question.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Gerald knows more about the Yukon.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Gerald, is Gerald here.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Oh, Fred's here.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, Fred's here. Fred, if you just want to give him maybe a brief summarization of his request.

MR. BUE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Fred Bue, Federal in-season manager for the Yukon.

I guess I'm not certain exactly what
you were asking. Trade and barter is part of the subsistence ANS package, and so we look at the subsistence harvest, we don't follow -- track it beyond that to where it goes off, does it go into someone's smokehouse or is it going down the street to the neighbor's grandparents or cousins by way of cash. We don't look at that. So it's subsistence, we look to make sure that the subsistence needs are met. ANS is the measure for that, and then beyond that then we go to the other uses.

But is that close to what you were looking for, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No, I think his question was -- I appreciate that answer too. But, okay, in times of conservation, and we have to limit the fishery, he's asking, like an .804 we just incorporated yesterday for the Kuskokwim and certain villages are going to be included in that and will have rural rights to subsist in that system because of conservation concerns, he's asking when the trigger is for the Yukon. What's the threshold there?

MR. BUE: Essentially the Yukon has been treated pretty much as subsistence fishery for chinook the last 10 years or so, and so it isn't -- I guess a threshold would be the ANS, once we think we have the escapement and then the amounts necessary for subsistence that would be the threshold for .804. And so we don't have a significant problem with people coming from outside the system to the area to fish. In fact, we have some people -- it is a -- it has been a question in the past, some relatives from outside the area do come to help fish even though we have subsistence restrictions in place and we've spoken with public members at public meetings asking them what they think about that, and the problem with that, is that, if they eliminate their relatives that can come home to fish then it further compounds the problem if they're not -- those people are often the ones that help them by the boat gas and get out and help operate the gear and so it's been -- we've kind of left it up to the fishermen to -- fishing community, and so we haven't imposed .804 restrictions to that extent since 2009, I believe, when we actually had a special action.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank you. I'm just trying to get just more discussion around this
topic because it came up a few times during the meeting here, during testimony about the Yukon and that, and I think I have Gene who wants to weigh in.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

There's two ways to get to what Francis is asking about. The first that there's a limitation to all but Federally-qualified users before the Federal Subsistence Board can address and adopt an .804 analysis recommended by the Office of Subsistence Management.

There is one in-season management authority, as be delegated by the Board could utilize that independent action to limit the fishery within Federal waters to all but Federally-qualified users.

That's the first step.

The second step is a proposal presented to the Board. And you're correct, the last time that did occur was in the late, early part of the decade in the 2000s. The last time this Board addressed the proposal, I think it was '14, possibly '15, in which the Board did not adopt and there hasn't been a Federal proposal since then.

One thing that bothers me is you keep on referring to ANS, there's no legal standing to ANS in the Federal Subsistence Program, it has not been adopted by the Federal Subsistence Program.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other questions for Mr. Thompson.

I hope that helped clarify some of your questions.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, thank you. I know I'm not supposed to ask a question to the Board. What is the secret remedy for a long-lasting relationship, I'll give you one shot.

Soup.

MR. THOMPSON: It's soup, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Soup.


CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: It is. I should have known that.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I just made that statement, I said everyone who lived to be 100 in our community lived on fish soup. You got me there.

(Laughter)

MR. THOMPSON: And another note, Mr. Chairman. If you're curious about how many holes are in a Pilot Bread cracker, there's 28.

Thank you.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: That's a good one. I even made up a song about Pilot Bread, but I won't sing it on the record here today and it has to be -- it goes along with Canada, the process.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that engaging conversation this morning.

Next, we'll call on John Lamont.

MR. LAMONT: Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Members of the Board. Respective Staff and audience. My name is John Lamont. I'm from (Indiscernible) or at the Mouth of the Yukon River. My P.O. Box number is Alakanuk, the closest village, and the village my wife is from.

First off, I'd like to apologize for my testimony on Monday, if I offended anyone when I talked about the couple of issues that I did. And then my follow through when a certain proposal came up on the
depth of nets for subsistence use on the Yukon River.

I'd like to thank the Board for this process, for all Alaskans, whether I'm indigenous or not. I really appreciate the Board recognizing the young emerging leaders of our state, of our land, and the youth of our land. I really appreciate that. And it's great to see this process, kind of like a village meeting, not like a State Board of Fish meeting where we're limited on what we can say and talk. I would have brought three banker boxes with me to go through regulations, starting with the charter of 1822, 1844, Treaty of Season 1906 Land Act, all the way up to Title VIII of ANILCA.

When Title VIII of ANILCA was being developed, it was very critical that we had a voice from the mouth of the Yukon, and which we didn't. The people from Nome area, the people from the Bethel area had a voice, we didn't. To this day we're still not recognized. We're represented by Nome in State politics by Representative Foster and Senator Olson, they rarely come to the mouth of the Yukon. We're represented by Senator Hoffman and the Representative from Bethel, and they rarely come to the mouth of the Yukon to our villages. We've kind of been isolated over the years. The mouth of the Yukon, I always called it the gate, we're the gatekeepers for the salmon, all species of salmon, including the Bering cisco that come up and sometimes, you know, take up to eight to 10 years to spawn, they don't just spawn and die off and it's a critical food source in the fall time for our people.

There's been a lot of talk during public testimony. I'd like to clear up a couple issues I know on the Yukon, I can't speak for the Kuskokwim. But on the Yukon our chinook salmon, you know, come up into fresh water, they spawn and they remain two years in fresh water and then they out-migrate to the mouth of the Yukon, then they -- you know, for the summer for three or four months and then they go out to the Bering Sea and they come back as four, five, six year olds, not seven, eight, nine year olds.

Another issue that was brought up during testimony I heard was commercial fishermen on the Kuskokwim threw salmon away. I have a brother who lives and camps and lives off the land at the
Kuskokwim, at the mouth, close to the mouth of the river, they've never thrown -- during their commercial opening, they've never thrown fish away, whether it's humpies or -- I don't know if they get humpies but on the Yukon we do, and that one time I can be honest with you, I've thrown a few humpies away when they tangled up my net and really got me frustrated.

Next issue, I guess, is we've been, as people, as indigenous people, we've been indoctrinated with the word N-A-T-I-V-E, I do not like using that word and it offends me personally but it may not offend a lot of you, it's been used by everyone almost at this meeting. I'm Native, your Native, we're Natives. I do not like that word and I do not like that word to be used around me or around youth. Our Native corporation submitted a resolution to the Alaska Federation of Natives a number of times to try to change that to the Alaska Federation of Aboriginal Peoples. In Canada if you use a term that doesn't relate to First Nations or First Peoples you'd be frowned upon and in Alaska it's different. Like I said, we, as indigenous people have been indoctrinated, we've been indoctrinated with ANILCA. Verbiage that was defined by not us, by Western educated people. Personally I feel like a child with special needs at preschool at this meeting. I've come to this meeting, over 30 years ago, one of the first meetings they had and I brought up the same issue I did when I testified on Monday, about -- I guess after years and years of ANILCA and Title VIII and the three criteria, the three criteria, you know, being that customary and direct dependence upon the populations as the mainstay of livelihood, but we've traditionally lived off -- the mouth of the Yukon traditionally lived off, our indigenous people, chinook salmon. We barter -- I guess if you want to include the term, customary trade, we bartered with canneries, all winter long we charge stuff that we needed to live our subsistence lifestyle and then the month of June we paid it off. Just like trappers did in Canada and Alaska at the turn of the century.

