

0402

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE BOARD

REGULATORY MEETING

VOLUME IV

TELECONFERENCE - ALASKA  
APRIL 15, 2022

MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Anthony Christianson, Chairman
- Charles Brower, Public Member
- Rhonda Pitka, Public Member
- Sara Boario, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Sarah Creachbaum, National Park Service
- Tom Heinlein, Bureau of Land Management
- Gene Peltola, Bureau of Indian Affairs
- David Schmid, U.S. Forest Service

Ken Lord, Solicitor's Office

Recorded and transcribed by:  
Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC  
329 F Street, Suite 222  
Anchorage, AK 99501  
907-227-5312; sahile@gci.net

0403

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Teleconference - 4/15/2022)

(On record)

MS. DETWILER: And I want to confirm, Tina, the court reporter is on and is recording this.

REPORTER: I am on, Sue, and, yes.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Tina. So this is Sue Detwiler. This is Day 4 of the Federal Subsistence Board's regulatory meeting for the 2022 to '24 wildlife regulatory meeting and I'm going to start with a roll call to see which Board members we have on.

National Park Service, Sarah Creachbaum.

MS. CREACHBAUM: Good morning, this is Sarah, I'm present.

MS. DETWILER: Good morning, Sarah.

BLM, Thomas Heinlein.

MR. HEINLEIN: Good morning, this is Tom.

MS. DETWILER: Good morning, Tom.

Fish and Wildlife Service, Sara Boario.

MS. KLEIN: Good morning, Sue, this is Jill Klein. And I'll be on for Sara Boario for the beginning of the meeting this morning, she will join when she's done with her meeting, most likely mid-morning.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you, Jill.

Forest Service, Dave Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: Good morning, Sue. Dave's here from sunny Juneau.

MS. DETWILER: Thanks, Dave.

0404

1 BIA, Gene Peltola.

2

3 MR. PELTOLA: Good morning, all, BIA is  
4 on.

5

6 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

7

8 Public Member Rhonda -- oh, actually I  
9 think Rhonda Pitka is not able to make it but I will  
10 call Public Member Rhonda Pitka are you on by chance.

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 MS. DETWILER: Public Member Charlie  
15 Brower.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 MS. DETWILER: And Chair Anthony  
20 Christianson.

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 MS. DETWILER: So we're waiting for the  
25 Chair and Public Member Brower. We have five members  
26 on so let's just hold on and wait for Tony to come on.

27

28 (Pause)

29

30 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hello, anybody  
31 there?

32

33 MS. DETWILER: Tony, this is Sue  
34 Detwiler, yes, glad you're on. We just finished  
35 completing a roll call, yeah, and actually I neglected  
36 to see who else was on the line, Liaisons to the Board.  
37 But we have five members -- five Board members present.  
38 Rhonda Pitka is not going to be on the call today, I  
39 understand. We're still waiting for Charlie Brower to  
40 sign on, and you just joined us, so we have six out of  
41 eight of -- members now, so we have a quorum. And my  
42 mistake I had neglected to go through the rest of the  
43 roll call to see who the other folks were on this  
44 meeting so if you'd like me to go ahead and do that I  
45 will, Mr. Chair, I will or just have them just maybe --  
46 maybe not go through that, either way.

47

48 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the  
49 floor, Sue, go ahead and see who's on today and then  
50

0405

1 we'll go ahead and get started with the business this  
2 morning.

3

4 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you. Okay,  
5 so moving on to legal Counsel, Department of Interior,  
6 Regional Solicitor's Office, Ken Lord.

7

8 MR. LORD: Good morning.

9

10 MS. DETWILER: Good morning, Ken.

11

12 USDA's Office of General Counsel, Jim  
13 Ustasiewski.

14

15 (No comments)

16

17 MS. DETWILER: Liaisons to the Board.  
18 Department of Fish and Game, Ben Mulligan or Mark  
19 Burch.

20

21 MR. MULLIGAN: Good morning, Sue. I  
22 know I am on and so is Mark.

23

24 MS. DETWILER: Great.

25

26 And okay -- and moving to the Regional  
27 Advisory Council Chairs. Region 1, Southeast, Don  
28 Hernandez.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 MS. DETWILER: Region 2, Southcentral,  
33 Gloria Stickwan.

34

35 MS. STICKWAN: Good morning, I'm here.

36

37 MS. DETWILER: Good morning, Gloria.

38

39 Region 2, Kodiak/Aleutians, Della

40 Trumble.

41

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

43

44 MS. DETWILER: Bristol Bay Nanci Morris

45 Lyon.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 MS. DETWILER: YKDelta, Raymond Oney.

50

0406

1 MS. PATTON: Good morning, Sue, this is  
2 Eva and I'll be speaking on behalf of Chairman Raymond  
3 Oney if anything comes up for YKDelta. Thank you.

4  
5 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

6  
7 Region 6, Jack Reakoff.

8  
9 MR. REAKOFF: Jack Reakoff's here, good  
10 morning.

11  
12 MS. DETWILER: Good morning.

13  
14 Region 7, Seward Peninsula, Louis Green  
15 or Neesa.

16  
17 MS. PILCHER: Yes, good morning, Sue.  
18 Yes, Neesa Pilcher here for Chairman Green.

19  
20 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

21  
22 Region 8, Northwest Arctic, Thomas  
23 Baker.

24  
25 MS. MCDAVID: Good morning, Sue. This  
26 is Brooke McDavid, the Council Coordinator for  
27 Northwest Arctic. Chairman Baker will not be available  
28 today so I will be presenting instead.

29  
30 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you, Brooke.

31  
32 Region 9, Eastern Interior, Sue

33 Entsminger.

34  
35 MS. ENTSMINGER: Yes, I'm here, good  
36 morning.

37  
38 MS. DETWILER: Good morning, Sue.

39  
40 Region 10, North Slope Borough, Gordon

41 Brower.

42  
43 MS. PATTON: Good morning, Sue. Gordon  
44 Brower, North Slope Subsistence Regional Advisory  
45 Council Chair will not be on today so I will be  
46 providing the Council's recommendation on the special  
47 action.

48  
49 Thank you.

50

0407

1 MS. DETWILER: Okay. Thank you, Mr.  
2 Chair. Mr. Chair, yes, so back to you.

3  
4 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue.  
5 Good morning everybody. So we'll go ahead and get  
6 started with the order of business this morning and  
7 we'll go ahead and open up the floor for non-consensus  
8 agenda items. So this is an opportunity at the start  
9 of the day for the public to talk to items or subjects  
10 that may not be listed on the agenda that are  
11 important.

12  
13 So we'll go ahead, Operator, and open  
14 up the floor for any public that wants to speak to non-  
15 agenda items. Thank you.

16  
17 OPERATOR: Thank you. To ask a  
18 question, please press star, one. Please make sure  
19 that your phone is unmuted and record your name clearly  
20 when prompted and to withdraw your request please press  
21 star, two.

22  
23 (Pause)

24  
25 OPERATOR: We have a question or  
26 comment from Jill, your line is open.

27  
28 MS. WEITZ: Thank you, can you hear me  
29 okay?

30  
31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have  
32 the floor.

33  
34 MS. WEITZ: Great. Good morning, Mr.  
35 Chair and members of the Board, and many thanks for  
36 your time. My name is Jill Weitz and I currently serve  
37 as the Director of Salmon Beyond Borders here in (In  
38 Native) Juneau Alaska.

39  
40 Salmon Beyond Borders is a community  
41 driven campaign that works to defend the transboundary  
42 salmon rivers that originate in Northwest British  
43 Columbia and spill out into Southeast Alaska. These  
44 rivers, the Taku, Stikine, and Unuk Rivers are the  
45 largest salmon producing rivers historically producing  
46 80 percent of our region's king salmon. Across the  
47 international border, BC has more than a dozen  
48 industrial projects in varying stages from the  
49 abandoned and polluting (Indiscernible) Chief Mine in  
50

0408

1 the Taku River water shed to the operating large scale  
2 open pit Red Chris Mine in the Stikine River water  
3 shed, to the permitted KSM Mine, which would be the  
4 largest open pit mine in North America -- one of the  
5 largest open pit mines in North America and in the  
6 world if built as proposed. The majority of these  
7 projects are gold mines with earth and tailings dams  
8 and require water treatment in perpetuity. With salmon  
9 populations declining throughout the state and these  
10 rivers, now, with kings listed by ADF&G as stocks of  
11 concern it is important that we do everything we can to  
12 ensure that the spawning and rearing habitats of these  
13 fish remains intact and productive for generations to  
14 come.

15  
16 Southeast Alaskans, led by tribes  
17 throughout Southeast Alaska, have, for years been  
18 calling for elevated Federal engagement as it relates  
19 to this international issue. This issue is currently  
20 managed by a non-binding memorandum of understanding  
21 between British Columbia and the State of Alaska and  
22 effectively Alaskans have been calling for binding and  
23 enforceable protections to not only ensure our salmon  
24 water sheds remain healthy and productive but that  
25 Alaskans have accountability should catastrophic events  
26 from tailings dam failure occur or cumulative impacts  
27 from multiple open pit projects in these very  
28 significant water sheds continue to be developed as the  
29 BC mining industry has identified this region as the  
30 Golden Triangle.

31  
32 As I mentioned the memorandum of  
33 understanding, it doesn't work, it's not binding, it's  
34 not funded, it does not allow for Southeast Alaska  
35 tribes, or Alaska tribes to have a seat at the table in  
36 determining how these water sheds are managed and, of  
37 course, on the U.S. side of these water sheds we have  
38 Federally-protected areas, such as Misty Fjords  
39 National Monument, which is 19 miles from the  
40 international border where the KSM Mine would be built.  
41 We have the Stikine/LeConte Wilderness area at the  
42 mouth of the Stikine where 80 percent of that water  
43 shed on its BC side has been staked with BC mining  
44 claims, and, of course, impacts to the Taku and the  
45 impacts to the Tongass are of great concern.

46  
47 We've identified roles for the Federal  
48 government and in over the course of the last decade  
49 there has been, with great support from the Alaska  
50

0409

1 Federal Delegation, to activate relevant Federal  
2 agencies to engage on this issue, not only with  
3 InterAgency cooperation but with coordination and  
4 collaboration across the international border, however,  
5 we have yet to get closer to obtaining these binding  
6 protections and really create opportunities and  
7 platforms for concerns from Alaskans to be heard and  
8 elevated and taken into consideration for developing  
9 these policies that will ensure that we have a seat at  
10 the table going forward.

11

12 Most recently, through the course of  
13 the last year, following a letter that the Southeast  
14 Alaska Indigenous Transboundary Commission sent to  
15 British Columbia requesting a pause in the permitting  
16 of new mines and expansion of existing mines until a  
17 formal consultation process is in place, many tribes  
18 throughout Southeast Alaska, as well as nine  
19 municipalities throughout Southeast Alaska have passed  
20 resolutions calling for a pause until international  
21 protections are in place as well as a permanent ban on  
22 tailings dams within these specific transboundary water  
23 sheds because of the risks that tailings dams pose to  
24 these water sheds at large.

25

26 I won't take up too much more of your  
27 time but I think it is incredibly important, of course,  
28 for relevant agencies, including the U.S. Forest  
29 Service, to increase their engagement with this issue  
30 especially as it relates to coordination with tribes in  
31 Southeast Alaska who have been working so hard to exert  
32 their sovereignty and garner a seat at the table in  
33 determining the management of these transboundary water  
34 sheds and the Southeast Alaska RAC has identified this  
35 issue as an important issue for our region's access to  
36 clean water and resources and I support those concerns  
37 and I support increased engagement from relevant  
38 departments and agencies within the Biden  
39 Administration and look forward to opportunities  
40 working in closure coordination with these agencies  
41 both here in Juneau and within our nation's capital.

42

43 I appreciate your time and I am happy  
44 to answer any questions if any members of the Board  
45 have any.

46

47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
48 Thank you for calling in this morning. Any questions  
49 from the Board.

50



0410

1 (No comments)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for presenting the information this morning and have a good day. Operator, is there anybody else who would like to be recognized at this time.

OPERATOR: No further questions or comments on the phone at this time.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. At this time we'll go ahead and open it up for any Board sharing or discussions this morning before we get started with the agenda.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing none, Sue, we'll go ahead and start where we left off yesterday. This morning we're going to pick up Wildlife Proposal WP22-36.

MS. DETWILER: Yes. That is the only remain -- that proposal is the only remaining item from the non-consensus agenda that was deferred from earlier this week to allow Staff to -- some time to work on the maps. I understand those maps are completed and they should be up on the website fairly soon. And I believe that we're ready to take that up and I'll turn it over to Lisa -- Lisa Grediagin.

MS. GREDIAGIN: Thank you, Sue and Mr. Chair. This is Lisa Grediagin, Wildlife Division Supervisor with OSM, for the record.

And just to recap a little bit on where we're at with Wildlife Proposal 22-36, this proposal was submitted by the Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission and requests modifications to community harvest systems for moose and caribou in Units 11, 12 and 13.

On Wednesday afternoon we heard the -- Pippa, the analyst, give the presentation for this analysis and covered the written public comments and then we were taking public testimony when we heard from AITRC about a proposed area for the community harvest systems in Unit 12 and then the Board decided to table this proposal to allow time for everyone to review that

0411

1 area. Staff created maps and distributed that to Board  
2 members. And as Sue mentioned, we're currently in the  
3 process of posting that map to the OSM website so that,  
4 you know, anyone from the public is able to access that  
5 map as well. Again, we can pick back up with that  
6 proposal process with asking for any additional public  
7 testimony unless the Board has, you know, any other  
8 questions or clarifications on this proposal or where  
9 we're at in the process.

10

11 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

12

13 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
14 questions for Staff.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Sue, we didn't  
19 get through the public testimony on this proposal.

20

21 MS. DETWILER: I will defer to Lisa on  
22 that. I think she said we were in the midst of public  
23 testimony.

24

25 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, thank you, Mr.  
26 Chair. This is Lisa. And we were taking public  
27 testimony when the Board decided to table this proposal  
28 so my recommendation is to ask if there's any  
29 additional public testimony on this proposal before  
30 moving on to the next step in the process.

31

32 Thank you.

33

34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, that's  
35 where I'm at just making sure we're on track to do the  
36 same here. So if there's any other public testimony  
37 this would be your time to speak to this and so we'll  
38 go ahead and open up the floor. Operator, if anybody  
39 would like to speak to this agenda item this is their  
40 opportunity. Thank you.

41

42 OPERATOR: As a reminder, to make a  
43 comment or give a testimony please press star, one.

44

45 (Pause)

46

47 OPERATOR: First question or comment  
48 comes from Bruce, your line is open.

49

50

0412

1 MR. ERVIN: Hi, good morning, can you  
2 hear me okay.

3  
4 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have  
5 the floor.

6  
7 MR. ERVIN: Hi, thank you, Chair.  
8 Board Members. I just wanted to say that I support  
9 Karen Linnell and AITRC on WP22-36.

10

11 And I was wondering, if possible, you  
12 know, would it be -- could we work out, maybe, an  
13 additional map to maybe acknowledge the Upper Tanana  
14 Dena' Traditional Territories, the boundaries of them.  
15 Maybe like a little supplemental map, or maybe just to  
16 put it on the record. I can email that to you guys if  
17 you want, I found a couple documents and so just to --  
18 just to summarize, I support Karen Linnell and AITRC  
19 with WP22-36.

20

21 Thank you.

22

23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
24 questions for the caller.

25

26 (No comments)

27

28 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
29 Operator, if there's anybody else in the cue we'll  
30 recognize them now.

31

32 OPERATOR: The next question or comment  
33 comes from Donna, your line is open.

34

35 MS. WILSON: Yes, hello, this is Donna  
36 Wilson. Thank you for recognizing me Chair. I have  
37 some comments to make in regards to this initially  
38 proposed 220 -- Proposal 224 with the Fish and Game has  
39 come -- has already passed and it looks like there is  
40 some interesting confusion or overlay here with the  
41 Federal and State lands. However, it doesn't reflect  
42 the public comment from Fish and Game when they were  
43 deciding this in the proposal. So I might add this  
44 just because I don't know if it was even considered.

45

46 I agreed with everything in this well  
47 reasoned proposal for Unit 13, and I commend Tony  
48 Gillum for addressing this so eloquently. There's a  
49 number of problems with this hunt. If the reasons

50

0413

1 cited aren't enough to pass this I can add the  
2 following:

3  
4                   That particular hunt in Unit 13 is  
5 called CM -- well it's community moose hunt 300 and  
6 that is in the State regulations. I don't know about  
7 the other areas that they hunt, but I do know that this  
8 section along the Glenn Highway between Chickaloon and  
9 almost Glennallen, but it's a narrow section of highway  
10 that Unit 13 has access all along the highway, numerous  
11 trails go deep in but there are so many people on the  
12 road that hunt in their yard, et cetera, this being  
13 open here is decimated with the moose. There's  
14 generations of people that have been hunting in this  
15 area as a community but not with a permit and since  
16 this community moose permit thing has been allowed in  
17 13 there has been a number of people signing up and  
18 hunting this community subsistence harvest hunt, moose  
19 and caribou, I believe, along the highway here that  
20 don't live in the area, they qualify for subsistence  
21 but they don't -- do not live in the area and they are  
22 hunting for people that don't even reside in Alaska and  
23 if you look at the permits that they issued you'll see  
24 that the addresses aren't all Alaska. It opens before  
25 the regular harvest and any bull means by the time  
26 these hunting parties have driven the highway they've  
27 shot every bull within the narrow corridor of the  
28 northern mountains and Matanuska River, nothing's left.  
29 It's lined by highway -- the highway is lined by homes,  
30 property, private property, tribal lands and people  
31 living along the miles of inescapable road, for man or  
32 beast, with numerous historic trailheads between. They  
33 service hunters, hikers, miners, trappers, skiers, dog  
34 sledders and rural homesteaders, like myself, for  
35 generations from Chickaloon to Glennallen. Imagine the  
36 disappointment when watching a legal moose on your land  
37 for weeks waiting for regular harvest to open and  
38 suddenly shots from the highway and people walking  
39 through your fence hunting any moose in your yard.  
40 They already have the advantage of any bull, why do  
41 they have every bull and extra days to do it before  
42 anyone else can. It does not leave any legal ones,  
43 they shoot everything they see. They don't live in the  
44 game unit and some aren't even real residents or have  
45 ever hunted.

46  
47                   There has been some confrontations.  
48 It's hard to report a violation without some contact.  
49 It's never good when guns are involved. Some don't  
50

0414

1 want to show their permit, or just, you know, to  
2 anybody, so how do you police this. It's not working.  
3 This is the general feeling of those who live along the  
4 Glenn Highway. There's plenty of hunting for the  
5 regular season with resident harvest tag adopt -- I  
6 think you could either adopt that proposal, which was  
7 already I guess looked at by the State, but it does  
8 give me concern because a lot of people are using this  
9 that are not rural living people, they live in -- most  
10 of them live in the Valley or somewhere else but.....

11

12 (Teleconference interference -  
13 participants not muted)

14

15 MS. WILSON: It's possible that some  
16 people are, you know, hunting in their yard up there in  
17 Glennallen but this was for a Copper Basin hunt. And I  
18 don't know what could be done about it but maybe a  
19 regulation or something put in there that would exclude  
20 what is considered the Glacierview Community on the  
21 Glenn Highway or somehow put something in there to keep  
22 people from hunting in the community that they're not a  
23 part of. I'm not sure how that -- how that works or  
24 whether it's something that the Federal Subsistence  
25 Board can handle but I just think it was worth having  
26 that acknowledged, whether it comes from an individual  
27 like myself or the State or, you know, the Fish and  
28 Game. I think it is important to consider all these  
29 people that are affected by a broad hunt area that does  
30 overlap with State.

31

32 So thank you for hearing my comments  
33 and I'll sign off.

34

35 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for  
36 taking the time to call in today. Any questions from  
37 the Board.

38

39 (No comments)

40

41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I appreciate  
42 you taking the time to call in. Operator, we'll go  
43 ahead and move on to the next one in the cue. Thank  
44 you.

45

46 OPERATOR: Next question or comment  
47 comes from Karen, your line is open.

48

49 MS. LINNELL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

50

0415

1 For the record my name is Karen Linnell, Ahtna  
2 InterTribal Resource Commission. I'd like to say thank  
3 you to the Park Service for providing and getting on  
4 the -- the map done to the areas that we agreed on. I  
5 appreciate the detail that is included in it and that  
6 we can truly understand and see what's going on on the  
7 landscape there, so I appreciate that. And I just want  
8 to say that I appreciate the collaboration and the  
9 support. Thank you, Donna, for getting on the record,  
10 the influx of hunters that we see in GMU 13, both under  
11 State and Federal hunts. I just appreciate that.  
12 Being on the highway system is both a blessing and a  
13 curse. And so I just want to say thank you very much  
14 for all the work that went into getting this done and I  
15 hope the Board will pass this unanimously.

16

17 Thank you.

18

19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
20 Karen. Any questions from the Board.

21

22 MS. LINNELL: I'm sorry, it was Lisa  
23 that made the map, so thank you Lisa.

24

25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank you  
26 for that. All right, Operator, we'll go ahead and go  
27 on to the next in the cue.

28

29 OPERATOR: There are no further  
30 questions or comments in the cue at this time.

31

32 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
33 We'll go ahead and move on to Regional Advisory Council  
34 recommendation.

35

36 MS. ENTSMINGER: Yeah, this is Sue  
37 Entsminger, Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council.  
38 On WP22-36 we modified it and -- with the -- by OSM's  
39 addendum with further modification to revise the  
40 community harvest system hunt area. And I do want to  
41 say that I think Pippa did a very good job of defining  
42 how this all went about.

43

44 And the Council was mostly agreed with  
45 OSM's conclusion from all of it. There's several  
46 points in it. But thought, including the Tetlin Refuge  
47 and the Wrangell-St. Elias lands in the Ahtna  
48 Traditional Use Territory as unnecessary because those  
49 lands were very remote. Only accessible by airplane

50

0416

1 and would be utilized by anyone participating in a  
2 community harvest system. Additionally, Upper Tanana  
3 communities were concerned about the community harvest  
4 coming into their area.

5

6 This was discussed and the Tok River  
7 Bridge, on the Tok Cutoff as a northern boundary of the  
8 area better reflects the Ahtna Traditional Use  
9 Territory. I'm just reading what's in the book right  
10 now and I just want to say that this was a very  
11 confusing and I had talked with Karen Linnell and with  
12 Barbara Cellarius, she's actually the one that brought  
13 it to my attention about the maps, and the Nabesna Road  
14 missing on the maps to understand where we were on it  
15 and I really want to thank Barbara for bringing it to  
16 my attention and I want to say that we worked really  
17 well together with Karen and this new map, we would  
18 definitely -- I mean my Council and I probably got  
19 wrapped around the axle, and myself included, but we  
20 would definitely support this -- the hash-tagged area  
21 in the maps that's provided to you.

22

23 Thank you.

24

25 Sorry it took so long.

26

27 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue.  
28 Any questions for the Regional Advisory Council.

29

30 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, this is DeAnna,  
31 Coordinator for the Southcentral Regional Advisory  
32 Council. And I believe Gloria Stickwan is online and  
33 can provide you with the recommendation from that  
34 Council. Thank you.

35

36 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have  
37 the floor, Gloria.

38

39 MS. STICKWAN: Council supported WP20-  
40 36 with modification to insert additional language to  
41 include only those portions of Unit 12 that lie within  
42 the Ahtna Traditional Use Territory. This proposal is  
43 beneficial to subsistence users as it provides for  
44 customary and traditional use of resources in Unit 11,  
45 13 and the Ahtna Traditional Territory within Unit 12.

46

47 Thank you.

48

49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,

50

0417

1 Gloria. Any questions for Gloria.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,  
6 hearing none, we'll go ahead and move on to Tribal  
7 Liaison comments.