I really would like the Department of Interior to review the definition of ANILCA, Title VIII and include -- I mean go back in history and take a look at that, how many people testified, how many people represented us at the mouth of the Yukon when that definition was being developed. Is that definition really fitting, we customary depended upon
that chinook salmon at the mouth. We may not have cut
it into strips and sold it but we bartered it with
canneries. Our customary fish was the summer chum
because they were easier to dry, we got them in July
and it was pretty good weather in July, too, back then.
Now, with the normal cycle of the Earth, you know,
we're seeing our seasons changing. We had a local
dependency on that chinook salmon. And we had no
alternative resources, we didn't have a road system, we
didn't have trapping, we didn't have moose, we were all
alone down there with our, you know, we really, really
enjoyed the life we had depending on the chinook
salmon.

But I really would like to thank you
for this process and for allowing us, and for allowing
me to come up and speak. I may not be the world's
greatest speaker but over time I really tried to get my
points across to people without offending anyone, you
know, I look at people and I don't want say, oh, George
over there, he looks like, you know, he doesn't know
what he's talking about, our elders taught us to watch
people, learn people, but don't talk to everybody about
those certain people. If you have an issue with that
person, go to that person independently and talk to
them in private.

I really appreciate you, Mr. Chairman,
allowing us this process, you and the State I guess,
and the Feds, you know, and being able to listen to our
people and help make critical decisions on the
resources that are available for us and we know,
though, at times, those resources can be limited or a
challenge to manage. You don't manage the resource,
and I apologize for that, but managing the people who
harvest the resources.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the
Board. I'd be more than happy to answer any of your
questions that you make have.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Mr.
Lamont, appreciate that.

Any questions or comments for Mr.
Lamont.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that, appreciate that.

Stanley Pete.

MR. PETE: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning. My name is Stanley Pete. I'm from the village Nunam Iqua on the mouth of the Yukon River.

These last few days I've been privileged to testify before the Board on the past and the present of our subsistence of life. And, you know, seeing the young individual this morning come and testify before the Board brought something to mind that is really dear and near to my heart. You know when we talk about subsistence, it's just eating food or gathering food for consumption or even to the bond that it -- the spiritual bond that we have with the food, what subsistence does for our people, it creates a bond in families that's more lasting than children being dropped off at school and, you know, too often, I believe now that parents drop their children off at school and say, here you go, teach my kid. You know, teachers can only do so much. But, you know, subsistence for families on the Yukon and throughout the whole state, it creates a bond and it teaches more than just unity, it teaches ethics to the children. It teaches them the values of hard work. It's more important than just eating food. You know I, myself, I have two children in boarding school because I want them to advance their education and teach them how to be independent. I want what's best for my children. But during the summer months they don't leave my sight. They're with me throughout the whole process of harvesting fish, gathering, curing, drying, you know, it teaches them unity. There's a bond that's created in my family. At least that's what I try to instill into my children, try to teach them the values of hard work, of the bond that, you know, teachers can't teach them.

I know my children enjoy doing it. They ask me are we going to go get some clams, or get fish, or catch a few birds or maybe a moose. You know they grew up doing that. You know, me, personally, I didn't have that close of a relationship with my father
with harvesting mammals or waterfowl or big game, but I wanted to make my children so comfortable in a family setting that they wouldn't have to look anywhere else to find comfort.

Too often we hear, you know, in communities that youth, young adults turning to drugs and alcohol, it's disturbing to hear that these youth and young adults are doing it. And, you know, I try to, at least in my family, to try to create a bond so lasting and so dear to my children's hearts that there should be no need to go out and find something else to make them feel better about themselves. You know I always tell youth and young adults in my community, you should have no need to do drugs and alcohol, you're basically telling me your life's not good enough that you need something to try to fill that void.

You know I've taken youth and young adults on hunting trips, I don't even shoot. The joy of watching these youth, these young adults harvest game for the first time is more meaningful than me catching my own bird, or my own big game or fish. It's really -- a real comfortable feeling watch youth, young adults catching something for the first time that you don't worry about if you're going to have something to eat, you eat that day. You know, I hope in the near future that, you know, more people will want to go and be in, you know, rural areas -- maybe not specifically rural areas, but in the wilderness setting with their families.

In let's say, maybe 50, 60 years ago, before all these villages were created, all these people were from settlements. I often wondered why people wanted to live secluded in an area with few people. And my step dad said to me, before he died, he said, the reason them people didn't all live in one big place is because they didn't want to deplete the resources that would feed them. There would not be so much people in one place that they would deplete all the resources in one area so they spread out to -- they didn't really have big communities. And, you know, that got me thinking, saying that, wow, these people must have been really, really family oriented and close and had a structure in place where there would be nothing else to make a family want to be living in an individual setting because their whole lives have been revolved around a family setting that their world was
complete. You know, even if they didn't have modern
education, they had the resources passed down to them
to survive. Some for even 100 years. They had that
available tool starting from being an infant to being
an elder. Even if the infant and the elder did not
really participate in the subsistence hunt or the
subsistence gathering or the subsistence fishing, they
played an important role. One was to inspire the
hunters to provide for the infant that can't provide
for themselves and to provide for the elder that was
near and dear to their hearts, regardless of if he
couldn't go out and hunt.

So my message is, you know, the
importance of subsistence, it's not just for food or
for wanting to be spiritually connected to the fish and
game that we harvest, but the bond that subsistence
creates with families. You know it's very important
just for families to be close. You know, we live in
this modern age, where even -- there's so much
distractions in this world, you got TV, cell phones,
you got teachers giving homework to youth and children,
that sometimes the only time that we sit in a family
setting is if we're going to eat. Or maybe the only
time the family really gets together is in Thanksgiving
or Christmas, but, you know, back in the day -- at
least in my dad's lifetime, there was always that
unity, where they always were close with each other and
they had the family setting year-round. There was
nobody running off to school or going to work or youth
being dropped off at schools.

So with that, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you
Stanley. I think you hit on a few key points there. I
know we've heard similar testimony across the state as
far as I've been involved, about that, you know, giving
our youth meaningful jobs and roles within our society,
and, subsistence is a big role in our rural communities
and making them feel the value that they have as a unit
of our family. So I appreciate your testimony. All
week we've been hearing similar testimony about the
importance and with a couple of new Board members, I
think it's been good that we've been able to get some
insight into the values that your family and other
families out there in rural Alaska have to protect that
way of life and continue to maintain those units of
survival, is what it comes down to.
And so I wish you the best with your kids and educating them in both sides of this world we have, because we have to be ourselves, indigenous peoples, but also Western people. And so I wish you the best with your family.

Any questions for Mr. Pete.

(No comments)

MR. PETE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

OPERATOR: On the phone line, to ask a question, please press star followed by one.

(No comments)

OPERATOR: There are no questions at this time.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. We have one more, Chariton Epchook.

MR. EPCHOOK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board. I'm Chariton Epchook, Chairman of Kwethluk Incorporated.

And I understand that last night you all approved Akiak's special action request with modifications to it, to deleting [sic] public waters and while I was thinking -- listening to these three gentlemen from Yukon talking about .804, it reminded me of my 20 years of employment with Organized Village of Kwethluk under the Indian Child Welfare Act. And during the first month I asked my administrator to attend a training, a formal training on Indian Child Welfare Act, he said no. There are a lot of manuals in that office, read them. So I read them. And one of the documents I came across was the Cannons and Constructions of Stair Dethesis (ph), where it directs agencies and departments that deals with Indians, or Alaska Natives, and it basically said that if that decision that you have made is not right for those Indians or Alaska Natives go back and work on that -- your decision again. That, itself, I am recommending that you read that document, the Cannons and Construction of Stair Dethesis (ph).
And the other portion, when we're dealing with subsistence, there should be no higher preference than subsistence. I guess by deleting that language that was in there, other public waters. You are already overthrowing that priority preference for subsistence. There are ways to remedy that. And one of the things that I've learned with the Organized Village of Kwethluk is communications, inter-department communications. If that does not happen the organization does not run like a well oiled machine. It has already broken down. Communication starts from the very people that makes decisions and goes all the way down to the last employee, the lowest of them all. That needs to happen. And I'm also recommending that you start communicating with all these other agencies. Without that, what's going to happen with this organization, the Federal Subsistence Board. If you don't communicate with your Staff, certain things are not on your desk, you're going to look for them, you're going to look for somebody to blame.

So I recommend that these two things.

Read the Cannons and Constructions of Stair Dethesis and open line of communication with other departments that you work with, or those other departments that deals with Alaska Natives or Indians.

Yes, subsistence is our way of life.

During these last four years, friends and relatives, because we have not had fresh salmon, a handful of them have passed on because we are buying store bought food, canned food, which we are not accustomed to. I don't have the statistics on those deaths caused by cancer, but there have been a handful because we're not getting our salmon, or the food that we're accustomed to. We're not accustomed to eating steaks, chicken, turkey, ham, that's why we send these proposals because we want the first taste of salmon after a long winter.

You heard me during the first day, the proper term should be, a taste of salmon, because all winter long we've had a taste of other fish and we don't want to use four inch nets this coming summer. And it boils down to my wife, she says, sternly, I want salmon this summer, and I'm with her, I want salmon this summer.
And I've spoken before, previously, and so many years, against this four inch, Alaska Department of Fish and Game has a regulation for in times of low abundance of chum, regulations that state that the Commissioner can use or issue an order to use 7.5 inch mesh nets. I believe last year I brought that up, it does not make sense to put four inch restrictions after a long winter and we want that taste of salmon, keep in mind that there are other salmon that go up with that chinook, chums and reds. And I've used that 7.5 inch net, I drifted with it, I've caught more big reds and big chums versus chinook with gillnet that size. With that four inch we've been killing off chinook. Most of them roll off that four inch net before we get to them. I remember my first time I caught one I was so happy, and right before I got to it, it rolled off, and I was like, oh, no, now I'm not going to get a taste of chinook salmon.

And my trip down to Napaskiak to get my boat fixed, that one area that they call that choke point, really smelled of dead fish, salmon, is what they actually were.

Back in 1980s the weir was first put up in the Kwethluk River, I went up there and I smelled that awful smell, dead salmon. Once you smell something you cannot forget it.

But, thank you, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board for giving me this opportunity to speak before you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

Any questions or discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And I just wanted to let you know we did pass a couple of proposals this week, one of them to allow for the use of six inch net up to the June 1st date, and then up to the Federal in-season manager after June 1st to provide that opportunity based on what the assessment of the run is. So that was our two actions this week, hopefully to help give that opportunity for a taste of fish. So I hope that helps you.
MR. EPCHOOK: Salmon.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Salmon.

Thank you.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Have a good morning.

MR. EPCHOOK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Unless there's anybody on line, Operator.

OPERATOR: If anybody on the phone lines would like to make a statement, please press star followed by one and I will be more than happy to open up your lines.

One moment.

(Pause)

OPERATOR: I see nobody on the phone lines who would like to make a statement, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. That concludes our public testimony for the morning on non-agenda items. Appreciate everybody taking the time and we'll take a five minute break and allow Staff to come up here with the RFR15-01, so -- oh, one second, when we come back I'm going to start off with Don. I called a break already, so when I come back I'm going to allow Don to speak to an item and then we'll get started. So, Don, when we come back from break.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: And don't forget to look at all the posters if you haven't seen those, too.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We're going to come back here, we're going to kind of start running
out of time this morning. We have Council members here and a quorum may become an issue here by noon.

We also have a request, if there is no opposition by the Board here, to include a U.S. Fish and Wildlife four minute video, because Greg does have to leave at 11:00. Without objection, I would like to insert that here, after we hear from Don, so I'll open up the floor to that. I know we did get a public testimony from Melanie Brown. I'm going to have to apologize Melanie, at this time, I did close the public testimony portion of it when we recessed and we are kind of running out of time with the quorum concern we have, we lost another public member here, and not sure when he'll return, and then we're going to lose other Board members as the morning proceeds. And, so with that I would just like to extend that apology and just say I'm sorry that I can't entertain your public testimony at this time.

With that I'm going to go ahead and turn it over to Don Hernandez, and go ahead Don.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Don Hernandez from the Southeast RAC. And I really appreciate you, with the time constraints here, giving me an opportunity to maybe hopefully get a brief answer to a question that might really aide the Council moving forward here.

I was handed yesterday a letter here at the meeting and it's dated April 12th and it was received by the Regional Forester on March 5th and it's in response to a letter that we generated back after our fall meeting, back in October, so, you know, given the time lags here and getting responses to questions, if I could get a short response now it might really help with the Council, who is in the process of drafting another letter right now on this same issue, so it could really speed the process up.

So with that said, it's in regard to the Forest Service's rulemaking on the roadless process doing an Alaska specific roadless rule.

And the Council has been requesting ANILCA .810 hearings as part of this process, and Mr. Schmid, in your response to our questions on this draft environmental impact statement process, you said that
the draft environmental impact statement will hopefully
be out this summer and when that is out the proposed
rule will begin its 60 day comment period this summer
and the rulemaking team will be scheduling meetings in
various locations. Am I to take the statement of
scheduling meetings, are those going to be ANILCA .810
hearings or something else?

MR. SCHMID: Yes, thanks Don. Through
the Chair.

So doing both. So there will be public
meetings with the release of the draft EIS, we hosted,
if you'll recall and I think most folks in Southeast
were able to attend, I think we hosted 17 public
meetings gathering input that goes into that draft and
so we took all of that input, we developed -- we are
working on six alternatives that span from essentially
a no action alternative, keeping the current roadless
policy in place to the State's request, which was for a
full exemption of the roadless rule.

We will be, and are actively, and
working with a contractor to develop those six
alternatives, they've been fleshed out. And so as we
release that we will be hosting public meetings. We
will also be conducting the .810 hearings, subsistence
hearings. Those will be scheduled.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. That clarifies
that. So do you intend, as part of the environmental
impact statement process, making an .810 finding as a
result of those hearings?

(Pause)

MR. SCHMID: Yes, that's my
understanding. Yes, uh-huh. I had to think about that
a little bit, Don, sorry. Yes.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Well, thank you very
much, that clarifies a lot.

MR. SCHMID: Okay.

MR. HERNANDEZ: That's going to clarify
a lot for the Council so.....

MR. SCHMID: Yeah, and I apologize we
weren't clear on the timing of those .810 hearings and when they would occur, we did -- I tried to share that early in the process on the first round of public involvement meetings but that may not have been clear to folks.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Very good. And you say the timing is still kind of fluid but we'll expect hearings probably this summer, the Council has noted in our letters that summertime is not the greatest time to hold subsistence hearings but we will at least look forward to those hearings when they do occur.

So, thank you.

MR. SCHMID: Yes, thank you. We will do the best we can. We're currently on a timeline and that's fluid. The process, is, after our draft rulemaking goes through the Office of Management and Budget, and CEQ, sometimes that's 'a fast process, sometimes that's not. We're optimistic that we'll be able to release that draft in late July of this year, which may push things out a little bit farther and maybe just beyond some of the fishing season.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you very much. I really appreciate that.