8

9 MS. LAVINE: Good morning, Mr. Chair.  
10 This is Robbin LaVine standing in for Tribal Liaison  
11 Orville Lind. There were no comments or  
12 recommendations during the consultation on this  
13 proposal.

14

15 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16

17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
18 We'll go ahead and move on to our Federal Liaison.

19

20 MR. MULLIGAN: Good morning, Mr. Chair.  
21 For the record, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
22 kind of parsed out aspects of this proposal and so I'll  
23 have a few statements on this one.

24

25 First is, the Department supports  
26 allowing community members to opt out of a community  
27 harvest system and retain their individual harvest  
28 limits. We viewed that as something as a fairness and  
29 having someone be stuck into one system seemed  
30 unnecessary. I'll at this time also put a pitch in for  
31 not -- we wouldn't recommend that quotas or bag limits  
32 be set based on number of participating hunters in any  
33 Federal or State harvest, rather quotas and bag limits  
34 should be based on the status of the available resource  
35 and the harvestable surplus based on biological  
36 metrics.

37

38 Next.

39

40 The Department took no position on  
41 defining the geographic boundaries of eligible  
42 communities as the most recent CDP established by the  
43 U.S. Census Bureau.

44

45 And then, third, you know, is we've  
46 testified previously on WP22-01 and 02. You know we  
47 have expressed our concerns over the timeliness and  
48 accuracy of data that will be collected but, you know,  
49 on Wednesday when we took this up and the first time  
50



0418

1 Ms. Linnell, from AITRC, testified she -- we heard loud  
2 and clear the importance of that data to them and also  
3 to us as managers and so we appreciate that statement.

4

5 And I will end our testimony there.

6

7 Thank you, sir.

8

9 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
10 State. Any questions for Ben.

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,  
15 hearing none, ISC recommendations.

16

17 MS. LAVINE: Good morning, Mr. Chair  
18 and members of the Board. This is Robbin LaVine,  
19 Subsistence Policy Coordinator and the InterAgency  
20 Staff Committee Chair. For Wildlife Proposal 22-36 the  
21 InterAgency Staff Committee provided the standard  
22 comment.

23

24 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

25

26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, ISC.  
27 Any Board discussion or deliberation.

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,  
32 open the floor for Board action.

33

34 MS. CREACHBAUM: Mr. Chair, National  
35 Park Service. Mr. Chair, I move to approve Wildlife  
36 Proposal 22-36 to codify temporary regulations that  
37 expire June 30th, 2022 regarding the community harvest  
38 system for moose and caribou in Units 11, 12 and 13  
39 with the OSM modification to clarify regulatory  
40 language, and with a second modification describing the  
41 area for the community harvest system in Unit 12 that  
42 better reflects that Ahtna Traditional Territory  
43 instead of all Federal public lands in Unit 12. With  
44 respect to the harvest system area in Unit 12, my  
45 modification includes the Eastern Interior Regional  
46 Advisory Council recommendation for lands along the Tok  
47 Cutoff plus an additional area of Unit 12 that is based  
48 on existing moose harvest areas in Federal regulations.

49

50



0420

1 MS. CREACHBAUM: The National Park  
2 supports the motion.

3  
4 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

5  
6 Fish and Wildlife Service, Sara Boario.

7  
8 MS. KLEIN: This is Jill Klein for Sara  
9 Boario and Fish and Wildlife Service supports the  
10 motion.

11  
12 MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Jill.

13  
14 BIA, Gene Peltola.

15  
16 MR. PELTOLA: BIA supports.

17  
18 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

19  
20 Tom Heinlein, BLM.

21  
22 MR. HEINLEIN: BLM supports.

23  
24 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

25  
26 Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

27  
28 MR. SCHMID: The Forest Service

29 supports.

30  
31 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

32  
33 Public Member Rhonda Pitk -- oh, I'm  
34 sorry, Rhonda is not on today. I understand Public  
35 Member Charlie Brower is with us now, Charlie, are you  
36 on.

37  
38 MR. BROWER: Yeah, I'm on. I've been  
39 on. I support.

40  
41 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you,  
42 Charlie.

43  
44 Chair Christianson.

45  
46 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support.

47  
48 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. The motion  
49 passes with seven votes.

50

0421

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue.  
2 And I think that concludes our non-consensus agenda  
3 items and as a matter of process I believe we now have  
4 to accept the consensus agenda items, Sue.

5  
6 MS. DETWILER: Yes. Yes. And Lisa  
7 Grediagin will be presenting the consensus agenda.

8  
9 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,  
10 we'll go ahead.

11  
12 MS. GREDIAGIN: All right, thank you,  
13 Mr. Chair. This is Lisa Grediagin, the Wildlife  
14 Division Supervisor at OSM. I'll be reading all the  
15 consensus agenda proposals and closure reviews along  
16 with their recommendations into the record.

17  
18 These are the proposals and closure  
19 reviews for which there is agreement among the Federal  
20 Subsistence Regional Advisory Councils, the Federal  
21 InterAgency Staff Committee and the Alaska Department  
22 of Fish and Game concerning Board action. The  
23 following are the consensus agenda proposals and  
24 closure reviews.

25  
26 Proposal WP22-05 requests the  
27 establishment of a draw permit hunt for elk in the  
28 Etolin Island area of Unit 3 with one permit issued per  
29 household. The recommendation is to oppose.

30  
31 Proposal WP22-06 requests the  
32 establishment of a Federal draw permit moose hunt with  
33 an any bull harvest limit and a harvest quota of up to  
34 20 bulls on Kupreanof and Kuiu Island in Unit 3. The  
35 recommendation is to oppose.

36  
37 Proposal 22-09 requests that Federal  
38 public lands draining into Lisianski Inlet and  
39 Lisianski Strait and Stag Bay south of the latitude of  
40 Mike Cove and north of the latitude of Lost Cove be  
41 closed to deer hunting October 15th to December 31st  
42 except by Federally-qualified subsistence users. The  
43 recommendation is to oppose.

44  
45 Proposal 22-11 requests that Federal  
46 regulation for mountain goats in Units 5A remainder be  
47 changed to remove the following language: A minimum of  
48 four goats in the harvest quota will be reserved for  
49 Federally-qualified subsistence users. The  
50

0422

1 recommendation is to support with the OSM modification  
2 to remove the language describing an announcement of  
3 the quota from unit-specific regulations and  
4 maintaining the delegation of authority letter only.

5

6 Wildlife Closure Review, WCR22-02  
7 review the closure to moose hunting from October 8th to  
8 October 12th west of the Dangerous River and September  
9 16th to September 30th east of the Dangerous River in  
10 Unit 5A except by residents of Unit 5A. The  
11 recommendation is to maintain status quo.

12

13 Proposal WP22-13 requests that deer be  
14 removed from the Unit 6 specific designated hunter  
15 regulation. The recommendation is to oppose.

16

17 Proposal WP22-14 requests that the  
18 black bear harvest limit in Unit 6 be increased from  
19 one to two black bears per year and that the Unit 6D  
20 season would close if the harvest quota was met. The  
21 recommendation is to oppose.

22

23 Proposal WP22-15 requests prohibiting  
24 trap or snare usage within 1,000 feet of specified  
25 trails, roadways and campgrounds. The recommendation  
26 is to oppose.

27

28 Proposal WP22-16 requests that the  
29 Federal Subsistence Board recognize the customary and  
30 traditional use of moose in Unit 7, 15A and 15B by  
31 residents of Moose Pass. The recommendation is to  
32 support.

33

34 Proposals WP22-17, 22-18 and 22-19  
35 requests the Board recognize the customary and  
36 traditional use of moose in Units 7, 15A, and 15B and  
37 15C respectively by residents of Moose Pass. The  
38 recommendation is to support. The recommendation for  
39 WP22-17 and 18 -- oh, I'm sorry.

40

41 The recommendation for WP22-17 and 18  
42 is to support. The recommendation for WP22-19 is to  
43 oppose.

44

45 Proposals WP22-21 and 22-22 requests  
46 that the Board recognize the customary and traditional  
47 use of caribou in Unit 7, and 15B and 15C respectively  
48 by residents of Moose Pass. The recommendation for  
49 WP22-21 is to support. The recommendation for WP22-22

50

0423

1 is to support with modification to remove Unit 15C.

2

3

4                   Proposals WP22-23 and 22-24 requests  
5 that the Board recognize the customary and traditional  
6 use of goats in Unit 7 remainder and Unit 15  
7 respectively by residents of Moose Pass. The  
8 recommendation is to support WP22-23 and to support  
9 WP22-24 with modification to remove Unit 15C.

9

10                   Proposal WP22-26(a) requests that the  
11 Board recognize the customary and traditional uses of  
12 sheep in Unit 7 by residents of Moose Pass. The  
13 recommendation is to support.

14

15                   Proposal WP22-25(a) requests that the  
16 Board recognize the customary and traditional use of  
17 sheep in Unit 7 by residents of Cooper Landing. The  
18 recommendation is to support.

19

20                   Proposal WP22-27 requests that the  
21 Board recognize the customary and traditional use of  
22 sheep in Unit 15 by residents of Cooper Landing. The  
23 recommendation is to support with modification to only  
24 establish customary and traditional use of sheep for  
25 Cooper Landing in Unit 15A and 15B and not in Unit 15C.

26

27                   Proposal WP22-32 requests the Federal  
28 Subsistence Board to recognize customary and  
29 traditional uses by rural residents of the North Fork  
30 Road area and the Nikolaevsk area for black bears,  
31 brown bears, caribou, mountain goat, moose and dall  
32 sheep in Unit 15. The recommendation is to oppose.

33

34                   Proposal WP22-33 requests eliminating  
35 the sealing requirement for black bear in Units 11 and  
36 12. The recommendation is to support.

37

38                   Proposal WP22-34 requests to change the  
39 salvage requirement to a bone-in for sheep taken in  
40 Units 11 and 12. The recommendation is to oppose.

41

42                   Proposal WP22-37 requests that the  
43 Federal Subsistence Board recognize the customary and  
44 traditional use of ptarmigan in Unit 9D by residents of  
45 Cold Bay, King Cove, Sand Point, Belkofski, Sanak,  
46 Pauloff Harbor, Unga and Nelson Lagoon. The  
47 recommendation is to support with the OSM modification  
48 to recognize the customary and traditional use of  
49 ptarmigan by residents of Unit 9D.

50

0424

1                   Proposal WP22-38(a) requests that the  
2 Federal Subsistence Board recognize the customary and  
3 traditional use of caribou in Unit 10 Unimak Island for  
4 residents of Cold Bay and Nelson Lagoon. The  
5 recommendation is to support.

6  
7                   Wildlife Proposal WP22-38(b) requests  
8 closure of State public lands in Unit 10 Unimak Island  
9 only to caribou hunting except by Federally-qualified  
10 subsistence users unless the caribou population  
11 estimate exceeds the population threshold. The  
12 recommendation is to support with modification to  
13 remove the closure from the unit-specific regulations  
14 and delegate authority to the Izembek National Wildlife  
15 Refuge Manager to open and close State public lands to  
16 non-Federally-qualified users annually based on the  
17 current population status of the Unimak Caribou Herd in  
18 consultation with ADF&G Staff via delegation of  
19 authority letter only.

20  
21                   Wildlife Closure Review WCR22-07  
22 reviews the closure to caribou hunting except by  
23 Federally-qualified subsistence users unless the  
24 population estimate exceeds 900 caribou in Unit 17.  
25 Specifically Unit 17A and 17C, that portion of 17A and  
26 17C consisting of the Nushagak Peninsula south of the  
27 Igushik River, Tuklung River and Tuklung Hills west to  
28 Tvativak Bay. The recommendation is to maintain status  
29 quo.

30  
31                   (Teleconference interference -  
32 participants not muted)

33  
34                   MS. GREDIAGIN: Proposal WP22-42  
35 requests the Federal Subsistence Board increase the  
36 harvest limit of moose from two to three in Unit 18  
37 remainder. The recommendation is to support.

38  
39                   Proposal WP22-43 requests delegating  
40 authority to the Federal in-season manager to increase  
41 the moose harvest quota in Zone 1 of the Kuskokwim hunt  
42 area of Unit 18 if the water levels are too low to  
43 access Zone 2. The recommendation is to oppose.

44  
45                   Proposal WP22-48 requests modification  
46 of the boundary between two hunt areas in Unit 22A.  
47 The recommendation is to support.

48  
49                   Wildlife Closure Review WCR22-09(c)

50

0425

1 reviews the closure to moose hunting in Unit 22A  
2 remainder, except by Federally-qualified subsistence  
3 users. The recommendation is to maintain status quo.

4  
5 Wildlife Closure Review WCR22-16  
6 reviews the closure to moose hunting in Unit 22E except  
7 by Federally-qualified subsistence users. The  
8 recommendation is to maintain status quo.

9  
10 Wildlife Closure Review WCR22-27  
11 reviews the closure to muskox in Unit 23 Cape  
12 Krusenstern National Monument except by Federally-  
13 qualified subsistence users but not residents of Point  
14 Hope. The recommendation is to modify or eliminate the  
15 closure as recommended by OSM.

16  
17 Proposal WP22-51 requests elimination  
18 of the Minto Flats Management Area registration hunt  
19 for moose in 20B. The recommendation is to support.

20  
21 Proposal WP22-52 requests that the  
22 closing date of the moose season in 25A be extended to  
23 December 20th. The recommendation is to support with  
24 modification to extend the moose season in the Coleen,  
25 Firth and Old Crow River drainages only.

26  
27 Proposal WP22-53 requests establishing  
28 a trapping season for Arctic fox in Unit 25. The  
29 recommendation is to support.

30  
31 Wildlife Closure Review WCR22-22  
32 reviews the closure of moose hunting in Unit 25D west  
33 to everyone except residents of Unit 25D west. The  
34 recommendation is to maintain status quo.

35  
36 Wildlife Closure Review WCR22-25  
37 reviews the closure to Federal public lands for hunting  
38 muskox in Units 26C except by rural Alaska residents  
39 from the village of Kaktovik. The recommendation is to  
40 maintain status quo.

41  
42 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

43  
44 That concludes the consensus agenda  
45 proposals and closure reviews.

46  
47 And I'd also like to take this  
48 opportunity to commend all the analysts for their great  
49 work analyzing the proposals as well as all the OSM  
50



0426

1 Staff and Council members and everyone that contributed  
2 to this meeting. I think we're all pretty frustrated  
3 with the teleconference format and looking forward to  
4 meeting in person again but besides all the technical  
5 and communication challenges I think this was a pretty  
6 successful meeting so far and, again, thank you  
7 everyone for all the work contributed to this meeting.

8

9 So I'll turn it back over to you, Mr.  
10 Chair, thank you.

11

12 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
13 Lisa. And I echo everything that you said there, I  
14 appreciate all of the patience from everybody online  
15 for this and all the Staff work and being available to  
16 answer the questions and then to work through issues as  
17 they arise as the meeting happens and to be able to  
18 come back and pull together packages that gives us  
19 enough information to do our job, I appreciate that  
20 from the Staff and all the Regional Advisory Council  
21 members that give us the insight on these proposals and  
22 the background. So just appreciate everybody that  
23 pulls together, the collective work that it takes for  
24 us to decide on these proposals. So thank you, Lisa,  
25 and the Staff and Sue.

26

27 So we'll go ahead, and I believe that  
28 opens up the floor for Board action on consensus  
29 agenda.

30

31 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

32

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

35

36 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
37 The Bureau of Indian Affairs moves to adopt the  
38 consensus agenda as presented.

39

40 MR. SCHMID: The Forest Service will  
41 second.

42

43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So we have a  
44 motion on the floor and seconded to accept. Any  
45 discussion by the Board.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the

50

0427

1 question.

2

3

MR. SCHMID: Question.

4

5

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All in favor to accept the consensus agenda signify by saying aye.

6

7

8

IN UNISON: Aye.

9

10

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Opposed, same sign.

11

12

13

(No opposing votes)

14

15

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion carries unanimously. Thank you.

16

17

18

MS. DETWILER: Mr. Chair, this is Sue Detwiler. That brings us to agenda item 8, which is Wildlife Special Action WSA22-01 pertaining to Unit 22 and 23 muskox. This is an action item and that presenter will be Brian Ubelaker.

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. UBELAKER: Thank you, Sue. Good morning, Mr. Chair and Members of the Board. Can everybody hear me all right?

25

26

27

28

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have the floor.

29

30

31

MR. UBELAKER: Great, thank you. As Sue said, and for the record my name is Brian Ubelaker and I'm a Wildlife Biologist with the Office of Subsistence Management. I'll be presenting a summary of Temporary Wildlife Special Action WSA22-01 which was submitted by the National Park Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

This special action has been separated into two parts, WSA22-01(a) pertaining to the Seward Peninsula muskox in Units 22 and 23 and WSA22-01(b) for northern Unit 23 Cape Thompson muskoxen. However, I will summarize both parts in my presentation. This analysis is found in your supplemental materials.

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

Temporary Special Action WSA22-01 requests the Federal Subsistence Board change the Federal muskox permits in Units 22 and 23 from a registration to a drawing permit for the 2022/24

47

48

49

50

1 regulatory cycle. This is considered a housekeeping  
2 requests as these permits have been distributed via a  
3 draw since about 1998. In addition the proponents  
4 request to standardize the language in the delegation  
5 of authority letters and to change the in-season  
6 manager from the Western Arctic National ParkLand  
7 superintendent to the Anchorage Field Office manager  
8 for the Federal muskox hunts in the southwestern  
9 portion of Unit 23.

10

11 Both muskox populations have been  
12 managed under a shared quota system with the State of  
13 Alaska since 1998. ADF&G has mostly issued permits  
14 under Tier II restrictions and Federal permits have  
15 been issued by drawing since about the same time.  
16 Federal in-season managers use the draw system to  
17 distribute permits because unclear language in the  
18 delegation of authority letters led them to believe  
19 they could. The Federal in-season managers consider a  
20 draw permit hunt to be the best management strategy for  
21 conserving natural and healthy populations while still  
22 allowing for subsistence use by Federally-qualified  
23 subsistence users.

24

25 Federal muskox hunts were originally  
26 established in 1995 on the Seward Peninsula with a  
27 harvest quota of seven muskoxen. In 1998, along with a  
28 shared quota system with the State being established  
29 the current season of August 1st through March 15th was  
30 established. Then in 2001 ADF&G initiated muskox hunts  
31 in Unit 23 north and west of the Noatak River. In 2002  
32 authority for the Unit 23 southwest hunt was delegated  
33 to the Western Arctic ParkLands superintendent. In  
34 2005 the Federal Subsistence Board established a muskox  
35 season within Cape Krusenstern National Monument and  
36 the Board of Game established a registration permit  
37 hunt in Unit 22D. In 2010 the Board opened Federal  
38 land to all users and allowed cow harvest for the  
39 entire season in Unit 22E. But in 2014 the cow hunt  
40 was eliminated Seward Peninsula-wide as a result of  
41 declining population. In 2016 the Federal Subsistence  
42 Board established a muskox hunt in Unit 23 north and  
43 west of the Kobuk River. In 2020 the Board reviewed  
44 Federal land closures on the Seward Peninsula and  
45 decided to maintain the closures because of low muskox  
46 populations.

47

48 Muskoxen were reintroduced to the  
49 Seward Peninsula in 1970 and the population grew  
50

1 rapidly until 2010. Then between 2010 and 2012 the  
2 population declined by about 23 percent. After this  
3 the population appears to have stabilized at the new  
4 lower population number and has averaged 2,233 muskox  
5 since 2012.

6  
7 The Cape Thompson Herd was introduced  
8 steadily at eight percent until 1998. The growth rate  
9 continued at two percent until 2005 when the population  
10 declined, which is believed to be caused by range  
11 expansion. Since then the population appears to have  
12 stabilized averaging 234 muskoxen.

13  
14 The harvest rate of Seward Peninsula  
15 muskoxen declined from the high of 5.8 percent in 2012  
16 which coincided with the drop in population to an  
17 average of 1.4 percent and has remained steady since  
18 then.

19  
20 Approving WSA22-01 will not change  
21 subsistence use of muskoxen by Federally-qualified  
22 subsistence users or affect the muskox population in  
23 either area as it is an administrative change only.  
24 However, allowing a Federal drawing permit hunt for  
25 muskoxen ensures harvest remains within sustainable  
26 levels and response to both changing hunt and herd  
27 conditions. A drawing permit also randomizes the  
28 selection of who receives a permit making permit  
29 distribution more equitable among Federally-qualified  
30 subsistence users.

31  
32 Standardizing the language in a  
33 delegation of authority letters to close the season,  
34 set any needed permit conditions, determine the annual  
35 harvest quota, the number of permits to issue, and the  
36 method of permit allocation between State and Federal  
37 permits provides clarity to the in-season managers on  
38 what authority they have and allows for effective and  
39 flexible hunt administration, while the change of in-  
40 season manager better reflects land status in the Unit  
41 23 southwest hunt area.

42  
43 Therefore, it is OSM's conclusion to  
44 support Temporary Wildlife Special Action WSA22-01.

45  
46 Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the  
47 Board.

48  
49 I'd be happy to address any questions.  
50

0430

1 MS. DETWILER: Yes, this is Sue  
2 Detwiler from OSM stepping in here. I just got a text  
3 that Chair Tony Christianson had to leave to take care  
4 of a community issue and so usually Rhonda Pitka would  
5 be second in line to act as a Temporary Board Chair,  
6 she is not here today. So I'm going to ask Ken Lord  
7 and unless I hear something from another Board Member,  
8 I'm going to ask Ken Lord if it's okay if I just run  
9 through the steps to get through this wildlife special  
10 action at this point and then when we get to the actual  
11 Board action where the Board makes a motion and takes  
12 an action, if we stop and see if Tony is back online  
13 and if Tony is not back online, then my suggestion  
14 would be we -- the Board takes a vote to select a  
15 temporary Acting Chair.

16  
17 Ken, is that within the scope of Board  
18 procedures?

19  
20 MR. LORD: It is Sue, that would be  
21 fine.

22  
23 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you. So  
24 unless I hear something from the other Board Members  
25 I'll just go down our list of steps here for this  
26 wildlife special action. We've just heard the analysis  
27 from the lead author so I believe the next step would  
28 be opportunity for Board questions of the author.

29  
30 (No comments)

31  
32 MS. DETWILER: Not hearing any  
33 questions from the Board for Brian so the next step  
34 would be Regional Advisory Council recommendations.

35  
36 MS. PILCHER: This is Neesa Pilcher,  
37 Council Coordinator for the Seward Peninsula Regional  
38 Advisory Council. I'll be presenting the Council's  
39 justification or comments for this special action  
40 request.

41  
42 The Seward Peninsula Advisory Council  
43 supported WSA22-01. The Council considered this a  
44 housekeeping request and recognized that the  
45 overharvest of muskox population would be really easy.  
46 They felt administering the permit by random drawing to  
47 be the most equitable manner for distribution and would  
48 help protect the muskox population.

49  
50

0431

1 Thank you.

2

3 MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Neesa. And  
4 do we have any comments from Northwest Arctic Regional  
5 Council, Brooke McDavid.

6

7 MS. MCDAVID: Yes, this is Brooke  
8 McDavid, the Northwest Arctic Council Coordinator.

9

10 And the Northwest Arctic Council  
11 supported WSA22-01. The council considered this a  
12 housekeeping request and concurs with administering the  
13 hunt in the same way it has been in the past. They  
14 also noted that muskox are really good eating for  
15 subsistence.

16

17 Thank you.

18

19 MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Brooke.  
20 Moving to North Slope, do we have Gordon Brower or Eva  
21 on for the Regional Council recommendation.

22

23 MS. PATTON: Thank you, Sue. This is  
24 Eva Patton, Council Coordinator for the North Slope  
25 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. And the North  
26 Slope only took action on the special action (b)  
27 addressing Unit 23 which will be coming up next.

28

29 Thank you.

30

31 MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Eva.

32

33 MS. GREDIAGIN: Sorry to interrupt,  
34 Sue, this is Lisa, but we're presenting them both  
35 together so I'm sorry for any confusion there, Eva,  
36 but, yeah, WSA22-01, the analysis were separated out  
37 but the intention is for the Board, you know, to act on  
38 them together. Thank you.

39

40 MS. PATTON: Okay, great, thank you.  
41 In that case both North Slope and the Northwest  
42 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council have  
43 recommendations on WSA22-01(b). And, again, for the  
44 record, Eva Patton, Council Coordinator for the North  
45 Slope Subsistence Regional Advisory Council making the  
46 Council recommendations on behalf of Chair Gordon  
47 Brower.

48

49 And the North Slope RAC supports WSA22-

50

0432

1 01 and the Council considered distributing permits  
2 through a random drawing to be more inclusive and fair  
3 than a registration permit hunt which favors those  
4 living closer to the permitting office. So, again, the  
5 Council thought drawing permits would be a more fair  
6 and equitable way to administer this hunt.

7

8 Thank you, Mr. Chair -- Madame Chair.

9

10 MS. DETWILER: Okay, that's my mistake  
11 there so thank you for that, Lisa. So I believe we  
12 need to go to WSA22-01(b), back to the Brian for that  
13 Staff analysis.

14

15 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, this is Lisa, I  
16 got a little distracted there. Brian, could you  
17 clarify, I thought you presented them together.

18

19 MR. UBELAKER: Yes. Yes, Lisa. Brian  
20 Ubelaker. I did present (a) and (b) together, yeah,  
21 information for 21(a) was regarding Seward Peninsula  
22 muskox, 22-01(b) was for the northern 23 Cape Thompson  
23 muskox. But, yes, information was presented together  
24 for 22-01, in general.

25

26 Thank you.

27

28 MS. DETWILER: Okay. So sorry about  
29 that confusion. So I just -- if that's the case then I  
30 would just want to make sure that all three Regional  
31 Councils have said everything -- made all the comments  
32 that they would like to on both of those proposals. Is  
33 that correct Neesa and Brooke.

34

35 MS. PILCHER: That is correct. This is  
36 Neesa Pilcher for the record. That is correct for  
37 Seward Peninsula.

38

39 MS. MCDAVID: For the record, this is  
40 Brooke McDavid. And, yes, that is also correct for  
41 Northwest Arctic.

42

43 MS. DETWILER: Okay. Okay, thank you.  
44 Then we can move on to Alaska Department of Fish and  
45 Game comments.

46

47 MR. MULLIGAN: Hello, this is Ben  
48 Mulligan. I'll just do (a) and (b) together. The  
49 Alaska Department of Fish and Game did not officially  
50

0433

1 take a position on the special action viewing it as a  
2 housekeeping measure. But I will say that when  
3 discussing this with the region, our wildlife biologist  
4 there, felt that for the health of the muskox  
5 population there the draw hunt was the way to go.

6  
7 Thank you.

8  
9 MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Ben. Next is  
10 InterAgency Staff Committee comments.

11  
12 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
13 This is Robbin LaVine. And for Wildlife Special Action  
14 22-01 the InterAgency Staff Committee provided the  
15 standard comment. Thank you.

16  
17 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. And Board  
18 discussion. Actually I think at this point I would  
19 feel most comfortable if we stopped here and make sure  
20 that Tony has not joined yet -- Tony, are you on, Tony  
21 Christianson.

22  
23 (No comments)

24  
25 MS. DETWILER: Sounds like not. So I  
26 would put it to the Board to select a temporary Chair  
27 and, Ken Lord, I'm not sure if there's a special  
28 procedure that the Board needs to go through.

29  
30 MR. BROWER: Ma'am.

31  
32 MS. DETWILER: Yes.

33  
34 MR. BROWER: I would nominate Gene from  
35 BIA to be the temporary Chair. Thank you.

36  
37 MS. DETWILER: Is there a second.

38  
39 MR. PELTOLA: This is BIA. I may have  
40 to step out shortly for a brief period and I wouldn't  
41 want to cause additional disruption. So I was  
42 wondering if Dave would be willing to, even though he  
43 may have a potential conflict coming up. So I hope to  
44 have it open for discussion.

45  
46 MR. SCHMID: Yeah, this is Dave with  
47 the Forest Service. And I'd be happy to fill in that  
48 role here if other Board Members were okay until the --  
49 I think one of our next agenda items, 9, I will be  
50



0434

1 making the motion there and would prefer someone else  
2 to cover that so it might be better for another Board  
3 Member here to take us to the end of the meeting if  
4 need be.

5

6 MS. DETWILER: So, Ken, does the maker  
7 of the original motion need to withdraw the motion to  
8 have Gene step in or is this something that can be a  
9 little bit more informally, like a consensus of the  
10 Board Members.

11

12 MR. LORD: We're in uncharted waters  
13 here, Sue, I think, you know, I think you can move  
14 ahead and if someone objects then please speak up.

15

16 MS. DETWILER: Okay. So it sounds like  
17 we just need a Board Member to step in. So let's see  
18 the next -- well, this agenda item will be voted on and  
19 then we have another agenda item after that. As Dave  
20 said, Dave is going to be involved with.

21

22 MR. SCHMID: So Sue I might offer a  
23 path here. Let's maybe work through this. I'd be  
24 happy to sit in as pro temp or whatever until we get  
25 through No. 8, agenda item, and then maybe take a break  
26 and see if our Chair, Mr. Christianson, is able to come  
27 back, and if not then more formally appoint another  
28 Board Member at that time.

29

30 MS. DETWILER: Does that sound good to  
31 the rest of the Board Members.

32

33 MR. PELTOLA: Fine by BIA.

34

35 MR. BROWER: Fine by Public Member.

36

37 MS. DETWILER: Any objections.

38

39 MS. KLEIN: No objections from Fish and  
40 Wildlife Service.

41

42 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you. So it  
43 sounds like it's back to you then, Dave. Okay. Thank  
44 you. So it sounds like it's back to you then Dave and  
45 we're at the Board discussion on Wildlife Special  
46 Action 22-01 followed by Board action.

47

48 MR. SCHMID: Thank you, Sue. So, as  
49 Sue stated, at Board discussion here on WSA22-01 and,  
50

0435

1 again, we took those together as 1(a) and 1(b). I'd  
2 open it for any discussion.

3

4 (No comments)

5

6 MR. SCHMID: Hearing no discussion I  
7 would entertain a motion at this point.

8

9 MS. CREACHBAUM: Mr. Chair, National  
10 Park Service.

11

12 MR. SCHMID: Go ahead, Park Service,  
13 thank you.

14

15 MS. CREACHBAUM: Thanks. I move to  
16 approve Temporary Wildlife Special Action WSA22-01(a)  
17 and WSA 22-01(b). And if I get a second I'll explain  
18 why I intend to vote in support of my motion.

19

20 MR. PELTOLA: BIA seconds.

21

22 MR. BROWER: Second, Public Member.

23

24 MS. CREACHBAUM: Thank you. Approval  
25 of WSA22-01(a) and WSA22-01(b) will not affect the  
26 subsistence use of muskox in Game Management Unit 22  
27 and 23. It is an administrative change to how Federal  
28 permits are distributed. Allowing for a Federal draw  
29 hunt will ensure that harvest remains within  
30 sustainable levels and respond to both changing hunt  
31 and herd conditions. It will further allow for more  
32 equitable distribution of permits -- excuse me -- to  
33 Federally-qualified subsistence users through the use  
34 of a random drawing and will allow for a limited  
35 harvest the population can sustain. Standardizing  
36 language in the delegation of authority letters will  
37 provide clarity to in-season managers and will allow  
38 for effective and flexible hunt administration and  
39 changing the in-season manager for muskox hunts in GMU  
40 23 to Southwest -- southwest -- better reflects land  
41 status in the hunt area.

42

43 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

44

45 MR. SCHMID: Yeah, thank you. Any  
46 other questions for Park Service.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50

0436

1 MR. SCHMID: Hearing none, would anyone  
2 like to call for the question.

3  
4 MR. BROWER: Question.

5  
6 MR. SCHMID: Thank you, Charlie.  
7 Question's been called. Sue, could you take a roll  
8 call vote here. Thank you.

9  
10 MS. DETWILER: Yes.  
11  
12 National Park Service, Sarah  
13 Creachbaum.

14  
15 MS. CREACHBAUM: National Park Service  
16 supports the motion.

17  
18 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

19  
20 Jill Klein on behalf of Sara Boario,  
21 Fish and Wildlife Service.

22  
23 MS. KLEIN: Fish and Wildlife Service  
24 supports the motion.

25  
26 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

27  
28 Gene Peltola, BIA.

29  
30 MR. PELTOLA: BIA supports.

31  
32 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

33  
34 Tom Heinlein, BLM.

35  
36 MR. HEINLEIN: Bureau of Land  
37 Management supports.

38  
39 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

40  
41 Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

42  
43 MR. SCHMID: The Forest Service  
44 supports with the justification provided by the Park  
45 Service.

46  
47 MS. DETWILER: Okay.

48  
49 Public Member Charlie Brower.

50

0437

1 MR. BROWER: Support.

2

3 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. And I will  
4 just check and see if Chair Christianson came on.

5

6 (No comments)

7

8 MS. DETWILER: Okay. So the motion  
9 passes six with two absent.

10

11 MR. SCHMID: Thank you, Sue. And,  
12 again, I would recommend that we break until the bottom  
13 of the hour, 10:30, and at which time if we come back  
14 and Chair Christianson is with us we will turn that  
15 back to him, and if not we will look for another Board  
16 Member to step into that role. We will still have a  
17 quorum, I believe, and can finish the agenda. So let's  
18 take a break until 10:30.

19

20 Thank you.

21

22 (Off record)

23

24 (On record)

25

26 MR. SCHMID: Hello, this is Dave Schmid  
27 with the Forest Service, are you ready to reconvene  
28 here?

29

30 MS. DETWILER: Yes, I am. I just had a  
31 bunch of papers, and all my papers fell off here so I'm  
32 shuffling but I'm going to -- I'm trying to pull up the  
33 roll list to see which Board members we have on now if  
34 that's all right with you, Mr. Chair.

35

36 MR. SCHMID: Acting Chair, that would  
37 be great. Thank you, so much.

38

39 MS. DETWILER: Acting Chair, okay.

40

41 Sarah Creachbaum, National Park  
42 Service.

43

44 MS. CREACHBAUM: Hi, Sue, I'm here.

45

46 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

47

48 Bureau of Land Management, Tom  
49 Heinlein.

50

0438

1 MR. HEINLEIN: I'm on, good morning.

2

3 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

4

5 Fish and Wildlife Service, Jill Klein  
6 or Sara Boario.

7

8 MS. KLEIN: Hi, Sue. This is Jill  
9 Klein, and Sara will be calling in momentarily.

10

11 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

12

13 MS. KLEIN: Thank you.

14

15 MS. DETWILER: Dave Schmid, I know  
16 you're on.

17

18 Gene Peltola, BIA.

19

20 MR. PELTOLA: BIA's on.

21

22 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

23

24 Charlie Brower, are you still on,  
25 Public Member.

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 MS. DETWILER: Anthony Christianson.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 MS. DETWILER: So, Mr. Chair --  
34 Temporary Chair, Acting Chair we have five Board  
35 members on. We're missing Rhonda Pitka, Charlie Brower  
36 and Anthony Christianson.

37

38 MR. SCHMID: Okay, thank you. Thank  
39 you, Sue. I'm a bit concerned without any public  
40 members here, moving forward, at this point, but would  
41 like to hear from others and I'd open it up just for  
42 Board thoughts here as we look for a path here. If we  
43 need to break and try and get more public members back  
44 on or try to move forward with a very small quorum.

45

46 MR. PELTOLA: BIA concurs about the  
47 lack of presence a Public Member. I guess I should  
48 clarify, BIA would prefer that we have at least one of  
49 our Public Members or the Chair present before we

50

0439

1 proceed.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. SCHMID: BIA, I agree. Gene, I agree. Gene, let's just quickly poll the other Federal members and see if they're in the same place here. Maybe I can start that round, Sue, and just start with Park Service.

MS. CREACHBAUM: I concur.

MR. SCHMID: Fish and Wildlife Service.

MS. KLEIN: Hi, this is Jill, and Sara is here and so I think we concur that we would like to have a Public Member present and/or Chair Christianson as Gene recommended.

MR. SCHMID: Okay. I think we're all in agreement. Let's look at maybe taking another break here until the top of the hour if that would be agreeable to folks here. I know I have conflicts starting after lunch but I would not feel comfortable moving forward without at least a Public Member here with us. And so unless I hear any opposition let's try another 25 minutes here until the top of the hour at 11:00 and maybe Sue or Staff, if you could continue to try and outreach to both Charlie and Tony and see if you can get any timing on their potential return and if you do get a hold of them that we would reconvene at 11:00 o'clock. Would that work for folks without any other objection.

MR. PELTOLA: Fine by BIA.

MS. BOARIO: Fine with the Service.

MR. HEINLEIN: BLM's good with that.

MS. CREACHBAUM: Yes.

MR. SCHMID: Okay, let's do that, and my apologies, this is part of our challenges with a teleconference meeting. I know we probably have public, I know we have Staff and others on but lets regroup here at the top of the hour, Operator, thank you.

(Off record)

0440

1 (On record)

2

3 MR. SCHMID: Welcome back folks here.

4 This is Dave Schmid filling in briefly as the Chair.

5 Sue, could you take another roll and make sure that we

6 have at least a Public Member on before we move forward

7 here at 11:00.

8

9 MS. DETWILER: Yes, uh-huh, I will do

10 that. Starting with National Park Service, Sarah

11 Creachbaum.

12

13 MS. CREACHBAUM: Hi, Sue, I'm here.

14

15 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

16

17 Bureau of Land Management, Tom

18 Heinlein.

19

20 MR. HEINLEIN: Hi, Sue, I'm present.

21

22 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

23

24 Fish and Wildlife Service, Sara Boario

25 or Jill Klein.

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 MS. DETWILER: I'll come back to them.

30 Dave Schmid, I know you're on.

31

32 Gene Peltola.

33

34 MR. PELTOLA: BIA's on.

35

36 MS. DETWILER: Charlie Brower, Public

37 Member.

38

39 (No comments)

40

41 MS. DETWILER: Go back to Fish and

42 Wildlife Service, Sara Boario, Jill Klein.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 MS. DETWILER: They may be having a

47 hard time getting into the speaker line.

48

49 We currently have National Park

50

0441

1 Service, Bureau of Land Management, Forest Service and  
2 Bureau of Indian Affairs. And we heard Charlie Brower  
3 on the line just a couple of minutes ago and so maybe  
4 he muted his phone. And Sara Boario from Fish and  
5 Wildlife Service, we're still waiting to hear from  
6 them.

7

8 MR. SCHMID: Yeah, I see Sara's on but  
9 apparently not in the speaking mode. I just received a  
10 chat there, Sue, if the Operator could get her into the  
11 speaking room.

12

13 MS. DETWILER: Yes. Robbin or Lisa, I  
14 imagine you're helping out with that.

15

16 MS. LAVINE: We're working with the  
17 Operator now, thank you.

18

19 (Pause)

20

21 OPERATOR: Sara's line is open.

22

23 MS. DETWILER: Hi, Sara, this is Sue  
24 Detwiler, I was doing roll call, are you on -- can you  
25 confirm that you're on?"

26

27 MS. BOARIO: I am on, can you hear me?

28

29 MS. DETWILER: Yes.

30

31 MS. BOARIO: Thank you.

32

33 MS. DETWILER: Just doing roll call,  
34 and I'm going to see if Charlie Brower has gotten into  
35 the speaking room yet.

36

37 MR. BROWER: Yes, I have. Just my  
38 phone seems to be funny right now.

39

40 MS. DETWILER: Great. Okay, thank you  
41 very much Charlie. And Chair Anthony Christianson.

42

43 (No comments)

44

45 MS. DETWILER: Not on. So we do have  
46 six members, Mr. Chair -- Acting Chair.

47

48 MR. SCHMID: Okay. Thank you, Sue.  
49 And we do have Public Member Charlie Brower on, which I  
50



0442

1 know we weren't comfortable moving forward with at  
2 least one Public Member and we do have a quorum. At  
3 this time, though, I think our next agenda item that we  
4 were going to take up is No. 9, which is the Fisheries  
5 Proposal 21-10, Lower Copper River area salmon that was  
6 deferred and coming back to the Board and since I will  
7 be involved in making the motion, at this time unless  
8 there's any other objection I would like to pass the  
9 gavel over to BIA, Gene Peltola. But, please, speak up  
10 anyone if you have an issue with that, if not, I will  
11 turn it over to Gene.

12

13 (No objections)

14

15 MR. PELTOLA: Hearing none, no  
16 objection, thank you, Dave, I appreciate it. So as  
17 Dave mentioned we're on Agenda Item 9, FP21-10 Copper  
18 River salmon. Sue, could you tell us what we have for  
19 the action process on this proposal.

20

21 MS. DETWILER: Yes, so the action items  
22 that we have listed on our -- for this agenda item  
23 would be an introduction of this agenda item, that will  
24 be done by Scott Ayers, our Fisheries Supervisor. We  
25 have an updated analysis of this proposal. We have a  
26 summary of Regional Advisory Council meeting points  
27 from when the two Regional Advisory Councils met on  
28 this, present that summary, and that would be an  
29 opportunity for the Council Coordinators and the Chairs  
30 of those two Councils to provide their summary and also  
31 be available for additional discussion. And then after  
32 the summary of Regional Advisory Council Chair  
33 comments, the Board would go into discussion and  
34 finally take action. And what is not currently on this  
35 agenda is a public comment period. It would be up to  
36 the discretion of the Board as to whether they wanted  
37 to add an additional public comment item, and if that  
38 were to be added it would probably come after the  
39 updated presentation of the updated analysis.

40

41 MR. PELTOLA: Okay, Sue, thank you.  
42 And I'm all in favor of inserting the comment period  
43 right after the updated analysis. Does anybody not  
44 agree with that step.

45

46 (No objections)

47

48 MR. PELTOLA: Okay, hearing none, Sue,  
49 why don't we go ahead and put the comment period right

50

0443

1 after the updated analysis and then from there we'll  
2 move on to turning it over to Scott and proceeding with  
3 the analysis. Go ahead, Scott.

4

5 MR. AYERS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
6 Members of the Board. Again, this is Scott Ayers, the  
7 Fisheries Division lead at OSM. We're going to switch  
8 things up a bit here and talk about a fisheries topic.

9

10 Specifically I'm here to speak with you  
11 about deferred Fisheries Proposal FP21-10 which  
12 requested a new Federal Subsistence fishery for salmon  
13 in the Lower Copper River adjacent to the Copper River  
14 Highway and then also why it's back in front of you  
15 again.

16

17 Fisheries Proposal FP21-10 requests the  
18 Federal Subsistence Board implement a salmon  
19 subsistence fishery in the Lower Copper River adjacent  
20 to the Copper River Highway with a harvest limit of 15  
21 salmon other than pink salmon for the first two members  
22 of the household and then 10 salmon for additional  
23 household members. It would limit chinook salmon  
24 harvest to five per household. Allowable gear types  
25 would be dipnet, rod and reel, spear or gaff. The  
26 proposal was submitted by Jesse Carter and Robert  
27 Jewell of Cordova.

28

29 FP21-10 was presented at the  
30 Subsistence Regional Advisory Councils at their fall  
31 2020 meetings. The Southcentral Council provided a  
32 recommendation in support of the proposal with the OSM  
33 modification that required a 48 hour reporting  
34 requirement. The Eastern Interior Council provided a  
35 comment in opposition to the proposal. Board action on  
36 this proposal at your January 2021 meeting was to  
37 defer, your justification was that the proposal  
38 resulted in a disagreement between Regional Advisory  
39 Councils, some tribal communities and other Federally-  
40 qualified subsistence users. You noted that the  
41 deferral would give the Southcentral and Eastern  
42 Interior Councils time to meet and work towards a  
43 compromise that can be supported by those affected. On  
44 March 16th, 2022 the Southcentral and Eastern Interior  
45 Councils met jointly to take up this deferred proposal.  
46 The Chairs of both Councils ran the meeting jointly.  
47 Board Member Creachbaum and Board Member Schmid were  
48 present and welcomed the group. Board Member Schmid  
49 also provided a clarification on expectations letting  
50

0444

1 the group know that it was okay for the Councils to  
2 disagree and that they were not required to compromise  
3 as part of this process. Council Members heard a  
4 presentation of the updated proposal analysis and were  
5 provided an overview of all the materials that were  
6 sent to the Councils for their consideration.  
7 Following this each Council member provided statements  
8 on the topic at hand touching on reasons for support of  
9 opposition, ideas for potential modification and then  
10 comments on process. When that was completed each  
11 Council voted on a comment to the Board. The meeting  
12 ended with closing comments. A transcript of that  
13 meeting is available on the OSM website by going to  
14 regions, choosing Southcentral or Eastern Interior and  
15 then clicking on meeting transcripts.

16

17 As I close here you'll receive an  
18 overview of the updated proposal analysis.

19

20 A summary of the main points from the  
21 joint Southcentral and Eastern Interior Council meeting  
22 will then be provided by the Council Coordinators.

23

24 The Council Chairs are here to speak to  
25 any questions that you may have and then you can  
26 proceed to your discussion, deliberation and action and  
27 obviously now we've added a public comment section in  
28 there as well.

29

30 Thank you for your time and please let  
31 me know if you have any questions.

32

33 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Scott,  
34 appreciate it. Any questions for Scott before we  
35 proceed.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 MR. PELTOLA: Okay, hearing none, Sue,  
40 next item.

41

42 MS. DETWILER: Yes, I believe that  
43 we're going to go into the Staff analysis. Scott was  
44 that going to be Stormy and Milo.

45

46 MR. AYERS: Yes, that's correct.

47

48 MR. PELTOLA: Please proceed Scott with  
49 the analysis.

50

0445

1 MR. HAUGHT: Thank you. Good morning,  
2 this is Stormy Haught with Chugach National Forest.  
3 Thank you Sue and thanks Scott for that background.  
4 Good morning Mr. Acting Chair and Members of the Board.

5  
6 Again, my name is Stormy Haught,  
7 Chugach National Forest. I'll be presenting an updated  
8 analysis for FP21-10. This updated analysis is  
9 available in the supplemental meeting materials.

10  
11 Proposal FP21-10 submitted by Jesse  
12 Carter and Robert Jewell of Cordova, Alaska request  
13 that the Federal Subsistence Board implement a salmon  
14 subsistence fishery in the Lower Copper River adjacent  
15 to the Copper River Highway. Harvest limits would not  
16 be additive to the current existing Federal subsistence  
17 permit for the Prince William Sound area or the State  
18 subsistence fishing permits in the Copper River  
19 district.

20  
21 Currently, Federal-qualified  
22 subsistence users in the Cordova area primarily fulfill  
23 their subsistence needs under a State of Alaska  
24 subsistence salmon fishing permit. Participation in  
25 the State subsistence gillnet fishery within the marine  
26 waters of the Copper River district requires use of a  
27 saltwater capable boat and fishing during commercial  
28 openers or fishing during Saturday periods, which can  
29 be a substantial barrier for local harvesters. The  
30 proponents rationale for submitting this proposal is to  
31 improve access to Copper River salmon by providing  
32 residents a road accessible harvest area.

33  
34 The proposed Lower Copper River area  
35 includes that portion of the Copper River from a  
36 boundary one-half mile up stream of the Copper River  
37 Highway to a boundary extending one-half mile down  
38 stream of the Copper River Highway, from the west bank  
39 of the river near Highway Mile 27, also known as Flag  
40 Point to the east bank of the river near Highway Mile  
41 38.