Thank you, Tony.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Thank you, Dave, for clarifying that for the Southeast RAC, I know they were very interested in some feedback on that.

All right, then hearing no objection, we'll turn the floor over to Greg.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you Members of the Board, for just a few minutes of time on your agenda.

In September of last year, it was September 13th, 2018 we were at the Alaska Migratory Bird Co-Management Council, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the State jointly delivered an apology on behalf of the agencies due to past actions and activities that were associated with both our migratory bird management, as well as our law
enforcement. And, you know, what I'd really like to do before we show this video, is to thank the Alaska Migratory Bird Co-Management Council Native Caucuses and individuals that were actively engaged in the dialogue and the discussion that brought about what I would say is an education for us, certainly as the agencies, and, you know, the opportunity to learn jointly of our history together and the rights and wrongs, in particular, of what happened over time. And I think it's thanks to these folks and their elders that we are, you know, able to publicly acknowledge that this history was provided, many things that were way beyond awkward but provided a, you know, a break in some of the cultural traditions and the ties and the things that were, you know, incredibly important to the cultures of the areas that we were doing the type of activities that we had undertaken.

And in this video, I think you'll note that we give special honor to the Late Raymond Stoney, for his courage in really stepping forward and telling his personal story and his father's story and really helping us understand and particularly, the important part, is how to be much, much better.

So with that thank you for these few minutes and I think, Tom, you have the ready to go.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yes.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Please spool it up.

(Apology Video Played)

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Obviously that contains a lot of information in there but, you know, we've successfully moved through a treaty amendment to correct the regulations. You know we have a Migratory Bird Co-Management Council, that now has a voice on the Flyaway Council that are now in attendance at the Service Regulation Committee, which entails both State and Fish and Wildlife Service.

We've come a long ways.

We obviously know that we have a ways to go yet, but this apology was issued, it was actually a pretty significant news day relative to around the state, but we continue to take this to local
communities and to villages, you know, to make sure
that we try to get the word out because it just doesn't
happen without that type of an effort, so our folks
certainly are engaged to taking this to -- I think it's
been at various Regional RAC meetings, community
meetings that I ask all of our managers to have
periodically with, you know, the villages and tribes
they work with.

So with that I would simply say thank
you for allowing us to show that and if you have any
questions or anything. I'm afraid we could take a lot
of time because there's a lot of depth to this issue
but certainly would open that up.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Greg. Again, I apologize to the people on line who
couldn't hear, it was a video presentation and so it's
just hard to get that loud enough in the room to be
heard on line. And just a question, maybe for Greg, is
this available on line for people to watch and so if
they didn't get to hear what was being said they can
find it somewhere?

MR. SIEKANIEC: It is available on line
and I believe we could make that as part of the meeting
notes here. And I'm looking at Crystal, who is our
Native Affairs Liaison over there.

MS. DAMBERG: We have the letter.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Oh, and for folks that
are actually here, we do have a letter that's available
out on the information desk that really speaks to this
as well and I would encourage you to pick that up.
Does that have the link in it -- we did not, so.....

MS. LEONETTI: Hi, it's Crystal
Leonetti, Alaska Native Affairs Specialist, Fish and
Wildlife Service.

This video is available on the U.S.
Fish and Wildlife Service Alaska YouTube channel, so
anyone can go to that YouTube channel and find it
there.

MR. SIEKANIEC: There you go, Tony, you
like TV you said, it's there.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I love YouTube, no, that's a -- yeah, I run up the bill, unlimited now wifi. Hey, nice job narrating there, too, Crystal, I caught the voice.

MR. SIEKANIEC: So thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

Thank you, Greg. Thank you Fish and Wildlife Service for recognizing that and going through that process with the people. I think that's very beneficial.

Okay, I think that's it there and we'll move on to Staff presenting information and update.

Scott. On Kenai River community gillnet, RFR15-01 [sic].

MR. AYERS: Thank you, Mr. Chair and Members of the Board. Again, Scott Ayers for the record. It's good to see you all again.

So this is just a brief update on the status of this RFR. The RFR is 15-01 and it's in relation to the Fisheries Proposal FP15-10 for the Kenai community gillnet fishery.

There were 740 requests for reconsideration submitted to the Federal Subsistence Board following the January 2015 adoption of Proposal FP15-10. The Office of Subsistence Management reviewed all the letters and identified claims in each of the three categories.

Four substantive claims were identified under criteria one, information previously not considered by the Board.

One under criterion two, which is existing information used by the Board is incorrect.

And 32 substantive claims were identified under criterion three, that the Board's interpretation of information, applicable law or regulation is in error or contrary to existing law.

At the January 2017 meeting, the last fisheries cycle, this Board reviewed the threshold
analysis and found three of the 36 claims to have merit. All claims fell under criteria three, that the Board's interpretation of information, applicable law, or regulation is in error or contrary to existing law.

The three claims -- the first claim was claim 3.12, gillnets are incompatible with the required release of any incidentally harvested 18 inch or longer trout or char.

The second claim was claim 3.13, incidental harvest of trout or char longer than 18 inches could lead to a high rate of mortality.

And the third was claim 3.32, there is not adequate window of opportunity between the early and late run chinook salmon to allow for safe harvest.

All three claims raised concern that aspects of the regulation implemented under proposal FP15-10 were in conflict with existing Federal subsistence regulation. Only information available at the time of the 2015 adoption of Proposal FP15-10 was used to review these claims for the purposes of the threshold analysis. At that time the Board directed Staff to consider all three claims for full analysis.

At the same 2017 regulatory meeting, the Board agreed to implement changes to the Kenai River community gillnet fishery that would follow the implementation pathway for the agreement, in principle, that we spoke about several days ago. The order of events established for all of this was first to pass a portion of the changes through modification of Proposal FP17-10, second to pass the remaining changes to the fishery through the rulemaking process, which you completed earlier at this meeting, and, finally, to complete the RFR process.

So that brings us to the present.

I will begin action on the final analysis after this meeting and it will come to you at the next regulatory meeting, which will be the wildlife meeting next April.

And that's all I have.

Please let me know if there are any
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for the update, Scott. Any questions for Staff.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, thank you.

That brings us to RFR18-01 Unit 2 deer. Status update. Terry Suminski.

OPERATOR: Just as a reminder for those on the phone that do have any questions, please press star followed by one.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

MR. SUMINSKI: Good morning everyone. I'm Terry Suminski with the U.S. Forest Service. I manage the subsistence program for the Tongass National Forest. I just have a short update on where we are in processing the request for reconsideration which have been received in response to Proposal WP18-01.

Proposal WP18-01 was submitted by the Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council and supported by the Federal Subsistence Board to reduce the deer harvest limit for non-Federally-qualified users on Federal public lands in Unit 2 from four male deer to two male deer.

The proposal also asks for reduction in the State deer hunting season in Unit 2, but that portion of the proposal was not supported by the Council, nor the Board.

Subsequently six letters were submitted in response to the Board's decision.

One letter from the State of Alaska.

Five letters from residents of Ketchikan.

Each of the six letters has been closely reviewed and 12 claims have been identified.
The threshold analysis is currently being drafted by Staff. The threshold analysis should be ready to present to the Board at its summer work session. If any of the claims are determined to meet the threshold at that point, a full analysis will then be completed.

Thank you.

And I'm available for any questions.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any questions for Terry on Unit 2.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, thank you, Terry, for the update.

MR. SUMINSKI: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: That moves us into presentation Eastern Interior Hunter Education Pilot Program.

Hold on one second, sorry, there, Katya, I'm looking at a deal here, we've added an agenda item.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Oh, okay, yep.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The threshold analysis process update that we added at the beginning of the meeting is 12A, so, thank you.