42  
43 Allowable gear would be dipnet, rod and  
44 reel, spear and gaff. With harvest limits for a  
45 household of one person of 15 salmon other than pink,  
46 five cutthroat trout with only two over 20 inches and  
47 no more than five chinook salmon per household. For a  
48 household of two would be 30 salmon other than pink  
49 salmon, plus an additional 10 salmon for each  
50

0446

1 additional person in the household over two. Five  
2 cutthroat trout with only two over 20 inches for each  
3 household member with a maximum household limit of 30  
4 cutthroat trout may be taken, with no more than five  
5 chinook salmon per household.

6  
7 I'll go through a little bit of  
8 regulatory history, this starts on Page 10 of the  
9 analysis.

10

11 The existing Federal subsistence  
12 fishing permit within the Copper River Delta and Prince  
13 William Sound area, this is FFPW010, which was  
14 established in 2004 allows for the harvest of fish in  
15 freshwater year-round except in the Lower Copper River  
16 and its tributaries which are closed to Federal  
17 subsistence harvest of salmon by regulation and  
18 excluding Eyak Lake and its tributaries which are  
19 closed to fishing for salmon. The Federal subsistence  
20 permit limits the harvest of salmon to 15 fish for a  
21 household of one, 30 fish for a household of two, and  
22 10 for each additional person in that household. The  
23 Federal and State subsistence permit harvest limits may  
24 not be added. There is no limit on the number of  
25 chinook salmon that may be taken within the total  
26 salmon limit on this permit because there are few, if  
27 any, chinook salmon returning to the freshwaters open  
28 to subsistence harvest in this area.

29

30 Historically there have been several  
31 Board actions on proposals submitted for the harvest of  
32 salmon in the Copper River down stream of the 52 Mile,  
33 or also known as the Million Dollar Bridge.

34

35 In 2007 Proposal FP07-14 was submitted  
36 requesting that the Copper River waters down stream of  
37 the Million Dollar Bridge be open to Federal  
38 subsistence harvest of salmon using dipnets and rod and  
39 reel with bait for the month of May, June and July.  
40 The Board rejected this despite noting in their  
41 decision justification that at that time there were no  
42 biological concerns. At that time the Southcentral  
43 Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council felt that  
44 other opportunities for harvesting salmon for  
45 subsistence already existed in the Cordova and Prince  
46 William Sound, both in the marine waters with a gillnet  
47 and in freshwaters with a dipnet.

48

49 In the 2018 fisheries proposal cycle

50

0447

1 Proposal FP19-14 submitted by the Native Village of  
2 Eyak proposed to extend the current Federal subsistence  
3 salmon fishery to waters of the Lower Copper River  
4 beginning one-half mile down stream of the road  
5 crossing at the Copper River Highway, Mile 27 and  
6 extending up stream to the Million Dollar Bridge using  
7 dipnet and rod and reel. The Native Village of Eyak  
8 withdrew Proposal FP19-14 during the first day of the  
9 2018 Council meeting.

10

11 In April 2020 a request was submitted  
12 to the Board to open a Federal subsistence dipnet  
13 season for salmon in the Lower Copper River. This was  
14 Fisheries Special Action Request FSA20-04 to offset  
15 related health and safety issues associated with the  
16 existing means of harvesting Copper River salmon in the  
17 State's Copper River district fishery. This issue  
18 generated large amounts of public interest with 38  
19 written comments supporting and 10 opposed to the  
20 measure. The proposal was considered by a special  
21 session of the Board and not adopted. One concern  
22 shared by some community members was the establishment  
23 of a Federal subsistence fishery would lead to the  
24 development of a State personal use fishery resulting  
25 in crowding and over harvest in the Lower Copper River.  
26 This could occur with or without the adoption of a  
27 Federal proposal, and for reference the State personal  
28 use was not proposed after the Federal fishery for  
29 freshwaters on the Copper River Delta was established  
30 in 2004.

31

32 Biological background on Page 17 of the  
33 analysis.

34

35 The State Upper Copper River SEG is  
36 360,000 to 750,000 sockeye salmon. Since 1998  
37 escapements have met or exceeded the minimum thresholds  
38 of the SEG range for sockeye salmon in the Copper  
39 River. Copper River chinook salmon failed to reach the  
40 sustainable escapement goal of 24,000 fish in 2010,  
41 2014, 2016, 2020. There's a summary of Upper Copper  
42 River sockeye and chinook total run and escapement  
43 numbers on Table 2, Page 18 of the analysis and note  
44 that the numbers in that table are for Upper Copper  
45 River wild stocks only so wouldn't include Delta stocks  
46 or Gulkana hatchery stocks. Coho, chum and pink salmon  
47 are not expected to be significantly impacted by this  
48 proposal, though some incidental harvest may occur.  
49 Additionally there are populations of unknown size of  
50

0448

1 rainbow trout that migrate up the Copper River, these  
2 are steelhead. Current Federal subsistence management  
3 regulations require the immediate release of rainbow  
4 trout unharmed unless taken incidentally in a  
5 fishwheel.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

Moving to current events, this is Page  
14 of the analysis.

Poor runs of Copper River sockeye  
salmon in 2008 [sic] and 2020 prompted concerns with  
total sockeye salmon run size of less than a million  
each of those year. Sockeye salmon sustainable  
escapement goals were met in both years but the 2018  
commercial harvest of just over 40,000 sockeye salmon  
in the Copper River district was the second lowest in  
the last 100 years and the 2020 commercial harvest of  
about 102,000 sockeye salmon was well below the 10 year  
average of over a million sockeye salmon. In-river  
personal use and sportfisheries were restricted in both  
years and State subsistence fisheries were restricted  
in 2018 including the first ever closure of the  
Glennallen subdistrict subsistence fishery.

In 2021 cumulative passage of 750,000  
fish passed the Miles Lake Sonar indicate in-river  
management objectives and the SEG were met for sockeye  
salmon. Commercial harvest of about 400,000 sockeye  
salmon in 2021 was considerably below the 10 year  
average of 1.25 million fish. The 2021 commercial  
harvest of 7,000 chinook salmon was below the 10 year  
average of 13,000 fish. For chinook salmon, the Native  
Village of Eyak's preliminary 2021 estimate of in-river  
abundance was 21,656 chinook salmon, that's below the  
24,000 fish escapement goal.

Cultural and traditional practices,  
Page 19 of the analysis.

The population of Cordova has been  
relatively stable over the last decade with the  
population of about 2,239 in 2010 and 2,316 in 2020.  
Commercial fishing and subsistence activities are  
considered central to the culture of the community. In  
2014 the ADF&G conducted a comprehensive subsistence  
survey of resources harvested by residents in Cordova.  
The surveys found that sockeye salmon were used and  
harvested by Cordova households more than any other  
salmon, with about 73 percent of households followed by

0449

1 coho salmon at 71 percent of households and chinook  
2 salmon at 63 percent.

3

4

5 The most commonly used gear type for  
6 harvesting salmon was removal from the commercial catch  
7 also known as homepack, followed by sport use rod and  
8 reel, which composed 38 percent of the total salmon  
9 harvested by weight. Access to sockeye salmon in  
10 freshwaters near Cordova is limited and in 2014 only 10  
11 percent of the harvest of sockeye was by rod and reel.  
12 The Federal subsistence and State rod and reel  
13 fisheries are especially important to Cordova residents  
14 because they are accessible by road. These fisheries  
15 focus on fall coho salmon primarily in the heavily used  
16 Ibeck Creek, Alaganik Slough and the Eyak River.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

A little harvest history here. I'll quickly summarize the harvest of the existing sub, and PU -- subsistence and PU fisheries in the Copper River, just kind of moving from smallest to largest. And this information is summarized in Figure 2 on Page 19 and Figure 3 on Page 21 of the analysis.

The 10 year average annual salmon harvest by fishery for the Federal subsistence harvest in the Copper River Delta, Prince William Sound area, again, this is primarily Ibeck Creek, Eyak River and Alaganik Slough, averaged 486 salmon total, approximately 80 percent of these were coho salmon. No chinook salmon have been reported as harvest under the Copper River Delta, Prince William Sound area Federal subsistence permit since its inception.

State subsistence permit holders in the Copper River district, this is the Copper River Flats gillnet fishery, averaged about 3,674 sockeye salmon and 530 chinook salmon. Federal subsistence harvest for the Upper Copper River district, this includes Chitina and Glennallen subdistricts combined, averaged 21,011 sockeye salmon and 809 chinook salmon. State subsistence salmon dipnet permit holders in the Upper Copper River district, this is the Glennallen subdistrict averaged 60,348 sockeye salmon and 2,500 chinook salmon. During this time dipnets composed about 70 percent of the State Gulkana subsistence permits issued. And then finally the Chitina subdistrict personal use fishery averaged harvest of 142,000 sockeye salmon and about 1,200 chinook salmon.



1 Effects of this proposal.

2

3

4 If adopted, this proposal would create  
5 access under a new Federal subsistence permit for the  
6 Lower Copper River area to include waters of the Lower  
7 Copper River as described previously. It would provide  
8 additional subsistence opportunities for Federally-  
9 qualified subsistence users living in the Prince  
10 William Sound area, especially those in the community  
11 of Cordova. This new harvest opportunity may generate  
12 some level of new interest that has potential of  
13 expanding the number of users and associated harvest,  
14 but it would also shift some of the harvest effort from  
15 the State subsistence fishery in the Copper River  
16 district and from the Federal subsistence fishery in  
17 the freshwaters of the Copper River Delta to the Lower  
18 Copper River. The total salmon harvest limit permitted  
19 per household would not change.

19

20

21 The proposed regulatory change would be  
22 expected to have a minimal biological effects on fish  
23 stocks, the projected harvest would be the smallest of  
24 any user group in the Copper River system estimated at  
25 about 2,000 sockeye salmon and 300 chinook salmon  
26 annually. And for context with other fisheries you can  
27 take a look at Figures 4 and 5 on Pages 27 and 28 of  
28 the analysis. This estimate is based on the annual  
29 State subsistence gillnet harvest in the Copper River  
30 district taking into account the smaller pool of  
31 qualified users and reduced efficiency of the allowable  
32 gear types; and that's essentially dipnet compared to a  
33 driftnet gillnet. It's not anticipated that the harvest  
34 from the proposed Lower Copper River area would affect  
35 subsistence, personal use or sport harvest in the Upper  
36 Copper River district.

36

37

38 The Superintendent of Wrangell-St.  
39 Elias National Park and Preserve is the Board delegated  
40 in-season manager for subsistence fisheries within the  
41 Federal waters of the Copper River drainage. While the  
42 Board delegated authority in all other non-Copper River  
43 waters within the Prince William Sound area to the  
44 Cordova District Ranger of the Chugach National Forest.

44

45

46 If approved, this fishery would need to  
47 be administered under a non-stackable Federal permit,  
48 separate from the existing permit, FFPW01 which is  
49 issued by the Forest Service. Both Federal permits  
50 would be available from the Forest Service office in

50

0451

1 Cordova.

2

3 Wrapping up here with the OSM

4 conclusion.

5

6 Support FP21-10 with modifications to  
7 include a requirement to report take of salmon to area  
8 managers within 48 hours of harvest.

9

10 And finally the justification:

11

12 Harvest and escapement information  
13 indicate that sufficient salmon are present to allow a  
14 Federal subsistence fishery in the Lower Copper River  
15 without creating biological concern. The proposal  
16 provides an opportunity for Federally-qualified  
17 subsistence users of Cordova that do not have access to  
18 a saltwater capable boat and drift gillnet gear to  
19 harvest sockeye salmon and chinook salmon in the Lower  
20 Copper River. Projected harvest is anticipated to be  
21 very small in comparison with other user groups and  
22 concern of harvest occurring prior to salmon being  
23 counted at Miles Lake Sonar site can be addressed with  
24 a proposed modification of reporting requirement to  
25 area managers within 48 hours of harvest.

26

27 Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the  
28 Board. That concludes my summary of Staff analysis.  
29 Would be happy to take any questions.

30

31 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, appreciate  
32 that analysis. Any questions for Staff on the  
33 analysis.

34

35 (No comments)

36

37 MR. PELTOLA: Okay, hearing none, Sue,  
38 I think this is where we inserted comments, is that  
39 correct?

40

41 MS. DETWILER: Yes.

42

43 MR. PELTOLA: Will you please work with  
44 the Operator to open up the lines for any comments from  
45 the public.

46

47 OPERATOR: Thank you. As a reminder,  
48 to ask a question or comment please press star, one.

49

50

0452

1 (Pause)

2

3 MR. PELTOLA: Operator, have you seen  
4 anybody hit star, one wanting to be heard?

5

6 OPERATOR: Yes, sir, we have two in the  
7 cue, just a moment.

8

9 MR. PELTOLA: Okay, thank you.

10

11 OPERATOR: First question or comment  
12 comes from Karen, your line is open.

13

14 MS. LINNELL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
15 For the record my name is Karen Linnell, Executive  
16 Director for Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission. We  
17 represent seven tribes along the Copper River -- I'd  
18 like to -- from the headwaters down to Chitina.

19

20 I'd like to say that I object to the  
21 addition of the written comments -- that only allows  
22 for the comments were -- submitted late last year for  
23 the on time comments -- there has been no other public  
24 opportunity for input through this review and deferment  
25 with either the Southcentral or Eastern Interior RACs.  
26 There was no advertisement or allowance for AITRC or  
27 anybody else to provide written comments. It's only  
28 those that were late for last year, so I object to the  
29 addition of that. It provides an unfair advantage to  
30 those comments solicited by the U.S. Forest Service  
31 Staff last year.

32

33 The one thing that I would like to  
34 really state, though, is right now we're in a decline  
35 and we've been struggling to meet management  
36 objectives, a 24,000 chinook goal. At the last Board  
37 of Fish meeting the Staff informed us that they were  
38 changing their management objective from 24,000 chinook  
39 to a range of 21,000 to 31,000 chinook. They created  
40 this range at a lower level, I believe, so that they  
41 would not have to declare a species of concern because  
42 they -- four out of the last five years they hadn't met  
43 their objective.

44

45 So that's one of our concerns.

46

47 The other concern is the Copper River  
48 residents north from Chitina up do not have another  
49 river to go to for salmon. They don't have the ocean

50

0453

1 to go to for salmon, this is our only source, while the  
2 residents of Cordova have two other rivers to go to and  
3 the ocean. So at what point does providing for  
4 everybody's subsistence needs negate our up river  
5 subsistence needs. We have nowhere else to go. And  
6 that, to me, is choosing one group over the other.  
7 While they have plenty of opportunity elsewhere, you  
8 know, once something happens to this river we have  
9 nothing, we have nowhere to go. And, you know, heaven  
10 forbid I have to go to the Cook Inlet to go get fish  
11 and take from other people's region, like the Kenaitze  
12 and the folks from Ninilchik. I know they're  
13 overwhelmed with folks coming into their area to take  
14 fish from their back door, I don't want to be one of  
15 those people going to somebody else's backyard to  
16 harvest.

17  
18 I do have to say two years ago fishing  
19 was so poor we shut our wheels down. I got 66 salmon  
20 in over a month. It used to be I'd get 66 in a day and  
21 shut my wheel down to work on them. In that one month  
22 I shut my wheel down. The Department Staff would say  
23 that I didn't put in the effort. But I was taught to  
24 not take when it's not there to take. I was taught to  
25 conserve. I was taught that when I was in -- in  
26 abundance to shut down as well because you want to let  
27 some go by. Right now the way the management is  
28 happening when they have, quote, record numbers going  
29 by the sonar, they liberalize what is allowed by  
30 personal use fisheries. Well, they don't liberalize  
31 anything for subsistence users. When they liberalize  
32 it we end up with more folks coming to dipnet. And I  
33 have to say when dipnetting in the personal use fishery  
34 first started there were only 3,000 dipnetters and  
35 right now it goes anywhere from seven to 9,000  
36 dipnetters come in. And it used to be that when there  
37 was high water they wouldn't fish. The water -- high  
38 water -- the water's high, dipnetting's poor but now  
39 they're dipnetting from boats and targeting those areas  
40 where the fish hold up during high water. So it used  
41 to be that when the high water would start to drop we'd  
42 start to catch fish in our fishwheels, we're not  
43 getting that anymore.

44  
45 And so for me and my fishwheel is near  
46 the headwaters at Chistochina, the only one farther  
47 than mine is Katie John's family camp, there's a few up  
48 there at Slana that -- and at Katie John's camp, which  
49 is why we have Federal fisheries in the first place in  
50

0454

1 the Copper River, all the way down, and that's my  
2 family, my home starts there and goes all the way to  
3 Chitina because I was married to Chitina people. So to  
4 be able to provide for everyone in between, our  
5 neighbors, all those Federally-qualified between  
6 Chitina and Slana is important and is our goal, not to  
7 limit anybody else's subsistence opportunities but they  
8 have way more subsistence opportunities down there than  
9 we do on the Copper River.

10

11 And just, again, I just want to say  
12 that I do object to the addition of those written  
13 comments. It provides an unfair advantage and skews.  
14 I do appreciate the Eastern Interior RAC and  
15 Southcentral RAC getting together again, although we  
16 weren't able to talk to them. It's my understanding  
17 that the Southcentral RAC voted again and they voted it  
18 down, from my understanding. And that's, I think, what  
19 Gloria said, it was by one vote.

20

21 But I do appreciate you folks taking  
22 this up again and I thank you for your time.

23

24 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Karen. Does  
25 anybody have any questions or comments from the Board  
26 for Karen.

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 MR. PELTOLA: Okay, hearing none,  
31 Operator, could we go to the second person who was  
32 online for comment.

33

34 OPERATOR: Next person is Robert, your  
35 line is open.

36

37 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Operator.

38

39 MR. JEWELL: Hi, my name is Robert  
40 Jewell. I'm one of the co-sponsors for this. I  
41 appreciate what the prior caller said but what people  
42 up north don't understand is you need to have access to  
43 the fish and if you don't have a boat, a commercial  
44 boat to go out and get them it's -- it's very  
45 dangerous. People go out there in those little skiffs  
46 and just by the Grace of God they make it back  
47 sometimes. All we're asking is for access to the same  
48 amount of fish.

49

50

0455

1                   When you heard the report, we're not  
2 really going to be taking any more fish than we already  
3 are. And what it comes down to me is, I'm really  
4 wondering why special interest groups are getting  
5 priority over rural Alaska residents. We live in a  
6 rural community that does not have road access like all  
7 the northern areas that can go to the Copper River at  
8 Chitina and get their fish. The two extra streams that  
9 the reds come in on are clear streams that you cannot  
10 dipnet. So -- and everybody knows, reds don't bite on  
11 line and lure. so our only trick is to try to do  
12 dipnets with them and you spook them away. We made  
13 this proposal Federal so that only Cordovans would use  
14 it. We don't want everyone coming here to use it, we  
15 just want Cordovans. There's a lot of folks here who  
16 could use this because living in a true rural community  
17 that doesn't -- that's not on road access our bills are  
18 skyrocketing and to have extra healthy fish would be a  
19 benefit.

20  
21                   And as stated in the meeting last year,  
22 we're fighting over two -- less than two percent of the  
23 fish and why we're not prioritizing subsistence users,  
24 I'm baffled.

25  
26                   Thank you for your time, have a great  
27 day.

28  
29                   MR. PELTOLA: Thank you. I appreciate  
30 those comments. And anybody on the Board have any  
31 questions for our last presenter.

32  
33                   (No comments)

34  
35                   MR. PELTOLA: Okay, hearing none,  
36 Operator, do we have anybody else in the cue to provide  
37 comments.

38  
39                   OPERATOR: Yes, sir, the next person is  
40 Donna, your line is open.

41  
42                   MS. WILSON: Hello, thank you, Mr.  
43 Chairman for allowing us to speak. For 40 years we  
44 have lived at the headwaters of the Chitina River,  
45 we've been there a long time. And we used to go to  
46 various places up and down the river and watch copious  
47 numbers of salmon spawn. Now we see very few, if any.  
48 Those spaces where they spawned are gone, they're just  
49 empty, the water's just there clear and just sitting  
50

0456

1 there and this is of great concern to me.

2

3

4 I understand what the Cordovans are  
5 expressing, that they only have those three or four  
6 places and it's hard. Well, it is really hard for us  
7 anymore. We don't have any fish. We just don't have  
8 any fish. And this is one river in the Upper Copper,  
9 not even all of them.....

9

10 (Teleconference interference -  
11 participants not muted)

12

13

14 REPORTER: Wait a minute. Donna.  
15 Donna, hold on. So if everybody could take a second  
16 and please look at your line star, six to mute, because  
17 somebody's talking over Donna right now. I'd  
18 appreciate that, star, six or mute.

18

19

19 Okay, Donna, go ahead.

20

21

22 MS. WILSON: Okay, thank you. All of  
23 us up here only have the Copper, that's it. We can't  
24 go to a slough or a creek or another place and find the  
25 salmon, we've just got this up here. I would hope that  
26 you don't open it more.

26

27

28 They say that many fish wouldn't be  
29 caught but where does that number come from. I've been  
30 asking around, where does that number come from? The  
31 guy -- the man from Cordova that just spoke said lots  
32 of folks could use this one, what do those numbers  
33 mean, what does that mean? They say it would be 2,000,  
34 where does that come from. What if it's easy to do up  
35 there and everybody chooses to go up there. I don't  
36 know. It's so scary because it's such a small resource  
37 for all of us and those of us up at the upper reaches  
38 don't have another option.

38

39

40 So we work hard to get our fish and  
41 sometimes that's just what it takes, it takes hard work  
42 and sometimes some people have to maybe ask for help or  
43 ask for others to help them.

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

44 And that's what I have to say, thank  
45 you.

47 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Donna,  
48 appreciate it. Any Board members have any questions  
49 for Donna. And, Donna, I do apologize on behalf of the  
50

0457

1 Program for the brief period by when you were spoke  
2 over by someone, we do apologize for that.

3

4 MS. WILSON: Yeah, thank you. I lost  
5 my bearing, I hope I didn't sound really stupid.

6

7 MR. PELTOLA: No, no, not at all. We  
8 appreciate do appreciate your time and effort and your  
9 comments.

10

11 MS. WILSON: Okay, thank you.

12

13 MR. PELTOLA: Hearing no questions for  
14 Donna, Operator, do we have anybody else in the cue.

15

16 OPERATOR: Yes. The next person we have  
17 is Jesse, your line is open.

18

19 MR. CARTER: Hello, can you hear me?

20

21 MR. PELTOLA: Yes, we can Jesse.

22

23 MR. CARTER: Thank you. So thank you  
24 for this opportunity again to speak on the proposal. I  
25 guess I'll just start off with a brief on, you know,  
26 how we came here.

27

28 I've been in Cordova for 33 years and I  
29 was involved in every fishery around Cordova. I was an  
30 owner and operator of the Copper River Flats Driftnet  
31 and this subject has come up quite a bit. But we used  
32 to be a booming town, we used to have herring  
33 fisheries, you know, we're subsidized, some of the  
34 community people with more income, but we've lost a lot  
35 of that, it's gotten tougher to live in Cordova,  
36 expenses, cost of living and everything is going way  
37 up. I've been involved in food drives in Cordova and  
38 there is a population that is in need with a little  
39 extra support to help them through the winter. So  
40 that's kind of the basis, you know, on the proposal.

41

42 We went around, we found an enormous  
43 amount of support, you know, for the proposal. And  
44 coming from, you know, being a fisherman and married  
45 into a fishing family who basically are living off of  
46 the Copper River I had to think this through from my  
47 perspective because I don't want to damage our fishery,  
48 our residents, I had to weigh out the needs. So my  
49 approach coming from my perspective into this is just  
50



0458

1 going to go forward and pull out any reason that would  
2 come up that would say why we do not need this fishery  
3 and I found the opposite. It's this fishery would help  
4 people. It would give a little boost to help them  
5 through the wintertime because there are people that  
6 could really use it. We have family members that are  
7 -- two families that are stacked up in trailers at  
8 times, you know, it's tough to live in Cordova. We  
9 need this extra support.

10

11 The one thing I want to touch on is  
12 throughout these meetings that I've been involved in,  
13 they keep saying we have all this access and all this  
14 fish and that's bologna. If you look at the report  
15 that was just put out you can see clearly that the  
16 commercial fishermen, which is what you call homepack  
17 catch the majority of the fish because they have these  
18 100,000 vessels, they have the gear, the hydraulics and  
19 they have the safety, and not only the safety they have  
20 the experience of going out on the Flats to fish. And  
21 for the people who do have skiffs and go out there and  
22 fish subsistence have to compete with commercial  
23 fishermen and that's not an easy thing to do.

24

25 I want to go back to the Eyak River and  
26 the Alaganik. These rivers are very slow moving,  
27 they're clear. I've tried dipnetting it several times  
28 and you cannot dipnet those rivers, you cannot get  
29 sockeyes in there unless you get lucky or unless a boat  
30 goes by and they spook the fish into your net. And we  
31 all know the regs, you cannot spook or herd fish. So  
32 you would be forced to fish illegally in the river  
33 unless you have a perfect ideal condition where the  
34 water happens to be murky and it's flooding.

35

36 So those rivers are not accessible for  
37 us to catch any kind of a homepack for reds. We do  
38 have silvers that we can catch on rod and reel. That  
39 ones's -- and that's mostly based on the Eyak and the  
40 Ibeck Rivers what puts a lot of stress on that with all  
41 the sportfishermen coming in.

42

43 There was an opportunity for someone to  
44 come down, we were going to show them, you know, the  
45 rivers, the access issues we have, take them around to  
46 some people, and let them talk to them why they needed  
47 it and they came in, we had no contact, no  
48 communication, they cherry-picked and went back to the  
49 Board and made statements like, you know, this -- this  
50

0459

1 person is against it or this group is against it, and I  
2 don't think that's fair. That's not fair to our  
3 community, it's not fair to the people that need it and  
4 I'm sorry that that happened that way but it's just not  
5 fair to us.

6

7 The catch is cumulative, that means  
8 we're not catching any more?

9

10 (Teleconference interference -  
11 participants not muted - busy tone ringing)

12

13 MR. PELTOLA: We can still hear you.

14

15 MR. CARTER: Can you hear me?

16

17 MS. LAVINE: Yes, please.....

18

19 MR. PELTOLA: Yes, we hear you.

20

21 MS. LAVINE: .....hold Jesse.....

22

23 MR. CARTER: Okay. I hear a busy  
24 sound.

25

26 MS. LAVINE: .....please hold on while  
27 the Operator identifies the -- there you go -- oh,  
28 please hold on while the Operator identifies the line.

29

30 MR. CARTER: j Okay.

31

32 MS. LAVINE: Operator, please let us  
33 know when we can proceed.

34

35 OPERATOR: You can proceed.

36

37 MR. CARTER: Okay, am I -- can you hear  
38 me?

39

40 MR. PELTOLA: Yep.

41

42 MR. CARTER: Okay, sorry about that.  
43 But I just wanted to, you know, Cordova has a need,  
44 basically that's what I'm getting at. They -- we keep  
45 coming back that there's no access and -- or I mean  
46 that we have all these rivers and there's access and  
47 unless you've been here trying it you'll see that you  
48 have to have a skiff, you have to have a skiff so you  
49 can access, you know, the Flats to go up there and  
50

0460

1 subsistence fish with your State permit to get reds.

2

3

4 So I don't think it's fair for the, you  
5 know, special interest groups to come in and say all  
6 these things that are like half-truths. You know like  
7 one of the Boards here they say there was a unanimous  
8 vote no, well, that was only one fifth of the Native  
9 voters that voted that down and I heard it was  
10 spearheaded by certain individuals. Because I followed  
11 up on that from the last meeting when they made that  
12 statement and I found several Native members that were  
13 for it, they didn't vote, but there was only one  
14 (indiscernible) that did and most of them were  
15 fishermen, which is another special interest. So I  
16 would just like for the facts to at least be straight  
17 if we're going to try to figure out how -- what is fair  
18 with the subsistence fish instead of making it  
19 political because that's not fair to us when the impact  
20 on this fishery, as you see, is going to be very  
21 minute, it's all accumulative and most of the fishermen  
22 that bring their pack in are commercial fishermen  
23 anyways.

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

I just ask that when you guys go to  
vote that we are a subsistence community and there are  
families who need this fish and they do not have access  
to catch these fish on the Eyak River and the Alaganik.  
So I appreciate your time and thank you for all the  
work that you've done.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Jesse. And on  
behalf of the Board I do apologize for that brief  
interruption when we had some background noise, it was  
not intended and we do apologize for that. So Board  
members, do you have any questions for Jesse, or  
comments.

MS. DETWILER: Mr. Chair, this is Sue  
Detwiler. While they're thinking of their comments,  
would it be possible to get Jesse's last name for our  
records.

REPORTER: Carter.

MR. CARTER: Yes, am I still open.

MR. PELTOLA: Yes, you are Jesse,  
please proceed.

0461

1 MR. CARTER: Yes, Jesse Carter.

2

3 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

4

5 MR. CARTER: And one last thing I'd  
6 like to mention, you know, the corporation here has put  
7 together a program, I think it's wonderful but the  
8 program is where they have a hired skipper and they  
9 take their members out on the Flats with a gillnet in a  
10 commercial boat to help them get their subsistence  
11 State fish. And I think that's important because if  
12 that doesn't speak louder than words on what kind of an  
13 access issue that we have, you know, that's -- that  
14 just says it, you know, we don't have an access issue  
15 -- we do have an access issue where you have to have a  
16 vessel.

17

18 So I just wanted to add that last point  
19 in, thank you.

20

21 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Jesse. And  
22 one more time do any Board members have any questions  
23 or comments for Jesse.

24

25 (No comments)

26

27 MR. PELTOLA: Hearing none, Operator,  
28 is there anybody else in the cue.

29

30 OPERATOR: Yes, sir. And as a reminder  
31 to give a question or a comment please press star, one.  
32 The next one in cue is Barbara, your line is open.

33

34 MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chair, my name is  
35 Barbara Cellarius. I am the Cultural Anthropologist  
36 for Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve. And  
37 I guess I should stop and make sure that you can hear  
38 me.

39

40 MR. PELTOLA: Yep, I could hear you on  
41 this end.

42

43 MS. CELLARIUS: Thank you. The  
44 Wrangell -- so I'm going to be presenting the comments  
45 for the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource  
46 Commission. These aren't my comments, they're from the  
47 Commission.

48

49 And so at it's fall 2020 meeting, the

50

0462

1 Commission took up this proposal and the Commission  
2 unanimously opposed the proposal. The creation of a  
3 new fishery on the Copper River will have the potential  
4 to affect Upper Copper River fishery. This was a low  
5 year for both chinook and sockeye salmon runs and SRC  
6 members have heard reports of people not getting enough  
7 salmon. Residents of Cordova have other opportunities  
8 to harvest salmon whereas Upper Copper -- upper river  
9 residents rely solely on Upper Copper River fisheries.  
10 The written public comment included in the proposal  
11 analysis indicated opposition from several long-term  
12 residents of Cordova along with the Native Village of  
13 Eyak with no comments from Cordova in support of the  
14 proposal. In the absence of local support, there is no  
15 reason for the SRC to support the proposal.

16

17 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

18

19 I would just add that the SRC did  
20 provide a comment to the joint RAC at their meeting --  
21 or a comment at their spring -- the SRC voted at their  
22 spring 2022 meeting to make a comment to the RACs at  
23 the joint meeting and they also opposed the proposal  
24 unanimously in that comment.

25

26 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

27

28 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Barbara. Are  
29 there any Board members who have any questions for  
30 Barbara.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 MR. PELTOLA: Okay, hearing none,  
35 Operator, do we have anybody else in the cue. And just  
36 for timing purposes, I'm not sure if we have anybody  
37 else in the cue or how many we have but we'll probably  
38 continue to take comment until the top of the hour so  
39 we could proceed with the consideration of the  
40 proposal.

41

42 Operator.

43

44 OPERATOR: Yes. Again, as a reminder  
45 to give a question or comment press star, one. The  
46 next person in the cue is Jim, your line is open.

47

48 MR. SIMON: Hello, did you say Jim, Jim  
49 Simon?

50

0463

1 MR. PELTOLA: Yes, Jim, go ahead.

2

3 OPERATOR: Yes, sir.

4

5 MR. SIMON: Oh, thank you very much.  
6 For the record my name is Jim Simon, I'm a Consultant  
7 with Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission but I'm  
8 taking off that hat and just speaking as a former  
9 Federally-qualified user from the Upper Copper River.  
10 I grew up in the Nelchina area. My father was Herb  
11 Simon and my mother Jackie Meekin.

12

13 And I just want to say that this is a  
14 complicated issue, I think, for the Federal Subsistence  
15 Board and I appreciate the challenges that you have in  
16 listening to the various testimonies.

17

18 You know when I was a kid we traded  
19 with Ahtna friends and neighbors in order to get most  
20 of our salmon, although I have helped on my family's  
21 fishwheel in the past and been a dipnet user in the  
22 Chitina subdistrict. The numbers of fish that are  
23 available in the Glennallen subdistrict today compared  
24 to when I was a kid in the '80s is just so dramatically  
25 difference, it's very concerning at the thought of  
26 opening up an additional fishery. I've only been to  
27 Cordova a couple times but at this last Board of Fish  
28 meeting in Cordova in December was the last time I  
29 visited there and it was great, you know, people are  
30 very friendly and one guy actually went out with one of  
31 my co-workers and caught a winter kind which we shared  
32 and ate during a break from the Board meeting and was  
33 really wonderful, you know, that another gentleman from  
34 Cordova shared with another co-worker, you know, a box  
35 of fish that I helped carry to the airport and, you  
36 know, it's really great that Cordovan residents share  
37 with those of us from the Upper Copper.

38

39 And I guess maybe I don't fully  
40 understand the access issues that others have spoken to  
41 but I see in the -- from Page 23 of the 2020 Prince  
42 William Sound annual management report, that says, and  
43 I quote, the Federal subsistence salmon fishery in the  
44 western portion of the Copper River Delta is  
45 administered by the U.S. Forest Service. In 2005 the  
46 Federal government began issuing permits allowing  
47 subsistence harvest on Federal lands in Prince William  
48 Sound and the Lower Copper River area. Legal gear  
49 types are dipnet, rod and reel and spear. In 2020 an

50

0464

1 estimated total of 101 Federal permits were issued but  
2 only 47 permits were fished with an estimated harvest  
3 of 98 sockeye and 416 coho. So it seems like in some  
4 respects these opportunities are provided, maybe not in  
5 the specific place that this proposal speaks to, but I  
6 am also concerned, like others, about how establishing  
7 this fishery could have additional detrimental affects  
8 on the subsistence fisheries up river and -- and I just  
9 don't think this is the right time.

10

11 There seems that there are  
12 opportunities that are really not being taken advantage  
13 of with less than half of the issued Federal permits,  
14 subsistence fishing permits being fished.

15

16 So with that, thank you very much.

17

18 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Jim. Do any  
19 Board members have any questions or comments for Jim.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 MR. PELTOLA: Hearing none from others.  
24 Actually I have one if you wouldn't mind Jim. when  
25 you're mentioning about the Glennallen subdistrict you  
26 used the descriptor, different, would you elaborate on  
27 what you meant by different?

28

29 MR. SIMON: What's different is just  
30 the inability to share with like my family, that used  
31 to happen in the '80s because even though I still get  
32 fish from my friends with fishwheels, it's almost like  
33 I feel guilty even receiving any of those fish because  
34 they're getting so few fish for their own needs. And,  
35 you know, that's what made me wonder, you know, here I  
36 was an outsider coming into Cordova and, yet, people  
37 were very quickly sharing with us but then to hear  
38 other Cordova residents, you know, it begs the question  
39 as to how much sharing is actually happening within the  
40 community, you know, because generally when you look at  
41 rural Alaskan communities across the state, from my  
42 previous work for the State Subsistence Division, 30  
43 percent of the households, and these are largely Alaska  
44 Native communities, 30 percent of the households  
45 harvest 70 percent of the resources consumed, used by  
46 that community. And -- so I wonder what's happening in  
47 Cordova that there are supposedly all these people who  
48 don't have any access to salmon and it seems peculiar  
49 from my standpoint and my, you know, 50 years of  
50

0465

1 history of sharing in the Upper Copper River area from  
2 the Glennallen subdistrict point of view where I was  
3 raised.

4

5 I hope that answers your question, Mr.  
6 Peltola.

7

8 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, appreciate it.  
9 Any other questions or comments for Mr. Simon.

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 MR. PELTOLA: Okay, hearing none,  
14 Operator, we're approaching the top of the hour, I'll  
15 take comments from one more individual if we have  
16 anybody in the cue.

17

18 OPERATOR: Okay. The last question or  
19 comment comes from Bruce, your line is open.

20

21 MR. PELTOLA: Go ahead, Bruce, if  
22 you're with us.

23

24 (No comments)

25

26 MR. PELTOLA: Hello. Operator, can you  
27 ensure that his line is open or remind him about the  
28 mute code.

29

30 OPERATOR: Bruce's line is open.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 OPERATOR: Bruce, are you there?

35

36 (No comments)

37

38 OPERATOR: So he's not saying anything,  
39 I don't know if he's muted on his end but his line is  
40 open here.

41

42 MR. PELTOLA: Okay. And it's star,  
43 six, correct.

44

45 MR. ERVIN: Can you hear me?

46

47 OPERATOR: Yes, sir, we can here.

48

49 MR. PELTOLA: Is that you Bruce?

50



0466

1 MR. ERVIN: Hi, sorry about that. This  
2 is Bruce Ervin, you can hear me okay.

3  
4 MR. PELTOLA: Yep, go ahead, Bruce.

5  
6 MR. ERVIN: Okay, sorry, I've been  
7 hitting all kinds of buttons -- not flying an airplane  
8 or something.

9  
10 But thank you, Chair. Members of the  
11 Board. Thank you for this opportunity to comment  
12 today. My name is Bruce Ervin, I'm a Northway Tribal  
13 member. And you know just starting off I'd like to  
14 oppose FP21-10 and I'd just like to reiterate and echo  
15 Karen and Jim and, you know, some of the concerns of  
16 AITRC. And, you know, as an Upper Tanana Dena' we have  
17 C&T for the Upper Copper River and, you know, I'm just  
18 really concerned about the low returns. I respect what  
19 Jesse and Robert were saying earlier, you know, it's  
20 really sad that the system where they live is really  
21 broken right now and they don't have that opportunity  
22 when they should but, you know, what we're saying up  
23 here is we're not seeing the salmon return and I sure  
24 as heck don't want to see it end up like the Yukon  
25 River. I don't want Batzulnetas to end up being like  
26 Canada where they don't be able to -- where they're not  
27 able to fish at all.

28  
29 I heard a story from one of my grandpas  
30 and I have Ahtna roots through Batzulnetas, one of my  
31 grandpas grew up there as a kid and is the brother of  
32 Katie John, and, you know, one of my grandpas, you  
33 know, he said that they used to get, you know, up to  
34 200 salmon a day, that's how good the numbers used to  
35 be back in the day. I don't think they see that anymore  
36 today and I don't want to see the Copper River end up  
37 like the Yukon. Because our Yukon relatives are really  
38 suffering right now, they weren't able to fish last  
39 year, I don't want to see that happen to the Copper  
40 River. Those low numbers, I see it, I hear it. All  
41 the tribes along the Copper River are letting you all  
42 know about it. They don't see it like how they used to  
43 when they were a kid. The numbers are going down and  
44 that's what they're trying to say. That's why they're  
45 fighting so hard right now to not let this happen.

46  
47 You know, sure, maybe if the population  
48 was good for the salmon, but we're just not seeing that  
49 right now. You know, these salmon are more than food  
50

0467

1 security, they're our identity, we're fighting for our  
2 relatives right now. So I don't think it's sustainable  
3 at this point in time and respectfully I'll have to  
4 oppose it.

5

6 And I see it every year, I see so many  
7 people going to Chitina, it's just flooded. A lot of  
8 the people who are there, they monetize it, they turn  
9 it into a cash economy and it's impacting our salmon.  
10 I see it at the Kenai River, all the people that flood  
11 there. When I first went there -- I don't even go  
12 there anymore there's so many people there and they  
13 charge so much money just to stay for a night, you  
14 know, you pay in 12 hour periods, you have to pay for  
15 parking, pay for camping, pay for this and that, you  
16 have to be rich to go fish in Kenai and there's  
17 thousands of people right there at the mouth. So  
18 that's another reason, you know, I'm very cautious  
19 about this proposal. You know there needs to be a  
20 better system in place for the people in Cordova, they  
21 shouldn't have to fight with us, we shouldn't have to  
22 fight with them. We all survive and we all depend on  
23 the salmon and the numbers right now are very low and I  
24 really don't want it to crash like the Yukon.

25

26 I just want to say thank you. Thank  
27 you, again, for letting me testify today and providing  
28 this opportunity. I appreciate you all and thank you  
29 for all your hard work.

30

31 Thank you.

32

33 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Bruce.  
34 Appreciate you providing time to provide comments to  
35 the Board. Board members, you have any questions or  
36 comments for Bruce.

37

38 (No comments)

39

40 MR. PELTOLA: Okay, hearing none, that  
41 will close out the public comment section for  
42 consideration of FP21-10, the Copper River salmon.  
43 Before we go into the summary of the Regional Advisory  
44 Council meetings, Sue, I was wondering if you could  
45 give a brief summary to the Board for our benefit about  
46 when and where these meetings took -- when and where  
47 these Regional Advisory Council meetings took place.

48

49 Thank you.

50

0468

1 MS. DETWILER: Yes, I would have to  
2 defer to the Council Coordinators on that. They are  
3 more up to speed on those details than I am, if you  
4 don't mind, Mr. Chair.

5  
6 MR. PELTOLA: No, no problem at all. I  
7 just wanted the Board to be presented with the date and  
8 times when the Regional Advisory Councils did take this  
9 up post deferral by the Board.

10  
11 MS. DETWILER: So I think, yeah, so the  
12 Council Coordinators, DeAnna Perry, and Brooke McDavid,  
13 I believe they will be summarizing the main points of  
14 the Council's joint meeting and then the Council Chairs  
15 or their actings are available for any additional  
16 discussion.

17  
18 MR. PELTOLA: Okay. Let's proceed with  
19 that presentation by the Council Coordinators and  
20 please include the date and location when the RACs  
21 convened. Thank you, much. Go ahead, proceed.

22  
23 MS. PERRY: Hello, Mr. Peltola, Acting  
24 Chair and members of the Board. This is DeAnna Perry,  
25 Council Coordinator for the Southcentral Regional  
26 Advisory Council. I'll be providing you with  
27 information regarding actions by the Southcentral  
28 Council. And then Brooke McDavid, the Council  
29 Coordinator for the Eastern Interior will follow with  
30 information regarding actions by the Eastern Interior  
31 Council.

32  
33 Before I start can everyone hear me  
34 okay.

35  
36 MR. PELTOLA: I can hear you fine on  
37 this end.

38  
39 MS. PERRY: Thank you. I will have to  
40 get back to you on the exact dates, I do not have those  
41 right in front of me since this I came prepared to give  
42 (indiscernible - cuts out)

43  
44 (Indiscernible - cuts out)

45  
46 MS. PERRY: Southcentral Alaska Council  
47 changed their position on the fisheries proposal from  
48 support to opposition. To express the position, the  
49 Southcentral Alaska Council voted on a motion to  
50

0469

1 provide a comment in support of Fisheries Proposal 21-  
2 10 with new OSM modification. The result of the vote  
3 was six votes in opposition and five in support. Two  
4 Southcentral Council members were absent and could not  
5 participate in the vote, however, they did provide  
6 written statements in support of the proposal.

7  
8 This Board was provided with a link to  
9 the transcript of the FP21-10 joint meeting between  
10 Southcentral and Eastern Interior Regional Advisory  
11 Councils so that they could read all Council member  
12 comments in their entirety. Council members spent a  
13 significant amount of time preparing and participating  
14 in this meeting and it was important to both Councils  
15 that this Board read their individual comments.

16  
17 As a reminder the Southcentral Council  
18 members comments begin on Page 71 of that joint meeting  
19 transcript and Eastern Interior Council members  
20 comments begin on Page 60.

21  
22 In the interest of time I'll remind you  
23 of some of the common themes expressed by Southcentral  
24 Council members.

25  
26 The following points were made in  
27 opposition of the proposal.

28  
29 There is already ample opportunity for  
30 subsistence salmon fishing in the Cordova area.

31  
32 Upper river residents only have the  
33 Copper River to fish on for salmon.

34  
35 The pandemic has passed and the same  
36 concerns for social distancing don't apply as when this  
37 proposal was introduced.

38  
39 If someone doesn't have a boat they can  
40 once again go with someone who does.

41  
42 People take care of each other. If  
43 someone doesn't have a boat to get the fish they need  
44 someone who will share salmon with them and allow them  
45 to fish with them.

46  
47 Salmon gets shared widely and passed  
48 out in Cordova.

49  
50

0470

1 Native Village of Eyak is a great  
2 example of proxy subsistence community fishing under  
3 State rules.

4  
5 There is no history of anyone  
6 dipnetting in the Lower Copper River so a new fishery  
7 would not be providing for use.

8  
9 It is not a good idea to open a new  
10 fishery and increase opportunity when runs are  
11 declining even if projected harvest would be small.  
12 Runs of both chinook and sockeye salmon are returning  
13 smaller and weaker fish.

14  
15 The State lowered escapement goals and  
16 still run sizes have only been at the lower end of  
17 management objectives.

18  
19 Subsistence salmon needs in the upper  
20 river are not being met.

21  
22 This proposal will affect 23  
23 communities who fish up river from where the proposed  
24 fishery would occur.

25  
26 Pursuant to data provided by the Ahtna  
27 InterTribal Resource Commission, in two of the 15 years  
28 from Gakona up to Batzulnetas and in seven out of 15  
29 years from Tonsina to Gakona amounts necessary for  
30 subsistence have not been met.

31  
32 Fishing would occur below sonar before  
33 proper assessment of run size could occur.

34  
35 The part of the river where this  
36 fishery is proposed would be difficult for anyone  
37 without a boat to access so this will not increase  
38 opportunity for people without boats.

39  
40 There are concerns that incidental  
41 catch will impact the stocks of king salmon.

42  
43 Opening new areas to make it easier to  
44 fish is not warranted in a declining fishery.

45  
46 And the current fishery has too much  
47 use already.

48  
49 Again, those were the Southcentral  
50

0471

1 Regional Advisory Council comments in opposition, but,  
2 again, I would ask everyone to look at the transcripts  
3 for all of those comments in their entirety.

4  
5 The Southcentral Alaska Council members  
6 made the following points in support of the proposal.

7  
8 There is support from this proposal  
9 from many local residents and entities.

10  
11 Adding a new fishing opportunity will  
12 not have an impact on escapement or up river harvest as  
13 harvest will be tiny compared to the other subsistence,  
14 personal use, and commercial fisheries take.

15  
16 Not all community members can  
17 participate in the State subsistence fishery.

18  
19 This will give subsistence users who  
20 cannot afford a boat, gas or gillnet a chance to catch  
21 some salmon.

22  
23 Will help people harvest subsistence  
24 salmon for their families and they especially help  
25 younger folks and elders.