So, there we go.

Robbin, you have the floor.

MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the Board. At the beginning of our meeting we did have a request to review the threshold policy. If you will recall -- just a moment.

(Pause)

MS. LAVINE: The policy currently does not require a threshold analysis, that was not a direction that was given at the time the policy was
formed. In the process of test driving this policy, this very first time, we're looking at ways in which we might be able to better support the process, and better support you, in your decisionmaking.

One of the articles that we came up with, or the tools that we came up with, was a threshold assessment, a very simple document that was handed out to you and if you find it useful, that's something we may be directed to incorporate into the policy and into our process.

Thank you.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Dave.

MR. SCHMID: Yes, thank you. And for allowing us to add this to this to the agenda. I just was hoping that we could have a discussion as well and maybe with some question and answer here, maybe make a motion to this effect.

But if you recall from our discussion, as stated, back on RP19-01, the Moose Pass rural, or non-rural determination, one of the recommendations that was -- that came back from Staff, I quote, the ISC recommends that the Federal Subsistence Board direct OSM to modify the non-rural determination policy to include a formal threshold analysis completed by the Office of Subsistence Management, for each validated non-rural proposal submitted, which is, I think, what we've introduced here.

I had a few questions and then maybe offer a motion, if that would be okay.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, I don't see any opposition.

MR. SCHMID: Okay. And so maybe you could just describe for us, again, about the threshold analysis process for non-rural, you could be just a little bit more in-depth on what that assessment was and maybe what we're looking for in a form of -- as a formal part of the non-rural determination.

MS. LAVINE: Yes, thank you. Through
the Chair. Mr. Schmid. This is a new process. We're
learning as we go. And we came together, first, as an
anthropology -- as the anthropology team, and the policy
coordinator to review the threshold requirements and in
this case, these were four threshold requirements to
rescind a non-rural determination, and through
discussion and review of our transcripts in the past,
and documentation on hand, we came up with a brief
assessment. We thought that it should be something
that is clear, and streamlined. And we had multiple
meetings, also -- not only with Staff and with ISC, but
also with LT and the Solicitor at the time.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Through the Chair. So,
Robbin, for clarification, you've been moving the non-
rural policy and trying on the new shoes that the Board
has set forth, and as you've tried on these shoes, for
clarification, that you've found some hiccups that
would be important for clarification by the Board at a
future meeting. Is that an abstract of what you're
trying to do?

MS. HARDIN: Thank you. Through the
Chair. Mr. Doolittle. We have been test driving --
Jennifer Hardin, Subsistence Policy Coordinator for
OSM.

We have been test driving this policy,
it's the first time through and we have identified,
both internally, and in discussion with Regional
Advisory Council and with the InterAgency Staff
Committee some ideas about how we can tighten things up
a little bit and one of those -- and to help guide the
process a little bit. You did not require us to do a
threshold analysis, however, the anthropology team
really felt like coming up with something streamlined
and concise would help guide -- not guide the
conversation but help facilitate the conversation with
the Regional Advisory Councils, with the InterAgency
Staff Committee, with this Board, and so while we
weren't required to do that, we did feel like it would
be a useful tool, and if you agree we'd be happy to
continue doing that. It does help us, also, kind of to
gather our thoughts and work through a proposal in a
methodical way.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

Does that help, Dave.

MR. SCHMID: Yes, thank you. Thank you, Jennifer.

So, if, any other questions or discussion, I would like to offer a motion at this point, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I'll entertain a motion.

MR. SCHMID: I move to direct OSM to modify the non-rural determination policy to include a formal threshold analysis to be completed by the Office of Subsistence Management for each validated non-rural proposal that is received in the future. And if I get a second, I can explain why I've made this motion.

MR. PADGETT: Second.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead.

MR. SCHMID: So justification. My thinking and -- that I would offer, a threshold analysis would be helpful for the Board and Regional Advisory Councils to consider Staff's OSM assessment of how non-rural proposals have or have not addressed each of the threshold criteria outlined in the policy in non-rural determinations.

A threshold analysis will provide a written documentation of the Regional Advisory Council input at this stage of the proposal process and a threshold analysis will contribute to a clear administrative record of the Board's decision related to whether or not a non-rural proposal should be forwarded to Staff for full analysis.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any questions or discussion.

Greg, and then Ken.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

So I'm just trying to follow this train, so presently
we operate under guidance and guidance you've been
putting together between, you know, two different parts
of the OSM group, so do we need to actually turn this
into formal policy in order to then step this to formal
threshold analysis so that we can all agree as Board
members to everything that would likely be contained
within that. Is that -- am I kind of following this
correctly?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Jennifer, go
ahead.

MS. HARDIN: Thank you. Through the
Chair. Mr. Siekaniec. You -- this -- I believe what
you're suggesting here is for us to revise the policy
that you've already adopted to include language that
would call for, whether it's an analysis, an
assessment, we've provided you with a document that
worked for us. We are happy to bring that back to you
in the summer work session with our recommendations for
a document that we think would work and then seek your
approval of that. But you have the authority -- this
Board has the authority to adjust your policy, we will
take your direction and respond accordingly.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair. Dave, is
that what you were expecting?

MR. SCHMID: Yes, Greg. I think -- my
understanding is that this has not been formalized in
the process and it was the Staff's recommendation as
they've moved through there that this is something that
would help all of us, it would help the RACs,
especially, and create that administrative record so
there's some clear decision points. And so it came as
a recommendation from Staff and our folks here that are
working on it.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Well, thank you, Mr.
Chair. That answered my questions.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
further questions or discussion on inclusion of the
threshold analysis to come before us in the form of a
form.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We appreciated
that. And I think that gives the Staff, you know, the
direction they need to go full throttle into the work
that it actually is required to complete the whole
analysis.

And with that, hearing no more
discussion, call for the question.

MR. PELTOLA: Question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been
called. Tom, would you read it into the record and roll
call.

MR. DOOLITTLE: You bet. This is for
possible activity at the summer work session, and,
again a motion to direct OSM to modify the non-rural
policy to include a threshold analysis for each
validated proposal received in the future.

BIA, Gene Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: Support.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Public Member -- not
there.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: He took a
break.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay. U.S. Fish and
Wildlife Service, Greg Siekaniec.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Support, with the
intent to add clarity and help for Staff.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Bureau of Land
Management, Chad Padgett.

MR. PADGETT: Support as stated.

MR. DOOLITTLE: National Park Service,
Herbert Frost.

MR. FROST: Support.

MR. DOOLITTLE: U.S. Forest Service,
David Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: I support.

MR. DOOLITTLE: And, Chairman Anthony Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Motion passes.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Jennifer.

MS. HARDIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Just a question for clarity. Would this Board like us to bring back a template document for you to approve at the summer work session?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead.

MR. SCHMID: Yes, I think that would be helpful, we didn't set a timeline, so, thank you, I think that would be what we would be recommending.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. All right, we'll move on to the next one, Eastern Interior Hunter Education Pilot Program.

For real's this time.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And, thank you, Greg, have a good day.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you. I apologize for having to leave early.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Katya.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Members of the Board. For the record my name is Katya Wessels and I'm Acting Council Coordination Division Chief.

So since we have a few new members on the Board I would like to start this presentation with
-- there's a delay -- with a little bit of background
of the Eastern Interior RAC initiative.