26  
27 This fishery isn't taking away from the  
28 other fisheries or other opportunities for people to  
29 fish elsewhere, it just provides another place to  
30 harvest under a Federal subsistence fishery.

31  
32 King salmon incidentally caught in  
33 dipnets can be easily released so this fishery will not  
34 impact that species.

35  
36 Dipnetting in other areas of  
37 Southcentral such as those shared between the  
38 communities of Hope, Cooper and Ninilchik have been  
39 successful without negatively impacting the resource.

40  
41 There was a lot of opposition for the  
42 Ninilchik gillnet, fear of decimating the fishery and  
43 harming king salmon, however, this has not had a  
44 negative impact and has provided close to 4,000 fish  
45 for their community.

46  
47 During low runs managers will be able  
48 to reduce or shut down this opportunity just like the  
49 other fisheries.

50

0472

1                   If fishing needs to be limited,  
2 personal and commercial use should be limited first.

3  
4                   Subsistence users take a small piece of  
5 the pie and should not have to fight over that small  
6 piece.

7  
8                   It would help ensure opportunity is  
9 provided for all Federally-qualified subsistence users  
10 and it is our duty as RAC members to provide a priority  
11 for all Federally-qualified rural subsistence users.

12  
13                   Again, these were point gleaned from  
14 the transcript from Southcentral in support of the  
15 proposal.

16  
17                   Additionally, during that joint meeting  
18 Southcentral Council members suggested the following  
19 modifications to the proposal if the Board were to  
20 adopt FP21-10. Although they did not vote on these  
21 proposed modifications as a Council items brought up  
22 were:

23  
24                   To require the release of king salmon.

25  
26                   Only allow dipnets, no spears or gaffs.

27  
28                   No guiding in the subsistence fishery.

29  
30                   And prohibit dipnetting from boats.

31  
32                   And finally there were additional  
33 comments stated by Council members by the Board's  
34 decision to defer this proposal and the request that  
35 both Councils meet to develop a compromised or  
36 consensus position. Some of those points that they  
37 wanted to share with the Board:

38  
39                   This whole process has been very  
40 confusing to the Council members.

41  
42                   We were told to compromise and then we  
43 were told we don't need to.

44  
45                   We were told we can't vote on this  
46 modified proposal again but now we're voting.

47  
48                   We can't make a new recommendation,  
49 only a comment.

50

0473

1                               This joint meeting is a public meeting  
2 but no public comments are allowed.

3  
4                               This whole process has gone awry of  
5 ANILCA.

6  
7                               When a new fishery was proposed in  
8 Kenai, OSM allowed a local working group to discuss a  
9 new fishery and the Council thinks they should have  
10 been allowed to do the same on this proposal.

11  
12                              The Council members felt that it was  
13 not right for the Board to pit two Councils against  
14 each other.

15  
16                              Additionally, they felt it was not  
17 appropriate to defer this issue for input from the  
18 Eastern Interior Council since the fishery would occur  
19 in the Southcentral region.

20  
21                              The Council members were not sure why  
22 this was sent back to them since they already voted on  
23 it.

24  
25                              The new Council members, almost half of  
26 each Council did not hear the public testimony that was  
27 received when Fisheries Proposal 21-10 was originally  
28 taken up by both Councils in the fall of 2020.

29  
30                              Mr. Acting Chair and members of the  
31 Board, that concludes some of the main points made by  
32 the members of the Southcentral Council at the joint  
33 meeting which happened on March 16th, 2022. That was a  
34 meeting with Eastern Interior Council. Again, I hope  
35 that you've all had a chance to review all of the  
36 Council comments from the transcript on this matter.

37  
38                              I'll now turn it over to Brooke McDavid  
39 to share specific information on Eastern Interior's  
40 actions at the joint meeting and then afterwards, Vice  
41 Chair of Southcentral RAC, Gloria Stickwan, and the  
42 Chair of Eastern Interior RAC, Sue Entsminger, are  
43 standing by to answer questions and provide additional  
44 feedback as well as myself and Ms. McDavid.

45  
46                              And, Mr. Acting Chair, it looks as  
47 though Staff has helped me out with the meeting dates.  
48 The Southcentral RAC took up the proposal the first  
49 time at the fall 2020 meeting, and that was October 7th  
50



0474

1 and 8th. And I would have to get back to you on the  
2 rest of the dates, I don't have that at my fingertips,  
3 Mr. Peltola, Acting Chair.

4  
5 Thank you.

6  
7 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, DeAnna. Go  
8 ahead, Brooke.

9  
10 MS. MCDAVID: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
11 Mr. Chair and members of the Board. For the record my  
12 name is Brooke McDavid and I am the Coordinator for the  
13 Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council.

14  
15 Just to provide a little bit of  
16 history, the Eastern Interior Advisory Council  
17 originally took this up -- took up this proposal during  
18 their fall 2020 meeting, which was held October 14th  
19 and 15th via teleconference. And then the Board ended  
20 up deferring the proposal at their 2021 meeting and it  
21 returned to the Councils. The Councils tried to meet  
22 jointly in the fall of 2021 but were unable to because  
23 of scheduling and so they ended up meeting jointly at  
24 the March 16th, 2022 meeting, also held via  
25 teleconference.

26  
27 So at that joint meeting on March 16th  
28 with the Southcentral Advisory Council, the Eastern  
29 Interior Council continued to oppose Fisheries Proposal  
30 FP21-10. To express their position, the Eastern  
31 Interior Council voted on a motion to provide a comment  
32 in support of the proposal with the new OSM  
33 modification. The result of a roll call vote was six  
34 votes in opposition and zero in support with four  
35 members absent.

36  
37 At this joint meeting members of the  
38 Eastern Interior Advisory Council made several points  
39 about the proposal and I will provide a summary of  
40 those main points now. So, again, these are points  
41 made in opposition to the proposal during the meeting.

42  
43 There are major conservation concerns  
44 for Copper River salmon and a new fishery should not be  
45 created when run sizes are declining and there is  
46 difficulty meeting escapement goals.

47  
48 Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
49 lowered the escapement goal so that it looks like  
50

0475

1 Copper River runs are doing okay but management  
2 strategies are not working if escapement goals had to  
3 be lowered.

4  
5 It is irresponsible to create a new  
6 fishery given all the changes in the marine environment  
7 where salmon rear.

8  
9 Cautious management is paramount due to  
10 the unknown impacts of climate change on Copper River  
11 salmon stocks.

12  
13 Fish are getting smaller in the Copper  
14 River because smaller females have less eggs, more fish  
15 need to reach the spawning grounds to ensure the  
16 viability of these runs into the future.

17  
18 Creating more opportunity in the lower  
19 river will put upper river subsistence fishers at a  
20 further disadvantage.

21  
22 Fishers in the Cordova region have  
23 tremendous opportunity to harvest multiple high quality  
24 salmon and other species while fishing opportunity in  
25 the upper river is very limited.

26  
27 Food insecurity is a concern in the  
28 Interior region and additional harvest down river could  
29 exacerbate this.

30  
31 There has been a decline in the ability  
32 of residents who live throughout the Copper River area  
33 to meet their subsistence needs in recent years.

34  
35 Dipnetting on the Copper River is not a  
36 customary and traditional fishery for Cordovans.

37  
38 Not having a boat is not a reason to  
39 start a new fishery.

40  
41 Council members were concerned that  
42 this sets a precedent and that new fisheries could be  
43 established every time someone says their subsistence  
44 needs aren't being met.

45  
46 Council members were also concerned  
47 that some fishers in Cordova might be abusing  
48 subsistence opportunities and selling some subsistence  
49 caught salmon.

50

0476

1 Managers need to learn from the salmon  
2 declines on the Yukon River and the severe impacts that  
3 has had on Yukon River subsistence users. It would be  
4 sad to see the same thing happen on the Copper River.

5  
6 The Copper River is already  
7 experiencing increased numbers of users and that  
8 increase is already stressing the resource.

9  
10 Mr. Chair, that concludes a summary of  
11 the main points made at the joint meeting in opposition  
12 of 21-10 by the members of the Eastern Interior  
13 Council.

14  
15 There were no comments from the Eastern  
16 Interior Council members in support of FP21-10 at that  
17 meeting.

18  
19 Even though the Council was in  
20 opposition to the proposal, during discussion some  
21 Council members did suggest two potential modifications  
22 if the proposal were to be adopted by the Board.

23  
24 1. Prohibit guide services in this new  
25 fishery.

26  
27 2. Prohibit dipnetting by boat.

28  
29 These modifications were just brought  
30 up during discussion and the Council did not vote on  
31 these modifications.

32  
33 In addition to comments about the  
34 proposal itself, the Eastern Interior Council members  
35 also provided comments about the Board's decision to  
36 defer FP21-10 and the request that both Councils meet  
37 to develop a compromise. Some of those points that  
38 members made were as follows:

39  
40 It has been too long between when  
41 Fisheries Proposal FP21-10 was originally reviewed by  
42 the Council and now, the joint meeting, to be deciding  
43 on it again.

44  
45 The Council has had three meetings  
46 since we originally took this up and after so much time  
47 lapse this is not really fair for our members to have  
48 to be discussing it again.

49  
50

0477

1                   There are four new members who were not  
2 present for the original deliberation and  
3 recommendation and who have not been previously been  
4 presented information on this proposal.

5  
6                   It is unfair for the Board the two  
7 Councils meet and try to compromise.

8  
9                   Additionally, some members felt under  
10 pressure by the Board to come up with additional  
11 comments.

12  
13                   Mr. Chair, and members of the Board  
14 that concludes the summary of some of the main points  
15 provided by members of the Eastern Interior Council at  
16 the March 16th, 2022 joint meeting with the  
17 Southcentral Council to discuss deferred Fisheries  
18 Proposal FP21-10. As DeAnna previously mentioned, the  
19 full transcripts are available for the full comments.

20  
21                   I will now turn it over to Southcentral  
22 Council Vice Chair, Gloria Stickwan, and the Eastern  
23 Interior Council Chair Sue Entsminger who may wish to  
24 provide additional comments.

25  
26                   MR. PELTOLA: Thank you. Gloria and  
27 Sue, please proceed.

28  
29                   MS. STICKWAN: This is Gloria Stickwan.  
30 Earlier this morning I heard about no one met with  
31 people in Cordova from up here. There was a Board of  
32 Fish meeting, my understanding was they did meet with  
33 residents in Cordova about fishing. I did not go down  
34 there so I don't really know. But I do know that they  
35 met with the people down there and had dinner with  
36 them, from -- people from up this way, the Ahtna people  
37 and fisheries proposals was talked about but I can't  
38 tell you who. I know they met with residents though.

39  
40                   And I just want to say, again, that,  
41 you know, all the RAC Southcentral members that fish on  
42 the Copper River were all opposed to this fishery and  
43 Eastern Interior as well.

44  
45                   And, again, Eyak has continuously been  
46 saying no to this proposed fishery.

47  
48                   I was told to say only things that the  
49 RAC has said, but I had to respond to that comment made  
50

0478

1 this morning. I think all the points were made. I  
2 hope you will consider and give deference to the RACs  
3 after meeting two times on this proposal.

4

5 A decision was made by both RACs.

6

7 Thank you.

8

9 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Gloria. Sue,  
10 do you have any additional comments as the Chair of the  
11 Eastern Interior.

12

13 MS. ENTSMINGER: Yes, thank you. You  
14 can hear me.

15

16 MR. PELTOLA: Five by five.

17

18 MS. ENTSMINGER: Okay. This is Sue  
19 Entsminger, Eastern Interior Chair. Yes, that was a  
20 good summary of all of the comments.

21

22 I want to talk a little bit, this kind  
23 of reminds me of the Yukon River, because I've been on  
24 this Council 21 years and, boy, this is the beginning  
25 stages of what has happened on the Yukon River to the  
26 point where they're not even being able to fish chums  
27 either, kings or chums, even for subsistence. So we  
28 need to be really, really careful when we look at these  
29 proposals.

30

31 And I want to talk a little bit about  
32 the process. And I do want to remind the Board  
33 members, there was three members not present at our  
34 meeting because they were at other meetings, and  
35 couldn't attend, and at any rate, Greg and I, the Chair  
36 of the Southcentral RAC were called by DeAnna and we  
37 started talking about what to do with coming up with a  
38 compromise. And I know, Greg -- I said, Greg, we  
39 probably won't agree on this one because of the Yukon  
40 River and the -- the -- we, the Eastern Interior, have  
41 -- it's a crossover proposal because the Copper River  
42 we have a C&T, the southern -- or the Unit 12 people  
43 have a C&T for the river and we put our wheels in or  
44 get fish from the Slana area. And at any rate Greg and  
45 I were talking and I -- we both felt a little -- a  
46 little bit concerned that it was brought back to us --  
47 for the concern -- and we talked about it several times  
48 and as you know it was delayed several times and every  
49 time I talked to Greg we felt like it put a lot on us  
50

0479

1 and I think a better process for us, as a Council, this  
2 might be a real learning experience for Staff, would be  
3 to have recognized that, okay, we didn't allow -- we  
4 were looking at this same proposal, we were not looking  
5 at any new information and it's a controversial issue  
6 over up river and down river and this would be better  
7 met if there was a working group. I suggested that at  
8 first to Greg when we talked. We talked several times  
9 before this meeting actually happened and we -- I don't  
10 think he was in favor of a working group at first but  
11 once we had the joint meeting I heard him say it a  
12 couple of times, that a working group and giving more  
13 information and allowing public testimony would have  
14 been a better way to have addressed this. And I think  
15 in the future it was really wrong not to have public  
16 testimony at the meeting or -- and then have public  
17 testimony at this meeting. So it just -- it's a little  
18 bit perplexed and confusing and concerned about the  
19 process. So I think it's very important to have more  
20 opportunity for the public to get involved and maybe  
21 talk about specifics about proposals that we might  
22 agree on, could have happened, but we're volunteers. I  
23 have to remind you all we're volunteers, and work that  
24 you guys do to help us is really important.

25

26 And that's the only thing that I have  
27 to add is just concern about the process.

28

29 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Sue. And I  
30 would just like to provide comment from this end is  
31 that providing public testimony is the discretion of  
32 the Chair but since I did hear some complaints that we  
33 had not provided those, that is the reason why I opted  
34 to allow opportunity for now for the Board's  
35 consideration.

36

37 With that being said we have heard from  
38 DeAnna, we've heard from Brooke, we've heard from the  
39 Vice Chair of Southcentral, the Chair of Eastern  
40 Interior, does the Board have any questions or comments  
41 for any of those four individuals involved in that  
42 presentation, if so please go ahead and ask directly.

43

44 MR. SCHMID: Yeah, Mr. Chair, this is  
45 Dave. Just a point of clarification, if I could help,  
46 maybe going back to DeAnna's comments and others that I  
47 heard on the vote as well. I know that the vote during  
48 the joint RAC meetings, I know there were a number of  
49 folks absent from the Eastern Interior and there were a  
50

50

0480

1 couple that were absent as well that submitted a  
2 written comment there, DeAnna, in terms of the  
3 Southcentral's RACs vote. Could you clarify that  
4 because you said that they voted against it but I know  
5 that the Chair, Greg, spoke a bit at the very end of  
6 the meeting and folks started falling off the phone  
7 fairly quickly but how did that end, if you could  
8 clarify that, in terms of a vote for the Southcentral.

9

10 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Member Schmid.  
11 Through the Chair, this is DeAnna Perry, Coordinator  
12 for the Southcentral Council. We did have two  
13 Southcentral Council members who were unable to attend  
14 any part of the meeting. In lieu of that attendance  
15 they did provide written statements in support of the  
16 motion, however, because they were absent they could  
17 not participate in the vote.

18

19 And, Mr. Peltola, Acting Chair, I do  
20 have the information that you requested earlier.

21

22 Again, the issue came before the  
23 Southcentral Council on October 7th through 8th, their  
24 fall 2020 meeting. The Board deferred this action in  
25 its meeting, January 26th through 29th, 2021. After  
26 that plans were made to have a joint meeting with  
27 Eastern Interior and we had targeted the week of  
28 October 11th, 2021 but as you know fall is our  
29 regulatory meeting and as we got closer and we found  
30 out how many proposals that both Southcentral and  
31 Eastern Interior would have on their agenda, with the  
32 approval of the Chairs, we deferred that to the winter  
33 meeting where we thought there would be more time,  
34 however, we couldn't have more than two RAC meetings in  
35 one week so both Councils picked one day, March 16th,  
36 to have their joint meeting and that's what Ms. McDavid  
37 and myself have summarized.

38

39 So thank you, Mr. Acting Chair, for  
40 allowing me to put that on the record.

41

42 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, I appreciate  
43 the effort. Are there any other questions from Board  
44 members for the group.

45

46 MS. ENTSMINGER: Mr. Chair, this is  
47 Sue, the Eastern Interior RAC Chair.

48

49 MR. PELTOLA: Go ahead, Sue.

50

0481

1 MS. ENTSMINGER: Yeah, I just wanted to  
2 let David Schmid know that, I think that's who was --  
3 about the members absent at our meeting. We had taken  
4 this up at our own meeting, not the joint meeting and  
5 it was a zero seven vote against it. And a lot of our  
6 members that are new and I -- I don't think the people  
7 on the Yukon River would be voting for it. But I'm  
8 just summarizing, I just wanted to let you know that.

9  
10 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Sue. Any  
11 further questions for Gloria, Sue, DeAnna or Brooke.

12  
13 (No comments)

14  
15 MR. PELTOLA: Hearing no others, Sue,  
16 the next item on the list is Board discussion, correct.

17  
18 MS. DETWILER: Yes, that's correct.

19  
20 MR. PELTOLA: Okay. We'll proceed.  
21 Any Board members have any further concerns, comments,  
22 questions they'd like to be answered, addressed from  
23 any of the parties involved at this point.

24  
25 MR. SCHMID: Yeah, Mr. Chair.

26  
27 MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, go ahead. Dave.

28  
29 MR. SCHMID: Yeah, not to drag this out  
30 any further but there were other -- let me see here, I  
31 didn't know if the ISC had any more comments, was that  
32 part of it or are we ready for Board deliberation?

33  
34 MR. PELTOLA: I'd defer to Sue on the  
35 process with regard to consideration for 21-10.

36  
37 MS. DETWILER: Yeah, to my knowledge  
38 the ISC did not take this up.

39  
40 MR. PELTOLA: Okay.

41  
42 MR. SCHMID: Okay.

43  
44 MS. DETWILER: But I would defer to  
45 Robbin on that.

46  
47 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
48 Through the Chair. The ISC did provide a  
49 recommendation on the original proposal and the Board  
50



0482

1 was presented with the original Regional Advisory  
2 Council recommendations and comments, the results of  
3 tribal consultations, the results -- or the comments  
4 from the State Liaison, and the comments from the ISC  
5 at that time and I believe you may find the ISC  
6 comments from the very first time this proposal was  
7 presented to the Board on -- let's see what page is  
8 that, on Page 35 of the analysis, that is part of the  
9 supplemental materials on our website.

10

11 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

12

13 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, much,  
14 appreciate it. So Dave, I think we're at the point if  
15 the Board does not have any further discussion we're  
16 open for a motion on the action -- the proposal. Any  
17 other questions, or comments, discussion from Board  
18 members.

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 MR. PELTOLA: Hearing none we're open  
23 for a motion for action on the item.

24

25 MR. SCHMID: Okay, Mr. Chair, Forest  
26 Service.

27

28 MR. PELTOLA: Go ahead, Dave.

29

30 MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chair, I move to adopt  
31 WP21-10 [sic] in support of the original Southcentral  
32 Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council  
33 recommendation to implement a salmon season fishery in  
34 the Lower Copper River adjacent to the Copper River  
35 Highway with a harvest limit of 15 salmon other than  
36 pink salmon for the first two members of the household  
37 and 10 salmon for additional household members and an  
38 annual harvest limit of five chinook salmon per  
39 household with the OSM modification to require a 48  
40 hour reporting period and additional modifications to  
41 include -- I have three of them:

42

43 1. Fishing by dipnet or rod and reel  
44 only.

45

46 2. Delay the start of the season to  
47 June 1st.

48

49 3. Prohibit dipnetting from boats.

50

0483

1                   Following a second I will explain why I  
2 intend to support my motion in support of the original  
3 Southcentral RAC's recommendation including the OSM's  
4 modification as well as the three additional proposed  
5 modifications that I just presented.

6  
7                   MR. BROWER: Second by Public Member  
8 Brower.

9  
10                  MR. PELTOLA: We have a second, please  
11 proceed.

12  
13                  MR. SCHMID: Thank you, Charlie. First  
14 of all, and most importantly I truly want to express  
15 how much I emphasize with the Federally-qualified rural  
16 residents of the Upper Copper River, including Ahtna  
17 and members of the Eastern Interior Subsistence  
18 Regional Advisory Council over concerns about the  
19 declining salmon runs on the Copper.

20  
21                  The Upper Copper has seen significant  
22 growth and you heard that from across the board, in the  
23 State personal use fishery, which has included the  
24 increased use of boats as dipnetting platforms as well  
25 as commercial guiding. From 2010 to 2019 the average  
26 annual harvest has been over 140,000 sockeye salmon in  
27 the Chitina subdistrict State personal use fishery.

28  
29                  During the same time, commercial  
30 harvest have averaged over 1.3 million sockeye salmon  
31 annually.

32  
33                  Declining chinook salmon runs have been  
34 a concern to all users across the state of Alaska for  
35 over a decade including those on the Upper and Lower  
36 Copper.

37  
38                  It is truly unfortunate to see two  
39 Federally-qualified user groups at odds with each other  
40 when over 90 percent of the Copper River sockeye and 96  
41 percent of the chinook salmon harvested between 2010  
42 and 2019 were by non-Federally-qualified user groups  
43 while Federally-qualified subsistence users took only  
44 three and four percent respectively. It's difficult  
45 for me to see how such a disparate harvest between non-  
46 Federally-qualified and Federally-qualified users  
47 translates into a subsistence priority to Federally-  
48 qualified users that rely on Copper River salmon for  
49 subsistence.

50

1 I've heard from others today that have  
2 mentioned that there's three streams, or two streams  
3 primarily in the Cordova area with Federal subsistence  
4 seasons for salmon, Eyak and Ibeck, and as you've  
5 heard, and I won't repeat, due to -- from public  
6 testimony -- due to low stream gradient and clear water  
7 dipnetting for salmon in the two streams is very  
8 challenging if not impossible most of the time. Again,  
9 the total harvest from those Federal fisheries is small  
10 from 2010 to 2019, I think you heard before, the  
11 average harvest on these streams combined was only 102  
12 sockeye and 481 coho and it's notable that most of  
13 these are caught on rod and reel.

14  
15 It's clear to me that these streams  
16 which represent the entirety of the existing Federal  
17 subsistence opportunity in Cordova do not provide  
18 adequate access or opportunity to constitute a  
19 reasonable Federal subsistence priority.

20  
21 Simply put, it leaves a significant  
22 portion of the Cordova community without a means to  
23 obtain Federal subsistence salmon.

24  
25 And, next, the proposed Federal  
26 subsistence fishery would provide a first opportunity  
27 for Federally-qualified rural users that don't have  
28 access to marine waters to obtain Copper River salmon  
29 coming out of winter when the need for salmon  
30 subsistence fish is greatest.

31  
32 Finally, probable -- the probable  
33 harvest from the proposed subsistence dipnet fishery on  
34 the Lower Copper is very low and anticipated to be at a  
35 maximum of 2,000 sockeye salmon annually. This is less  
36 than one-tenth of one percent, .08 percent, of the  
37 total average annual Copper River sockeye salmon run  
38 and less than one percent, .63 percent, of the total  
39 annual Copper River chinook salmon run. Such low  
40 harvest levels are likely to have a significant impact  
41 on the overall in-river salmon abundance relative to  
42 other existing fisheries.