So in 2005-2009 the Eastern Interior
Council became increasingly concerned about escalating
user conflict in their region. The Eastern Interior
region is a very large region, which includes Units 25,
20 and 12, and Units 25 and 20 are the second and third
biggest units in the entire state. 48 percent of this
region are Federal public lands administered by U.S.
Fish and Wildlife, BLM and NPS. As you can imagine
with a patchwork of land ownership, different
applicable regulations and different cultural hunting
values of different user groups, there's a lot of
potential for misunderstanding and user conflict.

The Council outlined the following
problems that might lead to user conflict.

Waste.

Accidental or deliberate of edible
meat, organs and bones valued by local communities.

Lack of knowledge on how to take care
of meat in Western and/or traditional practice.

Lack of respect for the values of local
people.

Insufficient knowledge about
possibilities to share harvested animal parts with
local communities.

Lack of land ownership awareness.

Knowledge of regulations.

In 2009, the Council voiced a need for
hunter ethics education program in a letter to OSM.

Eastern Interior RAC took a proactive
position on working towards achieving understanding and
tolerance for different cultural values as a means to
reduce waste and work towards better hunter ethics in
the field. Throughout 2010 to 2015, the Council
continued to bring this issue to the Board’s attention
and requesting hunter ethics education in its annual
reports.
In 2016, in its annual report reply, the Board stated that it fully supports this effort and looks forward to a successful program.

During its winter 2017 meeting, the Council had an extensive discussion on record on how to proceed with this initiative. At this point the Council clearly stated that it wanted the work to be done in cooperation with the State. A work group comprised of OSM, State and Council representatives convened for a breakout session during lunch to discuss the issue. And the Council felt so strongly about the importance of this hunter ethics education initiative, that at that meeting the Council voted to adopt hunter ethics education as a regular agenda item for any future Council meetings.

In the late spring, early summer of 2017, OSM prepared an action plan to develop pilot projects and timeline for its implementation. The plan and timeline were presented to this Board during its July 2017 session, the Board approved them and directed OSM to proceed.

Now, I would like to talk about the intents of this initiative.

The intent of this initiative, from the start, has been to develop a positive and collaborative volunteer hunter outreach and education program using partnership and a stakeholder consensus process. The program that's being developed is not intended to be a substitute for the State of Alaska Hunter Education Program. And to be clear, this educational program would not involve any new Federal regulations. The goal is to work within existing structures and systems.

The main goals of this hunter ethics education initiative are:

- To strive towards understanding and tolerance for different cultural hunting values.

- To reduce user conflict between user groups through education and outreach.

- To encourage respect and work towards better hunter ethics in the field for all user groups.
Throughout the process, the Council stressed, that it is important to partner and collaborate with other Federal land management agencies, State of Alaska, Native tribal organizations, and hunter organizations, air taxis and transporters.

The Council wanted to be inclusive and move forward in a positive way, and they wanted to create a dialogue between subsistence and sport/commercial users.

With funding through a U.S. Fish and Wildlife grant program, the first hunter ethics education brainstorming workshop was held in Fairbanks in September 2017. It brought together 22 representatives from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, University of Alaska-Fairbanks, and Tanana Chiefs Conference, as well as OSM and the Council participants.

The meeting was the first step in building a stakeholder consensus. The participants of the meeting shared their knowledge and experience regarding user conflict situations in the Eastern Interior region and brainstormed on areas for finding common ground and creative ideas for effective delivery of hunter outreach information to all user groups.

The participants of the facilitated workshop stressed the importance of building partnerships across different user groups and the cultural sensitivity needs to go both ways, which will create a better path to build cultural understanding. It was specifically noted that in Alaska user conflicts cannot be solved just by using regulations, it needs to be addressed by the way of human to human interaction and that it's important to think outside of the box to find creative ways to foster partnerships. The ideas presented at the meeting laid a foundation for developing a draft hunter education outreach strategy that will share different perspectives, cultural, traditions and share values and provide resources for hunters to get more information and encourage interest and volunteer participation in education programs.

The workshop participants worked in groups and developed three pilot project concepts.
The three concepts that were developed, I will talk more about them in a little bit.

The first concept was local community liaison, it was a target hunter outreach program.

The other one was Don't Be That Hunter, a campaign to establish proper hunting ethics within a target group.

And a larger, statewide, public outreach campaign, which the participants called, Hunt With Heart, It's The Alaskan Way.

And you can find the results of the September 2017 workshop in a report, which is in supplement six of your Board meeting books.

During the winter 2018 meeting, 20 people participated in the roundtable discussion at the meeting at the request of the RAC Chair. The Yukon Flats National Wildlife Refuge reported on making steps towards implementation of concept two, the local community liaison. They partnered with CATG and actually hired a local community liaison for one season. The Council members made suggestions towards improving all three pilot project concepts.

We were able to secure additional funds to hold a second workshop in October 2018. The second workshop was necessary to seek cooperation and solicit input from a broader group of stakeholders. The results of this workshop are still being processed but I will be able to share with you a few highlights of this meeting.

This time around we were able to get together a much larger and more diverse group representing various user groups, which, besides Federal and State agencies, additionally included subsistence users from TCC region, Arctic Village, Northway, Nenana, Venetie, Manley and the Ahtna region, as well as hunter organizations, which included Alaska Wild Sheep Foundation, Alaska Outdoor Council and Alaska Safari Club International. We were also fortunate this time to have representatives from both Ft. Wainwright and Eielson Air Force Base.

The goals and objectives of the
workshop were to continue broader open dialogue to share perspectives and experiences on challenges related to hunter ethics and share current management approaches, including hunter education and outreach practices, further develop and build upon three pilot project concepts, form smaller working committees of partners to move project concepts forward.

For interactive dialogues, we used a new technology which was voting on line to answer the questions. Like you can see in this diagram, the participants of the workshop were asked, what does it mean for you to engage in harvesting activities or to recreate in the Eastern Interior, and that's the answers and the more people used one word, the bigger the font is.

So I would like to talk a little bit more details about the pilot project concepts.

The concept one, the local community liaison program is a targeted hunter outreach program. It intends to share community developed message about local hunting values and traditions to hunters arriving at an airport. The Ft. Yukon airport was specifically targeted. The community liaison would engage newly arrived non-local hunters in a conversation and would provide them with gift game bag imprinted with the key messages developed by the project partners with input from a community. This would help build awareness of local customs and traditions and mutual understanding before hunting activities begin, a followup visit with the liaison representative after the hunt would be offered for interested hunters.

This concept project could be replicated in many rural access airports.

And at the workshop the representative from Ft. Yukon that was hired as a local community liaison shared his work experience and he was the right man for the job, he was very engaging and entertaining so he was the right person to connect with hunters.

So the next concept that was originally called, Don't Be That Hunter, that would target hunter outreach -- targeted hunter outreach education program to teach the importance of mutual respect while hunting through building improved relationships between
military, local communities and the land. The campaign 
would focus on military hunters and provide information 
on different sets of values, perceptions of hunting 
space and local customs and tradition.

The participants of the workshop did 
not like the title, Don't Be That Hunter because they 
considered it to be negative, to have a negative tone 
to it. So they decided to change the title for this 
concept, Hunt Like An Alaskan.

So the third concept, hunt with heart, 
it's the Alaskan Way, that would be a statewide hunter 
education campaign. This campaign would be implemented 
via collective action, public, private community 
partnership to unify Alaskan hunters about shared 
values.

At the end of the workshop it became 
obvious that different parties were interested in 
different projects and it may be worth to explore each 
of them for implementation.

The recommendations that came out of 
the October 2018 workshop are:

To have teleconference meetings for 
each pilot project concept with the participants that 
were interested.

Identify working group participants 
that are ready to commit to work on a concept.

Identify a committee chair for each 
concept.

Identify resources that each group 
participant or their organization can leverage to 
complete the projects.

Many workshop participants volunteered 
to provide their technical expertise, knowledge, 
existing outreach and education resources and some 
organizational funding for the implementation of the 
projects. The Council's hunter ethics education 
outreach initiative was presented at the November 2018 
Annual Sportsmen Rendezvous which was hosted by the 
Safari Club International Alaska Chapter.
Then just recently right before the Eastern Interior meeting, which was in March, we had a chance to hold a small meeting of the group that was working on the Hunt like an Alaskan, building the relationship with the military personnel subcommittee. We had that in Fairbanks because a lot of the participants of this group are from Fairbanks, so it was really at no cost to the government and the participants from the Eastern Interior RAC already were there. What we got, we got a lot of interest from actually Ft. Wainwright and Eielson Air Force Base. They came to this meeting where we were trying to decide how we will move forward. So we only had a couple of hours so there's like no real outcome except a commitment from both Ft. Wainwright and Eielson Air Force Base that they want to work with us to develop this program.

Now, I would like to talk about an item which the Eastern Interior included in its 2018 annual report to the Board, and the Council, really, to move forward, they would like to have a clear understanding of the mechanisms on how this Council can form partnerships to advance the pilot project, and if there's any government policies or limitations associated with entering partnerships and receiving funding. The Council would also like to inquire if the Federal agencies, representatives of the Board, have any funding that can be directed towards implementing a pilot project, or projects. And the Council requests that the Board directs OSM to prepare a letter of support for the hunter ethics education outreach initiative that can be used when seeking partnerships.

So I hope to get some kind of feedback from this Board on these requests from the Council when we prepare the Board's reply to the Council's annual report.

But first I would like to end this presentation with the words from Aldo Leopold; a peculiar virtue in wildlife ethics is that the hunter only has no gallery to applaud or disapprove of his conduct, whatever he's asked, they're dictated by his own conscious, rather than by a mob of onlookers. It is difficult to exaggerate the importance of this fact.

Thank you, very much for your attention.
If you have any kind of questions or would like to say something I would be happy to hear it.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Katya, for the very thorough presentation and a lot of good work there. Thank you for continuing on with what we asked you to do and it seems it's been very well engaged and the concepts look pretty good, I mean as far as -- so hopefully we can look to support the one that will have the most far-reaching.

Is there any discussion or questions for Katya. We're not looking to approve anything at this point, I think we're still engaged in the process as far as moving forward, so identifying the people and what not. So, thank you.

Any questions.

Carol.

MS. DAMBERG: Through the Board. Thank you, Chair. This is Carol Damberg, I'm the InterAgency Staff Committee member for the Fish and Wildlife Service filling in for our Board Director, Greg Siekaniec.

I just would like to comment that this is, to me, one of the most exciting projects that I have seen ongoing right now, and I really commend the work that's being done by Katya and all of the folks. We've got multiple folks involved with this at our National Wildlife Refuges, and she had the long list of partnerships. And, you know, I just really think this speaks to so much of what I've kind of heard today from our public about needing more communication and building trust and getting information out there. And so I just really, really strongly applaud this whole initiative and think it's extremely -- extremely important for us to continue with.

Thanks to all of you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I was just wondering if the Board has any kind of comments they would like to add -- that we would add to the Board reply to the Council's request that they put into their annual report from 2018. And you have what they were asking on the screens in front of you.

(Pause)

MS. WESSELS: And if it's hard to read I can read it again, but.....

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No, I think we can see it. So you're, I guess, seeking direction from the Board here. I think the one thing I do see there is a letter of support for the continued efforts.....

MS. WESSELS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: .....is the primary request there.

Funding. Obviously we'd have to go through that process.

And then mutual understanding of what mechanisms we would have that we could inform our partners on the process that's unfolding and how that would be utilized by the public.

MS. WESSELS: Yes, correct. Because Council members, they are actually trying to be very proactive and they would like to go out and seek funding with other organizations, they just don't want other organizations to promise them funding and then they're constrained by some Federal rules or regulations on how they can utilize that funding.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay.

Carol, and then Tom.

MS. DAMBERG: Thank you, Chair. This is Carol Damberg again, speaking for the ISC, representing the Fish and Wildlife Service.

My question is, in terms of funding, what level of funding are you seeking for support at this time, do you have any specific levels of funding
that you're looking for?

MS. WESSELS: Well, it's really a rough estimate but the two project concepts, the smaller ones, one was like 25,000 a year, and the other one was 30. The larger statewide concept the ask is for 750 to 2 million, but we are not ready to work with this larger project concept, that will require a huge effort. We, at least, would like to proceed with one of the smaller concepts.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Tom.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yes, Katya, as you know, this is a volunteer effort and encouraging partnership effort. It's a little odd to write a letter to ourselves, so -- but in the encouragement, I think the Board has shown, you know, through their support of moving forward with, you know, part of the process and we take these baby steps, I think they've given the, you know, the green light from what you've expressed previously. So I'm really not sure where the letter of support, you know, to ourselves, doesn't seem to -- to quite jive.

MS. WESSELS: Well, I think the Council was asking for a letter just like a piece of paper, a letter, that says that, you know, the OSM or the Board supports, like a formal letter, basically that they can take with them when they're seeking partnerships.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Bert.

MR. FROST: I was going to say, it sounds like to me like the Council, the Eastern Interior RAC Council, right, is asking the Board to write them a letter just saying that we support this initiative so that when they get clear understanding that they can go out and look for money, and, to me, I guess that would be a solicitor question, can RACs accept money on behalf of, I don't know who, and then, you know, then they got to go find money. But to me those are the two questions, I think.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Ken.

MR. LORD: Yeah, actually I'm trying to research that question on the fly right now so I'm not ready to give an answer. Yeah.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Karen.

MS. LINNEL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. As a participant at some of these meetings, the letter of support would be good to whom it may concern in regards and in support of this hunter ethics effort, the hunter ethics education effort that can be used by the partners that participate in this workshop and planning effort that we can, as partners, not just the Eastern Interior RAC seek funding but other organizations, the NGOs that can work to pull this effort together.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. I got it, I think I got a clear understanding of what the request is, and, you know, we do provide the Staff and the time and, you know, the forum, and so I think it would be outside of our purview here to write a letter of support to whom it may concern, that, through Staff and other OSM actions, that we completely support this hunter ethics program. I don't see why we wouldn't be able to just get a form letter to you in regards to your request to continue that outreach program and seek additional funding from alternative sources to meet the needs of this specific program that we support in concept.

So I think we should be able to do that if I don't hear any opposition here from the Board, to just maybe direct Staff to draft a letter of support that includes what I just stated.

Gene.

MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, Tony, just looking at the title the Eastern Interior Council FY2018 annual report, so there's one -- if everybody on the Board thought it was a good project, you know, or a good effort, I should say, I haven't heard anybody say it's not, then could not the Chair just sign a letter of support saying we support the outreach efforts to improve ethics for hunters, you know, along that lines, to -- since it came to us via an annual report, wouldn't the official response be when we respond to the Regional Advisory Council and -- well, I guess what I'm saying is are they wanting a response prior, because it was sent to the Board via their annual report, normally we have a report -- you know, a response to their report.
And the second thing is that with regard to funding. I think whether it'd be any of the individual agencies would want to look at more specifics because we usually don't say, yeah, we'll give you $20,000 to work on this, or 100,000 to work on this, we want to see specifics, how it's directly applicable to each and every one of our programs and if we have funding then we got to battle for that.