43  
44 In summary, conservation and management  
45 actions over low salmon abundance should target where  
46 the vast majority of harvest occurs, primarily in the  
47 State commercial fishery in marine waters and State  
48 personal use fisheries in the Upper Copper River  
49 drainage. While the Joint Council meetings did not  
50

0485

1 result in any compromise that was supported, several  
2 constructive suggestions were made by members from each  
3 Council, which I've taken into consideration and  
4 incorporated into our modification of the proposal.  
5 With the addition of these modifications to the  
6 proposed regulation many of the concerns expressed  
7 about overharvest should be alleviated.

8

9 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

10

11 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Dave. We'll  
12 go into Board deliberation.

13

14 (No comments)

15

16 MR. PELTOLA: So one thing I'd like to  
17 comment about is that we've heard from both the  
18 Southcentral and Eastern Interior and about how they  
19 feel like they were put on the spot. At least from  
20 BIA's perspective that was never the intention. The  
21 deference provided to Regional Advisory Councils is  
22 very significant and they did have a split in opinion,  
23 that's at least from BIA's perspective, that's where I  
24 look for us going back to the Regional Advisory  
25 Councils, it was not intended to put them on the spot,  
26 put them in a bad light, whatsoever. There is great  
27 significance of the position of the Regional Advisory  
28 Councils with regards to the Board and there's certain  
29 things that -- there's only certain circumstances when  
30 the Board can counter a Regional Advisory Council  
31 decision with regard to take, those are very limited.  
32 So that's the significance of the Regional Advisory  
33 Council input. I apologize and I'm sorry to hear that  
34 the Regional Advisory Councils weren't as happy as they  
35 could have been but that's the significant role that  
36 the Regional Advisory Councils play.

37

38 A question that maybe, before we get to  
39 -- before we get to the call for the question, I could  
40 ask of OSM, if they could address this for the Board's  
41 benefit as well, is, the delegation of authority to  
42 this potential fishery if the Board passes, where does  
43 that lie, is the first question, Sue, or maybe Scott.

44

45 MR. AYERS: Mr. Chair, this is Scott  
46 Ayers for the record.

47

48 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Scott, go  
49 ahead.

50

0486

1 MR. AYERS: The delegated authority for  
2 managing the Copper River lies with the National Park  
3 Service with the Superintendent of Wrangell-St.Elias, I  
4 believe.

5  
6 MR. PELTOLA: In that delegation,  
7 Scott, does it stipulate methods, means and bags, or  
8 harvest levels?

9  
10 MR. AYERS: I don't have the delegation  
11 pulled up right now but all of the fisheries  
12 delegations are the same allowing for emergency special  
13 actions only -- I can look that up in just one moment,  
14 Mr. Chair.

15  
16 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you.

17  
18 (Pause)

19  
20 MR. PELTOLA: Please bear with us for a  
21 slight pause here.

22  
23 (Pause)

24  
25 MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chair, while we're  
26 waiting, Dave Schmid.

27  
28 MR. PELTOLA: Go ahead, Dave.

29  
30 MR. SCHMID: Yeah, I, too, and I should  
31 have began earlier here extending my apologies to the  
32 RACs that the intent, as Gene shared was not to pit one  
33 against the other, one RAC, or to put -- to try and  
34 find some forced comprise. And I know that that's how  
35 it was interpreted and I apologize if some of the  
36 language that I used earlier or on the record  
37 contributed to that. I did try to make that clear when  
38 we started the -- when welcoming folks together to the  
39 meeting that, you know, not compromising or not  
40 changing positions was perfectly acceptable and I do  
41 apologize for that. I think if anything contributed to  
42 a hardening of original positions and maybe some  
43 stronger feelings.

44  
45 So my deepest regrets if I did  
46 contribute, that was certainly not the intent. I was  
47 hoping that the RACs could hear from each other and  
48 maybe at least understand each other's position a  
49 little bit closer.

50

0487

1 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2

3 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Dave. And  
4 your comments do address what I consider the backbone  
5 of the Federal Subsistence Program, and that is the  
6 engagement and involvement and the outcomes from our  
7 Regional Advisory Councils. Thank you, Dave.

8

9 MR. AYERS: Mr. Chair, this is Scott.  
10 I'm ready.

11

12 MR. PELTOLA: Go ahead, Scott.

13

14 MR. AYERS: I pulled up the letter or  
15 delegation and specifically I'm looking at the scope of  
16 delegation and it permits the in-season manager to open  
17 or close Federal subsistence fishing periods or areas  
18 provided under the codified regulations. It also  
19 permits them to specify methods and means, to specify  
20 permit requirements and to set harvest and possession  
21 limits for Federal subsistence fisheries. It also  
22 permits them to close and reopen Federal public waters  
23 to non-subsistence fishing but does not permit them to  
24 specify method and means, permit requirements or  
25 harvest and possession limits for State managed  
26 fishery. That delegation may only be exercised when  
27 it's necessary to conserve healthy populations of fish  
28 or to ensure the continuation of subsistence uses. All  
29 other changes to codified regulations such as customary  
30 and traditional use determinations or requests for  
31 special actions greater than 60 days shall be directed  
32 to the Board.

33

34 Please let me know if that clarifies  
35 things, Mr. Chair.

36

37 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Scott. I do  
38 appreciate that. One other point I would like to raise  
39 is, and then I'll go see if there is any other Board  
40 members who have any comments or concerns before we  
41 call for the question, but I'd like to reiterate a  
42 portion of the statement that Dave made when he was  
43 justifying his motion.

44

45 Is that, once, again, the Federal  
46 Subsistence Program is placed in a scenario to argue  
47 over a significant minority of the run, it constitutes  
48 anywhere from one to two percent of the run. The  
49 overall impact of the fishery for Federally-qualified  
50

0488

1 users lies outside the potential direct action of the  
2 Federal Subsistence Board and our Federal regulations  
3 have a minimum impact on the overall run size return as  
4 a whole. I just wanted to reiterate what Dave  
5 mentioned.

6  
7 With that being said, any other Federal  
8 Subsistence Board have any questions or comments.

9  
10 MS. CREACHBAUM: Mr. Chair, NPS.

11  
12 MR. PELTOLA: Go ahead.

13  
14 MS. CREACHBAUM: Mr. Chair, I move to  
15 amend the motion to authorize the Lower Copper River  
16 fishery on a temporary basis for a three year period  
17 beginning in 2022. And if I get a second I'll explain  
18 the justification for supporting my amendment.

19  
20 MS. BOARIO: Second.

21  
22 MR. PELTOLA: We have a second. Go  
23 ahead, Sarah.

24  
25 MS. CREACHBAUM: Thank you. The intent  
26 of my amendment is to authorize the Federal subsistence  
27 fishery on the Lower Copper River on a trial basis. I  
28 acknowledge the introduction of this Federal  
29 subsistence fisheries is consistent with the intent of  
30 ANILCA and, as such, a Federal priority. This said, it  
31 comes at a difficult time with the Secretary of  
32 Commerce recently declaring disasters in the Copper  
33 River salmon fisheries in 2018 and 2020. Additionally,  
34 the chinook salmon runs have been at historic lows in  
35 recent years and sockeye salmon runs have been weak.  
36 The introduction of a new fishery should be done with  
37 great caution, have a deliberate approach and allow for  
38 those that manage the fisheries of the Copper River,  
39 the State of Alaska and Wrangell-St.Elias National Park  
40 and Preserve the opportunity to test the fishery for  
41 three years to best learn how the new activity  
42 integrates into current systems of commercial and in-  
43 river management before finalizing the regulations.  
44 This pilot approach is the responsible and professional  
45 action required of public servants employing the  
46 precautionary principle to management of fish and  
47 wildlife while best meeting the needs of the resources  
48 and the people who depend on them. It is also  
49 appropriate to allow our partner in conservation of  
50

0489

1 Copper River, the State of Alaska, the opportunity to  
2 evaluate and adapt to a new fishery while minimizing  
3 any potential impacts to participants in existing  
4 Federal subsistence fisheries up river, many of whom,  
5 already have difficulty in meeting their needs.

6  
7 For these reasons I intend to support  
8 my amendment to establish the Lower Copper River  
9 fishery on a temporary basis only with an exception of  
10 evaluation and revision in three years time.

11  
12 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

13  
14 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Sarah. Any  
15 discussion or comments about the amendment.

16  
17 MR. AYERS: Mr. Chair, this is Scott  
18 Ayers with OSM, I have a question.

19  
20 MR. PELTOLA: Go ahead, Scott.

21  
22 MR. AYERS: Sorry, I was listening in  
23 to the amendment and I just wanted to make sure I had  
24 it accurately, that this would make this a temporary  
25 three year fishery and the starting year would be 2022?

26  
27 MS. CREACHBAUM: That's correct.

28  
29 MR. AYERS: Thank you.

30  
31 MR. PELTOLA: Any other questions or  
32 comments before we proceed.

33  
34 (No comments)

35  
36 MR. PELTOLA: Hearing none then I'd  
37 like to make one comment. I'm not necessarily a fan of  
38 sunset clauses. I think if the Board were to take an  
39 action to establish a fishery, that there is ample in-  
40 season and regulatory measures to serve the same  
41 purpose, it would just require due diligence and paying  
42 attention to the fishery, the agency, and the  
43 management.

44  
45 Anybody else have any questions or  
46 comments.

47  
48 (No comments)

49  
50



0490

1 MR. PELTOLA: Hearing none, would  
2 support a call for the question.

3  
4 MS. PITKA: Hi, I'm sorry, this is  
5 Rhonda Pitka.

6  
7 MR. PELTOLA: Go ahead, Rhonda.

8  
9 MS. PITKA: Hi. No, I just wanted to  
10 let you know that I was online finally.

11  
12 MR. PELTOLA: Okay. Rhonda.....

13  
14 MS. PITKA: My plane was late and I  
15 finally landed.

16  
17 MR. PELTOLA: Okay. We are at -- we  
18 are discussing FP21-10, the Lower Copper River area  
19 salmon. We've gone through the intro by the Fisheries  
20 Office, we received an updated analysis, we received a  
21 summary from the Regional Advisory Council Joint  
22 meeting of Southcentral and Eastern Interior, in  
23 addition to comments from the two Chairs. We took  
24 about 45 minutes of additional public comment. We had  
25 a motion made by National Forest Service [sic], and  
26 then we had an amendment made by the National Park  
27 Service.

28  
29 And for Rhonda's benefit, Sue, could  
30 you please ask Staff to read the original motion and  
31 then the amendment.

32  
33 MS. DETWILER: Yes. So the original  
34 motion was to adopt Fisheries Proposal 21-10 as  
35 modified by OSM and further modified by the Forest  
36 Service to allow fishing only by dipnet, and rod and  
37 reel, delay the start of the fishery to June 1 and  
38 prohibit dipnetting by boat.

39  
40 And the amendment that is now under  
41 consideration is to make this a temporary three year  
42 fishery starting in 2022.

43  
44 REPORTER: And, excuse me, this is  
45 Tina, the court reporter, could I just clarify who made  
46 the second on the amendment because I only heard a  
47 woman's voice but no name. Thank you.

48  
49 MS. DETWILER: The second on the  
50

0491

1 amended -- the second on the motion to amend was made  
2 by Rhonda Pitka, I believe.

3  
4 REPORTER: Oh, okay, I thought it was  
5 Fish and Wildlife Service. Rhonda, is that correct?

6  
7 MS. PITKA: No, no, I did not make that  
8 -- I'm sorry, I didn't make that second, I wasn't -- my  
9 line was still on mute.

10  
11 REPORTER: That's what I thought, okay.

12  
13 MS. DETWILER: Oh, okay.....

14  
15 REPORTER: So who made the second, Fish  
16 and Wildlife Service?

17  
18 MS. BOARIO: Fish and Wildlife Service  
19 seconded.

20  
21 REPORTER: Thank you. Thank you, very  
22 much.

23  
24 MR. PELTOLA: So, Rhonda, a procedural  
25 question for me, since normally you fill in in the  
26 absence of the Chair, would you like to take over at  
27 this time or would you like me to follow through with  
28 the completion of 21-10, then have you take over after  
29 that.

30  
31 MS. PITKA: I'd like you to follow  
32 through with completion. Thank you.

33  
34 MR. PELTOLA: Okay. Okay, thank you,  
35 Rhonda. So we've updated Rhonda, she's online now, we  
36 appreciate your presence, Rhonda.

37  
38 So at this point we've had a motion,  
39 we've had an amendment to the motion. So we could look  
40 for a call for the question to vote on the amendment.

41  
42 MR. SCHMID: Question on the amendment.

43  
44 MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair, I have a  
45 question.

46  
47 MR. PELTOLA: We had two people speak  
48 over each other.

49  
50

0492

1 MR. BROWER: Yes, I just had a question  
2 on the amendment, if I may before we vote.

3  
4 MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, go ahead, Charlie.

5  
6 MR. BROWER: Yeah, I have a concern  
7 with the trial run for three years. What -- what's the  
8 outcome of this pre-run trial?

9  
10 MR. PELTOLA: Okay, Sue, if you could  
11 elaborate, if I get it wrong. But if the Board was to  
12 adopt this with the amendment the regulation would be  
13 put in place for a three year period starting in 2022  
14 and would potentially expire after that. You can  
15 correct me if.....

16  
17 MS. DETWILER: Yes, that's -- that's --  
18 yeah, that's my understanding. But I also would like  
19 to ask Theo Matuskowitz, if he's online, he's our  
20 regulatory specialist, if you would like anything  
21 further than that he can provide that information.

22  
23 MR. PELTOLA: Theo, if you're on board  
24 could you provide a little input for the Board's  
25 consideration please.

26  
27 MR. MATUSKOWITZ: Yes, Mr. Chair. This  
28 is Theo Matuskowitz, for the record. What Sue said is  
29 basically correct. This regulation would expire at the  
30 end of the season in 2024 and unless someone took an  
31 action to submit a proposal to continue this action it  
32 would just expire and removed from the regulations.

33  
34 Let me know if you have any further  
35 questions. Thank you.

36  
37 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Theo.  
38 Appreciate that clarification.

39  
40 MS. CREACHBAUM: Mr. Chair, National  
41 Park Service.

42  
43 MR. PELTOLA: Go ahead, Sarah.

44  
45 MS. CREACHBAUM: Just for a point of  
46 clarification, the three year time period would be made  
47 with an expectation of evaluation and revision in three  
48 years time. Thank you.

49  
50

0493

1 MR. PELTOLA: So I have a question  
2 then, would the evaluation or revision based on your  
3 motion you made, would you intend the regulation to be  
4 permanent, the Board revisit and reevaluate and take  
5 potential action three years out?

6  
7 MS. CREACHBAUM: Yes, Mr. Chair.

8  
9 MR. PELTOLA: So based on that  
10 clarification I'd have a question for legal counsel,  
11 Solicitor's Office, Ken. Would the Board be able to  
12 revisit an existing regulation that is on the books for  
13 reevaluation or consideration three years out without a  
14 particular motion -- or proposal being made to the  
15 Board for consideration?

16  
17 MR. LORD: Gene, I actually had the  
18 same question and I was about to text that to Theo so  
19 we could discuss it. So if you could give us a minute  
20 offline we'll figure that out for you.

21  
22 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Ken. So at  
23 this time I propose let's give them a 12, 15 minute  
24 break, come back at 15 minutes past the hour and  
25 hopefully we'll have clarification. Thank you, Ken.  
26 Talk to everybody shortly.

27  
28 (Off record)

29  
30 (On record)

31  
32 MS. DETWILER: We'll go back and do a  
33 roll call here to make sure we have a quorum of Board  
34 members back on the call.

35  
36 Starting with National Park Service,  
37 Sarah Creachbaum.

38  
39 MS. CREACHBAUM: Hi Sue, I'm present.

40  
41 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

42  
43 Tom Heinlein, BLM.

44  
45 MR. HEINLEIN: Hi, Sue, I'm present.

46  
47 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

48  
49 Fish and Wildlife Service, Sara Boario.

50

0494

1 MS. BOARIO: I am here, thanks, Sue.

2

3 MS. DETWILER: Forest Service, Dave

4 Schmid.

5

6 MR. SCHMID: I'm here, Sue, thanks.

7

8 MS. DETWILER: Thanks, Dave.

9

10 BIA, Gene Peltola.

11

12 MR. PELTOLA: BIA's back.

13

14 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

15

16 Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

17

18 MS. PITKA: Hi, I'm online.

19

20 MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Rhonda.

21

22 Public Member Charlie Brower.

23

24 (No comments)

25

26 MS. DETWILER: Chair Anthony

27 Christianson.

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 MS. DETWILER: Robbin, or someone on  
32 the call, could you check with the Operator and see if  
33 Public Members Brower is trying to get in.

34

35 OPERATOR: This is the Operator, if  
36 you're on the line please press star, zero. If you're  
37 on the line please press star, zero.

38

39 (Pause)

40

41 OPERATOR: No one has signaled at this  
42 time.

43

44 MS. DETWILER: Mr. Chair, we have  
45 Rhonda Pitka -- Public Member Rhonda Pitka and then the  
46 five agency Board Members online. We're trying to get  
47 Mr. Brower, who was just recently online and Anthony  
48 Christianson.

49

50

0495

1 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Sue. Sue, why  
2 don't give it a couple more minutes to try to get  
3 Charlie online. We have at least Rhonda here if we are  
4 in a position where we end up proceeding although I  
5 would like to have both involved in the final decision  
6 of this proposal if can be. So let's give it a couple  
7 more minutes.

8  
9 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

10  
11 (Pause)

12  
13 MR. PELTOLA: To the members of the  
14 public, we do apologize, we're giving it a couple more  
15 minutes here to see if we get one more of our Public  
16 Members back online. If we don't hear from anybody  
17 here shortly then we'll proceed.

18  
19 (Pause)

20  
21 MR. PELTOLA: Operator, have we had any  
22 success in getting Public Member Brower back on board?

23  
24 OPERATOR: At this time I don't -- I  
25 still do not see Mr. Brower.

26  
27 MR. PELTOLA: Okay, unless there's an  
28 objection from any of the other Board Members I propose  
29 we proceed.

30  
31 (No objections)

32  
33 MR. PELTOLA: Okay, hearing no  
34 objections, Theo and Ken, could you please enlighten  
35 the Board what you have discussed, please.

36  
37 MR. MATUSKOWITZ: Yes, Mr. Chair.  
38 Again, this is Theo Matuskowitz for the record. First,  
39 I'll point out that this is something new that the  
40 Board hasn't done before, however, I feel fairly  
41 confident the Office of Federal Register would allow  
42 this. We could use terminology along the lines of, you  
43 know, this regulation expires on XX, you know, end of  
44 season 2024 unless reviewed or renewed by action of the  
45 Board. So I think that would be safe to use and would  
46 be accepted by the Federal Register.

47  
48 And I'll also point out since we're  
49 talking about a three year period here, also that would  
50

0496

1 not preclude anyone from submitting a regular proposal  
2 to revise change, you know, whatever this -- this  
3 regulation. But as of what we're attempting to do --  
4 what you're attempting to do now, yes, I believe we can  
5 do that if we were to word it a certain way and I'll  
6 work with the Federal Register to get this through.

7

8 Please let me know if you have any  
9 questions.

10

11 Thank you.

12

13 MR. PELTOLA: Yes, Theo, this is Gene.  
14 Just one follow up after your explanation there. Would  
15 there need to be a specific -- what would it take for  
16 the Board to invoke an expiration or extension if we  
17 were going to review the effectiveness after the three  
18 year period. So procedurally what would have to be  
19 presented to the Board outside of another proposal to  
20 take action as proposed?

21

22 MR. MATUSKOWITZ: Well, since -- well,  
23 it would be in the regulation that, you know, we're  
24 referring to, you know, some action being renewed by  
25 the Board, it's in the record that at the expiration if  
26 you want -- if the Board wants to vote to continue it,  
27 if the Board wants to vote to, you know, make it  
28 permanent and drop the, you know, the timeline you can  
29 do that because we're saying it this certain way in the  
30 actual regulation. So it's basically, you know, in  
31 2024 the Board can act on this if they so desire and  
32 make whatever changes they want or if they decide -- if  
33 you decide to do nothing it will expire.

34

35 MR. PELTOLA: Okay, Theo, thank you.  
36 Anybody have any questions for Theo and/or Ken, from  
37 the Board.

38

39 (No comments)

40

41 MR. PELTOLA: Any questions or  
42 comments.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 MR. PELTOLA: I'd like to provide one.  
47 I do appreciate the effort that Ken and Theo put into  
48 it. I'm still a bit uncomfortable with the verbiage or  
49 terminology which has been utilized, is that I've heard  
50

0497

1 should, may be able to, will work with as opposed to a  
2 yes or no, and for those reasons I'm leaning towards  
3 not supporting this amendment.

4

5 Any other questions or comments from  
6 any other Board members.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 MR. PELTOLA: Hearing none, we'd  
11 entertain a call for the question to vote on the  
12 amendment.

13

14 MR. SCHMID: Question. And I believe  
15 Charlie has joined or is trying to call in now.

16

17 MR. PELTOLA: Okay. I have a question,  
18 Operator, can you confirm whether Public Member Charlie  
19 Brower is on or not.

20

21 OPERATOR: Mr. Brower, if you're on the  
22 line please press star, zero. Again, if you're on the  
23 line please press star, zero. At this time I don't see  
24 where anyone has called in with the host passcode.  
25 Just a moment.

26

27 (Pause)

28

29 MS. DETWILER: Mr. Chair, while we're  
30 waiting for Charlie to join on, may I just read the  
31 wording that we have now for the amendment to make sure  
32 that it's what the Board is wanting to vote on.

33

34 MR. PELTOLA: Please do, Sue, with the  
35 concurrence of the motion maker.

36

37 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you. So the  
38 amendment that the Board will be voting on would make  
39 -- it's an amendment to the prior motion, to adopt with  
40 modifications. This amendment would make it a  
41 temporary fishing season starting in 2022 to expire  
42 following the 2024 season unless renewed by action of  
43 the Federal Subsistence Board.

44

45 (Pause)

46

47 MS. DETWILER: So I'm just looking for  
48 concurrence with the motion maker and seconder, that  
49 that is -- and, I guess the attorneys, to make sure

50



0498

1 that that is the wording -- wording of the amendment  
2 that the Board should be voting on.

3

4 MR. MATUSKOWITZ: Mr. Chair, this is  
5 Theo Matuskowicz, may I address this issue, please.

6

7 MR. PELTOLA: Go ahead, Theo.

8

9 MR. MATUSKOWITZ: Yes, I think we'd  
10 have a problem using the word, temporary. These are in  
11 the CFR, they're permanent regulations, so that very  
12 well could become a sticking point to try and get this  
13 published. I think it would be best if we remove,  
14 temporary, and just say, to make, you know, this  
15 regulation effective starting in 2022 and to expire  
16 following the 2024 season unless renewed by action of  
17 the Federal Subsistence Board. The temporary part, I  
18 feel, would be questioned because they'd probably refer  
19 to our special action regulations and say, well, why  
20 don't you address it this way because, you know, the  
21 CFR are permanent regulations.

22

23 So that would be my only  
24 recommendation.

25

26 Thank you.

27

28 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Theo, for the  
29 clarification. So, Sue, can.....

30

31 MS. DETWILER: Yeah, reread -- reread  
32 it as -- as modified by Theo.

33

34 MR. PELTOLA: Excuse me?

35

36 MS. DETWILER: I'm sorry, I  
37 interrupted, I was going to offer to reread it with the  
38 modification by Theo.

39

40 MR. PELTOLA: Oh, actually I was  
41 checking with Sue [sic] to see what her motion actually  
42 was, if she could review her motion and be willing to  
43 read it such that -- since we did have a second and we  
44 had a call for question, and if she used the term,  
45 temporary, then I would say with concurrence of the  
46 motion maker and the second before we continue  
47 deliberations and potential vote and strike that from  
48 her motion -- or her amendment I should say. So Sue  
49 [sic], did you use the term, temporary.