And in the situation of BIA, a majority of our funding is passed through our tribes, through compacts and contracts, and we have very little we retain.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, very much, Mr. Peltola. You're exactly right. Everything what you said, we can use it to prepare the annual report reply and that's what I was looking for. I was looking for the Board's contribution to the reply. Yeah, but we don't need any answer in advance.

Thank you.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, Katya, I just wanted to reiterate that and thank you, Gene, because he was reading my mind. Is that, again, it has to be part of our delegated process and part of the Board and also part of the RAC process, and it really is about the partnerships that will evolve out of it that are really -- you know, are -- we're part of it, but we're also part of the collective, so, again, the annual report process is the right mechanism at this point, and, again, some other clarities will need to come from the solicitor.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any other questions, concerns.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that presentation, I think we got somewhere. Appreciate all the effort out there.....

MS. WESSELS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: .....and the
continued support by the workgroups and, good job.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We're going to start to lose additional Council members here and one item we keep kicking around here is the schedule of upcoming Board meetings, and so if we can all take a look at that. I know if we doodle poll it or discuss it here today, or pull out our calendars, mainly the summer work session is probably a little hotter topic because that's coming up sooner than our April public meeting. So those are the two that we have.

So summer work session, I believe we all kind of stated sometime in August.

Gene.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, thank you. From my understanding there's a doodle poll that's done by OSM so we kind of have an idea of the dates we're going to go with for our summer work session. One thing I'd like to plant in all of our minds now, is that -- and that's the next topic about next year's meeting, is that, the 2010 Secretarial Review severely criticized the Federal Subsistence Board for not meeting outside of Anchorage in rural areas. The last and only time the Federal Subsistence Board met in a rural area was in conjunction with a Regional Advisory Council meeting to take up a specific topic and that meeting occurred in Southeast March 2012. So one thing, I'd like to plant a seed in all your minds is that I would like to see the Federal Subsistence Board ask OSM to look at rural locations which could facilitate a Federal Subsistence Board meeting, including facilities for the meeting, housing so we can meet in a rural area in our upcoming meeting.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You mean in August?

MR. PELTOLA: No, our next scheduled -- we had two on the schedule, the summer meeting and the April meeting.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, the following April public meeting.
MR. PELTOLA: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay.

MR. PELTOLA: That'd give OSM time to give the Board a list of potential meeting locations and then facilities, you know, the size that we may require to pull off a meeting. And so like, one, it gets towards the Secretarial review, we've heard a lot of people provide testimony to the Board that we fail to meet in rural areas, we're failing to meet outside Anchorage and this could be a first step in trying to address that.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thanks, Gene.

So do a doodle poll.

MR. DOOLITTLE: We will.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, I think we've discussed that so summer work session, April public meeting.

Jennifer.

MS. HARDIN: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, I believe we've set the August work session dates, and that's what I just wanted to get on the record here, is that, the August work session dates have been set for August 15th and August 16th in Anchorage at the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Regional Office, Gordon Watson Conference Room.

And also not on your agenda is that we will send a doodle poll out for the April meeting as you've already directed us, but also in January of 2020 we'll need to have a work session as well for the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program, the next funding cycle decisions.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. All right, that completes that. We'll move on to the highlights in the Partnership, the Partners Program for the Fisheries Monitoring and Alaska Native Science and Engineering Program, ANSEP.
Jared Stone.

MR. STONE: Good morning, Mr. Chair and Members of the Board. My name is Jared Stone. I'm a fisheries technician with the Office of Subsistence Management. And today I'll be providing you with an overview of our partnership with the Alaska Native Science and Engineering Program. And, additionally, I'll be providing you some of the highlights of our successes with the internship program for hiring rural Alaskan youth.

Each year the Office of Subsistence Management and ANSEP applies for grand funding through the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation and this is used to help build and support career development for rural Alaskans. This grant funding is used to pay for the recruiting, hiring, training, some of the salaries and scholarships for college, and hopefully be able to retain some of these students as we begin to build their interest in conservation.

During 2018 we hired a total of 17 students, 10 of which were Bridge students. Now, these Bridge students are students that are just graduating from high school and going into their first year of college. And this is a really great time for us to introduce them to the fields of biology and the Bridge students begin their eight week long internship here in Anchorage at ANSEP where they receive two weeks of Federal training and they get their Federal firearm training, their water egress training, the MOCC boat training and various other CPR and other first aide trainings. After that they meet with their mentors who are professional fisheries, wildlife and marine mammal biologists and by the end of their internships they return back to Anchorage and present posters about their internships and graduate from ANSEP's Bridge Program.

We brought in their posters from last summer for you to see and I highly recommend that you take some time today to see some of the really great internships that some of these students worked this last summer.

We also hired seven university students to work summer long internships. By this time the university students really begin to hone in on their
fields of study, whether it be fisheries or wildlife. Now, not all of these students worked with OSM or with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Some of the students worked with our partner biologist, with the Partners For Fisheries Monitoring Program and some of the other students also worked with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game on various Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program projects.

So if the students are successful in their internships and have met their criteria set forth by ANSEP they're eligible for scholarships to help them support their college.

So for this upcoming summer, we have secured funds to hire a total of four more Bridge students and six more university students. The internships this year include eider research on the Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge, brown bear habitat work on Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge, sea otter work with Marine Mammals Management in Kachemak Bay, genetic analysis of Dolly Varden and walrus tissue in the Conservation Genetics Laboratory, counting salmon on the Unalakleet River weir and nesting surveys in Utqiagvik.

This last slide, I wanted to introduce you all to the students who worked with us this last summer with their hometowns listed beside them.

And, with that, I'd like to thank you for your time today and I'd ask if you had any questions.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Jared. Thank you for that rewarding work. It seems like we're doing a lot of outreach and continuing to educate the next generation and hopefully that will start to bleed out into other communities and have a more informed public that can help us stay engaged in this process and bring a meaningful role to everybody out there in rural Alaska to help supply a good feed of information for us.

Thank you.

Any questions for Jared on the program.

Dave.
MR. SCHMID: Yes, Mr. Chair. Thank you for the presentation. So I spent well over 20 years in Alaska and went outside, and when I came back last year was introduced to this program and it's amazing, the Forest Service also participates as well in partnership through the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation and it is just a refreshing program and to see and meet some of the folks and interns that we've been working with as well throughout the Chugach and Tongass National Forest. So I just wanted to offer my appreciation as well.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Jared, appreciate it.

MR. STONE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: 2020-2023 Partners For Fisheries Monitoring Program.

MS. HYER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Council Members. My name is Karen Hyer and I work with the Office of Subsistence Management, and I administer the Partners for Fisheries Monitoring Program, and I have a very brief update for you.

At the end of last year we announced an opportunity for funding for the program, 2020-2023, that funding opportunity closed early this spring and the review panel met and reviewed the proposals and has made a recommendation and we are currently working through that recommendation now and have started the process but we don't have a final announcement yet as to who our new partners will be.

So once we have that done we'll put out a news announcement and it'll be on our website.

But that's all I have.

Any questions.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any questions for Karen.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Karen, appreciate it.
MS. HYER: All right, thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

That concludes the agenda as presented and agreed upon by all the Board members here.

The floor is open, I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

MR. PELTOLA: So moved.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion to adjourn, is there a second.

MR. FROST: Second.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion's been made and seconded. Any opposition to the motion to adjourn at this time.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, that concludes our Federal Subsistence Board meeting, and thank all of you for your participation.

Thank you very much.

(Applaud)

MR. DOOLITTLE: Way to go guys.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, way to go team. I feel like we're all a team now, students, communities, Staff, leaders, thank you all.

(Off record)

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)
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