50

0499

1 MS. CREACHBAUM: You're asking for  
2 Sarah.

3  
4 MR. PELTOLA: Yes, Sarah Creachbaum.

5  
6 MS. CREACHBAUM: National Park Service.

7  
8 MR. PELTOLA: Yes, sorry about that.

9  
10 MS. CREACHBAUM: Oh, that's okay. It's  
11 not -- we did not use the word temporary.

12  
13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We can take it  
14 out. We did but we can take it out.

15  
16 MS. CREACHBAUM: Oh, I see, I'm sorry.  
17 We did apparently but we're prepared to remove that.

18  
19 MR. PELTOLA: So with the verbiage,  
20 temporary, in the original amendment, in order to  
21 facilitate the concerns expressed by our Regulations  
22 Specialist and with input from the Solicitor's, with  
23 the concurrence of the second, would -- Sarah  
24 Creachbaum, would you be willing to strike the term,  
25 temporary?

26  
27 MS. CREACHBAUM: Yes.

28  
29 MR. PELTOLA: The second on that motion  
30 I believe was Sara Boario.

31  
32 REPORTER: Yes.

33  
34 MR. PELTOLA: Sue, could you confirm  
35 who the second was on the amendment for us, please, so  
36 we could get concurrence from the second.

37  
38 MS. DETWILER: I believe it was Sara  
39 Boario or Jill Klein may be sitting in for her at the  
40 moment.

41  
42 MR. PELTOLA: Jill or Sara are you  
43 online?

44  
45 MS. BOARIO: Yeah.

46  
47 MR. PELTOLA: Do you concur striking  
48 the term, temporary?

49  
50

0500

1 MS. BOARIO: Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you much. So we have clarification on the motion that, temporary, is not utilized based on the advice from the Regulations -- and Solicitor's Office input. Question has been called, is that correct, Sue?

MS. DETWILER: Actually I don't remember who called for the question if they did.

REPORTER: Yes, the Forest Service.

MR. SCHMID: This is Dave. I did call for the question, Forest Service.

MR. PELTOLA: Okay, thank you, Dave. Sue, could you please proceed with the roll call vote on the amendment.

MS. DETWILER: Yes. Starting with the maker of the motion, Sarah Creachbaum, National Park Service.

MS. CREACHBAUM: The National Park Service supports.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Sara Boario, Fish and Wildlife Service.

MS. BOARIO: Fish and Wildlife Service supports.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Gene Peltola, BIA.

MR. PELTOLA: Bureau of Indian Affairs votes to oppose. This is too complex of an issue to be trying something for an initial first time with the significance of subsistence on the Copper River. Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Bureau of Land Management, Tom Heinlein.

0501

1 MR. MCKEE: Sue, this is Chris McKee,  
2 I'm standing in for Tom, he had to step away for  
3 another meeting briefly so I'll be acting in his stead.

4  
5 BLM supports.

6  
7 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

8  
9 Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

10  
11 MR. SCHMID: Forest Service opposed.

12  
13 MS. DETWILER: Okay.

14  
15 Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

16  
17 MS. PITKA: I oppose the amendment.

18  
19 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

20  
21 Public Member Charlie Brower.

22  
23 MR. BROWER: Oppose.

24  
25 MS. DETWILER: Okay. The vote is --  
26 Chair Anthony Christianson, did you come on.

27  
28 (No comments)

29  
30 MS. DETWILER: So it looks like the  
31 motion fails, three yeas and four nos.

32  
33 MR. PELTOLA: Okay, thank you, Sue.  
34 That brings us back to the original motion as presented  
35 by National Forest Service [sic]. Any other  
36 discussion, if not we'd be ready to entertain the call  
37 for the question.

38  
39 (No comments)

40  
41 MR. BROWER: Question.

42  
43 MR. PELTOLA: Question's been called.  
44 And, Sue, can you please conduct a roll call vote of  
45 the Board members.

46  
47 MS. DETWILER: Okay. So for  
48 clarification the original motion was to adopt FP21-10  
49 with modification as recommended by OSM, with further  
50

0502

1 modification by Forest Service to allow fishing only by  
2 dipnet and rod and reel, delay the start of the fishery  
3 to June 1, and prohibit dipnetting by boats.

4

5 And starting with the Forest Service.

6

7 MR. SCHMID: Yes, Forest Service. I  
8 support the motion with the justification I provided  
9 earlier.

10

11 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

12

13 Sarah Creachbaum, Park Service.

14

15 MS. CREACHBAUM: National Park Service  
16 supports.

17

18 MS. DETWILER: Sara Boario, Fish and  
19 Wildlife Service.

20

21 MS. BOARIO: Service supports.

22

23 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

24

25 Gene Peltola, BIA.

26

27 MR. PELTOLA: The Bureau of Indian  
28 Affairs asks that as Acting Chair you come to us at the  
29 end of the roll call vote.

30

31 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

32

33 BLM, Thomas Heinlein.

34

35 MR. MCKEE: BLM supports.

36

37 MS. DETWILER: Okay.

38

39 Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

40

41 MS. PITKA: Hello, can you hear me?

42

43 MS. DETWILER: Yes. Yes, Rhonda, what  
44 is your.....

45

46 MS. PITKA: Okay, great. I oppose. I  
47 oppose FP21-10. The Eastern Interior Regional Advisory  
48 Council opposed the proposal because of potential  
49 conservation concerns and depletion of very important  
50

0503

1 subsistence resource, and they detailed a lot of  
2 concerns on Page 34 of the Board book.

3

4 Thank you.

5

6 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

7

8 Public Member Charlie Brower.

9

10 MR. BROWER: Opposed.

11

12 MS. DETWILER: Okay.

13

14 Chair Anthony Christianson, if you've  
15 come on.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 MS. DETWILER: Finally back to you, Mr.  
20 Peltola.

21

22 MR. PELTOLA: Standby, concurring with  
23 Staff.

24

25 (Pause)

26

27 MR. PELTOLA: BIA's been very torn on  
28 this issue, although when I spoke to the significance  
29 of the Regional Advisory Councils and their input, the  
30 last vote presented to us is two Regional Advisory  
31 Councils in opposition so BIA votes to oppose in  
32 support of the Regional Advisory Councils.

33

34 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you. So the  
35 vote is four in favor of the motion to adopt, and three  
36 opposed. The motion passes.

37

38 MR. PELTOLA: Okay, that completes  
39 FP21-10. I appreciate everybody's patience. I know we  
40 did -- it was a little unorthodox but we try to get  
41 some input in, we tried to get legal advice so the  
42 Board could take appropriate action. With that being  
43 said, I would like to, if she's willing to take it,  
44 pass on to -- pro tem duties to duties to Public Member  
45 Rhonda Pitka.

46

47 MS. PITKA: Yes, absolutely.

48

49 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Rhonda.

50

0504

1 MS. PITKA: Thank you very much, Mr.  
2 Peltola for your handling the meeting. I just landed  
3 in Seattle at about 1:00 p.m., and so my service was  
4 very spotty at times.

5  
6 So right now we're at scheduling of  
7 upcoming Board meetings.

8  
9 MS. DETWILER: Yes, Madame Chair, we  
10 just have two more agenda items. Schedule of upcoming  
11 Board meetings and the last item is Federal Subsistence  
12 Management correspondence procedures and I would note  
13 for Item 11, correspondence procedures, the original  
14 requester for that agenda items was the Chair, Tony  
15 Christianson, who requested this item be on the agenda  
16 and he is not present as far as I know. That is --  
17 it's not a time sensitive issue, the Board could, at  
18 it's pleasure, defer it to the next meeting or continue  
19 on with this agenda item at this meeting. I'm prepared  
20 to go either way on that, I'm the presenter on that.

21  
22 And actually I kind of got ahead of  
23 you, Madame Chair, I apologize. You were ready to  
24 launch in to schedule of upcoming Board meetings.

25  
26 MS. PITKA: Yes, thank you. So the  
27 schedule of upcoming Board meetings, I believe that's  
28 Robbin LaVine.

29  
30 MS. LAVINE: Yes, thank.....

31  
32 MS. DETWILER: Yes.

33  
34 MS. LAVINE: .....you, Madame Chair.  
35 This is Robbin.

36  
37 MS. PITKA: Go ahead.

38  
39 MS. LAVINE: And I first would like to  
40 confirm the 2022 summer work session. Earlier in the  
41 year we conducted a doodle poll and seven of the eight  
42 Board members confirmed availability for July 26th and  
43 27th. I want, on the record, to confirm that a quorum  
44 of the Board would be available on those dates. And I  
45 would note that this is a very difficult time for Board  
46 members and Staff alike. Staff, in particular, are  
47 constrained by deadlines, reviews and preparing all of  
48 the work and meeting materials for the Regional  
49 Advisory Councils -- the printing of those Council book  
50

0505

1 materials would begin August 3rd. So just letting you  
2 know that it's very hard to schedule these things with  
3 so many busy people.

4

5 Thank you, Madame Chair.

6

7 And I'm, you know, ready to entertain  
8 discussion on the dates of July 26th and 27th.

9

10 MR. PELTOLA: Madame Chair, BIA.

11

12 MS. PITKA: Go ahead, BIA.

13

14 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
15 Robbin, I do appreciate the comments about being busy,  
16 as well as the leadership of our DOI agencies, we are  
17 busy as well. Just so people are aware I did respond  
18 to the doodle poll, those are the only dates that I, at  
19 BIA, could participate in the summer work session.

20

21 Thank you, Madame Chair.

22

23 MS. PITKA: Thank you. And, yeah, so I  
24 responded to the doodle poll is those dates were the  
25 only dates that would work for me. But, really, with  
26 the lack of salmon fishing in the Interior right now I  
27 think my calendar's pretty clear.

28

29 So does anybody else have any comments  
30 on the dates.

31

32 MS. BOARIO: Madame Chair, Fish and  
33 Wildlife Service.

34

35 MS. PITKA: Go ahead.

36

37 MS. BOARIO: My apologies to the Board  
38 and to the Staff, those dates do not work for me. And,  
39 Sue, it sounds like if what you need is a quorum, you  
40 may well have it so.

41

42 MS. PITKA: Fish and Wildlife Service,  
43 will your alternate be available at that time?

44

45 MS. BOARIO: Yep, my alternate will be  
46 available.

47

48 MS. PITKA: Thank you. Does anybody  
49 else have any comments on the summer session dates.

50



0506

1 (No comments)

2

3 MS. PITKA: If not, I'm not sure what  
4 action's required here, is it a vote?

5

6 MS. LAVINE: No, Madame Chair, no  
7 formal action is required unless we are selecting and  
8 confirming a final date for the winter public meeting.  
9 I just wanted to confirm and it sounds like aside from  
10 Board Member Boario we do have a quorum for the July  
11 26th and 27th, and in addition an alternate is  
12 available.

13

14 Thank you, Madame Chair. We will begin  
15 planning that meeting for -- it is a work session -- we  
16 will be addressing the annual reports for the Regional  
17 Advisory Councils and reviewing Board replies.  
18 Additionally, the Board is required to have an  
19 executive session to review Council member nominations.  
20 And we're very hopeful that we'll be able to hold this  
21 meeting in person but I, of course, defer to my  
22 superiors on that. We can all be hopeful and I am  
23 hopeful.

24

25 So thank you, Madame Chair, we'll begin  
26 work on that.

27

28 The next item that I'll bring to your  
29 attention.....

30

31 MS. PITKA: Thank you. I just have one  
32 more question. So do we know what dates where we will  
33 know if we will be in person or not, when we can  
34 confirm that we will or will not be in person?

35

36 MS. DETWILER: Madame Chair, this is  
37 Sue. And I have not heard of any firm deadlines, I  
38 think it's kind of a moving target depending on how the  
39 pandemic goes. You know, yeah, that's all we know, the  
40 numbers are trending in a positive direction and we're  
41 going to be planning to have the upcoming meeting in  
42 July and fall meetings in person but things could  
43 change.

44

45 MS. PITKA: Okay. I was mostly just  
46 asking for planning purposes for myself and child care.

47

48 MR. PELTOLA: Madame Chair, BIA.

49

50

0507

1 MS. PITKA: Go ahead, BIA.

2

3 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
4 DOI has been operating under the no personal attendance  
5 at gatherings greater than 50. I heard rumors that  
6 that was lifted when I inquired earlier on this week so  
7 that'd be something that OSM could and should look  
8 into. Based on the experience that we have had, I  
9 think we're well overdue with regard to continuity and  
10 to be effectively pulling off a Board meeting to have a  
11 -- to be proceed -- proceed with the meeting between  
12 now and the fall all in person.

13

14 Thank you, Madame Chair.

15

16 MS. PITKA: Thank you for that  
17 clarification, I appreciate it.

18

19 Okay, now, we are on B, 2023 winter  
20 public meeting. Go ahead, Robbin LaVine.

21

22 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
23 I would like to bring to your notice that we will be  
24 scheduling the fish and shellfish regulatory meeting.  
25 That is a public meeting. It's usually a three day  
26 meeting and we are identifying the last week of  
27 January, you know, the first couple of days of  
28 February, or the week of -- or the days of February 7th  
29 through the 9th for that meeting.

30

31 So if -- if anyone has a preference,  
32 you can speak now, otherwise if you request, I will  
33 send out a doodle poll soon to confirm. Regulatory  
34 meetings, especially if we are to have them in-person  
35 require a lot of logistical work in advance.

36

37 Thank you, Madame Chair.

38

39 MS. PITKA: Thank you, I appreciate  
40 that. Does anybody have any comments on those dates  
41 for the winter public meeting.

42

43 MR. PELTOLA: Madame Chair, BIA.

44

45 MS. PITKA: Go ahead.

46

47 MR. PELTOLA: A doodle poll probably  
48 would help, but conferring with Staff February 7th to  
49 9th fits the BIA's agenda.

50

0508

1 MS. PITKA: Okay, does anybody else  
2 have any comments or would we all just have a doodle  
3 poll.

4  
5 (No comments)

6  
7 MS. LAVINE: Madame Chair, I'll prepare  
8 a doodle poll for the Board and your Staff.

9  
10 MS. PITKA: Thank you so much, I  
11 appreciate that.

12  
13 So with the knowledge that it's those  
14 two dates that's going (indiscernible - background)  
15 available to me. Thank you, very much.

16  
17 Now, we're at Federal Subsistence  
18 Management Program correspondence procedures. Go  
19 ahead, Sue, you were saying something about this  
20 earlier.

21  
22 MS. DETWILER: I was just trying to get  
23 off mute here. This agenda item was requested by two  
24 Board Members, one of whom was Tony Christianson. It's  
25 an informational item to go over what the Board's --  
26 what OSM's correspondence procedures are after the  
27 Board takes an action. So I'm prepared to give that  
28 overview now unless the Board would rather wait until  
29 Tony is back to also engage in the discussion and hear  
30 the overview.

31  
32 MS. PITKA: You can just go ahead and  
33 give the overview and then we'll brief him after.

34  
35 MS. DETWILER: Okay. Okay. So I will  
36 -- I'll go over the information I had prepared. And so  
37 a couple of -- a couple of Board members had requested  
38 an overview from OSM correspondence procedures  
39 including how we process Board decisions after they're  
40 made and on our procedures for outgoing correspondence.

41  
42 Federal subsistence regulations assign  
43 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service with responsibility for  
44 providing administrative support to the Board. Within  
45 Fish and Wildlife Service, the Office of Subsistence  
46 Management or OSM is the program that carries out this  
47 administrative support. OSM prepares the outgoing  
48 correspondence and other documents needed to implement  
49 Board decisions and carry out other direction from the  
50

1 Board. We also prepare correspondence drafted by the  
2 Regional Advisory Councils such as their reports to the  
3 Board, their comments on proposals that are under  
4 consideration by the Alaska Board of Game and Board of  
5 Fisheries, letters to other agencies and tribes and so  
6 on. Fish and Wildlife Service and USDA Forest Service  
7 co-manage the Federal Subsistence Management Program so  
8 OSM works closely with the Forest Service in preparing  
9 regulatory and policy documents. The Forest Service's  
10 Regional Advisory Council Coordinator also works  
11 closely with OSM in preparing correspondence and other  
12 documents coming from the Regional Advisory Councils.  
13 The Regional Advisory Council's documents -- the  
14 Council Coordinators draft the documents, such as the  
15 Council's annual reports to the Board. These documents  
16 are reviewed in OSM and we help with editing for  
17 clarity and formatting and we put the documents on  
18 letterhead. OSM does not change the messaging or  
19 content of RAC correspondence. After OSM has finalized  
20 the letter it goes back to the Regional Advisory  
21 Council Coordinator and to the Council Chair for their  
22 review -- final review and signature. OSM then mails  
23 the correspondence to the recipient and the parties  
24 indicated on the CC list.

25  
26 So that's for Regional Advisory Council  
27 documents.

28  
29 And so turning to documents for the  
30 Board. OSM also prepares documents for the Board that  
31 implement actions the Board has taken. Board actions  
32 include, regulatory actions such as Subparts C and D  
33 regulations, which are the harvest regulations such as  
34 seasons, harvest limits, methods and means as well as  
35 the customary and traditional use determinations. The  
36 Board also makes recommendations to the Secretaries of  
37 Interior and Agriculture on revisions to Subparts A and  
38 B of the regulations which include general provisions  
39 of Program structure.

40  
41 Other non-regulatory actions the Board  
42 takes are recommendations to the Secretaries of  
43 Interior and Agriculture such as nominations to the  
44 Regional Advisory Councils as well as general  
45 correspondence to the Alaska Department of Fish and  
46 Game. So OSM drafts Board correspondence for those  
47 actions as well.

48  
49 Correspondence coming from the Board,  
50

0510

1 such as Board decisions or letters, OSM drafts the  
2 correspondence often in consultation with the Regional  
3 Solicitor's Office and sends the draft to the Board  
4 Chair for his review and approval. After the Board  
5 Chair approves the document, OSM applies his signature  
6 to the document and we forward it to the next steps in  
7 the process which are our internal agency processes.

8

9                   So the regulatory actions requiring a  
10 Federal Register notice, OSM works with the Regional  
11 Solicitor's Office, Forest Service Staff and Fish and  
12 Wildlife Service headquarters and Department of  
13 Interior to prepare the Federal Register Notice. And  
14 the Federal Register package includes not just the  
15 Federal Register notice but all the additional  
16 informational materials that are required by Fish and  
17 Wildlife Service and Departmental -- Department of  
18 Interior for all Federal Register notices.

19

20                   For any other Board letter or other  
21 documents that go to the Secretaries of Interior or  
22 Agriculture and for any issues that may be  
23 controversial or rise to the attention of the Fish and  
24 Wildlife Service Director or Headquarter's office, Fish  
25 and Wildlife Service has internal review processes that  
26 must be completed before the documents can be finalized  
27 and transmitted. The purpose of these reviews is to  
28 ensure that Fish and Wildlife Service Regional and  
29 National Leadership are fully knowledgeable of Federal  
30 Subsistence Management issues that may require the  
31 attention of the Fish and Wildlife Service Director.

32

33                   So for the Regional review process, for  
34 leadership here in Alaska, OSM prepares a package that  
35 includes Board documents, such as the memo or letter  
36 from the Board, or the nominations package for the  
37 Regional Advisory Councils, we also include a note to  
38 reviewers that briefly describes the document, a  
39 briefing paper with more detailed information on the  
40 documents, possibly a communications plan and any other  
41 necessary reporting documents. And so that package  
42 goes also includes a Regional surname sheet, who, in  
43 the region has reviewed and signed off on the -- on the  
44 package. And so OSM prepares that package and then we  
45 route it within the region to our external affairs  
46 office and from there it goes to the regional executive  
47 secretary in our office -- in the regional office,  
48 Deputy Regional Director and then finally the Regional  
49 Director for review and approval of the package before  
50

0511

1 it goes to the Fish and Wildlife Service Headquarter's  
2 office. At the Headquarter's office, they have their  
3 review process as well. It's reviewed by upper level  
4 managers before it goes to the Fish and Wildlife  
5 Service Director. And once the Fish and Wildlife  
6 Service Director is completely apprised of the issue,  
7 then the package is forwarded to the final recipient,  
8 such as the Departments of -- Secretaries of Interior  
9 and Agriculture.

10

11 And just -- so those are the -- that's  
12 the process, and just a couple of other comments.

13

14 The Fish and Wildlife Service regional  
15 and Headquarter review processes do not modify the  
16 decisions made by the Board but they may edit other  
17 information in the package and this regional review  
18 process also reviews for developing briefing materials  
19 for the Fish and Wildlife Service when she briefs  
20 Headquarter's Staff and Department of Interior on  
21 Federal Subsistence Management issues.

22

23 So that is the overview of OSM  
24 correspondence procedures for Board actions.

25

26 Thank you, Madame Chair.

27

28 MS. PITKA: Thank you, very much, Sue,  
29 I appreciate that.

30

31 I've lost internet connectivity on my  
32 laptop so does anybody have any questions for Sue right  
33 now.

34

35 MR. PELTOLA: Madame Chair, BIA. I  
36 don't have any questions but I have some comments.

37

38 MS. PITKA: Oh, please, go ahead.

39

40 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
41 So going through the process, I was one of the Board  
42 members that asked this to be presented to the Federal  
43 Subsistence Board for a looksee. My concern has been  
44 and continues to be that 50 CFR 110.(indiscernible-cuts  
45 out)9 stipulates that the Fish and Wildlife Service  
46 will be provide administrative services to the Office  
47 of Subsistence Management, although, if you look at the  
48 process which has been put in place for correspondence  
49 and the outcomes of Board meetings, I think it's too

50

0512

1 burdensome, too much of a burden, it is designed to be  
2 agency-specific as opposed to Federal Subsistence  
3 Program position. So we have Fish and Wildlife  
4 Service's review process must be completed before a  
5 document could be finalized and transmitted. The  
6 purpose of those reviews is to ensure that the Fish and  
7 Wildlife Service and the National Leadership are fully  
8 knowledgeable about the Federal Subsistence Management  
9 issues as is required action of the Fish and Wildlife  
10 Service Director. I agree that that is a significant  
11 role for any agency within the Federal Subsistence  
12 Program, including the National Leadership, although  
13 that is why each of the Bureau's has an ISC member to  
14 prepare those internal briefs for our particular  
15 membership and I think there is -- this is:

- 16
- 17 1. Takes way too long.
- 18
- 19 2. Too much oversight.
- 20
- 21 3. Has potential to be allowed for
- 22 passage of an agency-specific position rather than the
- 23 Federal Subsistence Program position.
- 24

25 And once the draft is made by OSM, I  
26 think -- I have no problem it being reviewed by  
27 External Affairs Staff but it also should be run by the  
28 Forest Service to recognize their role the Program, and  
29 then put out to the public or the final destination  
30 after that minimal review.

31

32 And it is -- I think we would get to a  
33 point where we'd have a lot quicker correspondence to  
34 the public, which they deserve. I think there'd be  
35 more of a programmatic position forwarded on.

36

37 And with that being said, Madame Chair,  
38 for the Board's consideration I would like to recommend  
39 that multiple Board members come together to establish  
40 a correspondence committee to establish procedures and  
41 policies for the Federal Subsistence Program for OSM to  
42 follow.

43

44 Thank you, Madame Chair.

45

46 MS. PITKA: All right, thank you,  
47 Member Peltola, was that a motion.

48

49 MR. PELTOLA: It can be made a motion,  
50

0513

1 correct. Yes.

2

3 MS. PITKA: Oh, perfect. Please make  
4 that a motion -- oh, sorry.

5

6 MR. PELTOLA: So moved as stipulated.

7

8 MS. PITKA: Thank you, very much Member  
9 Peltola, I appreciate that. Is there a second for this  
10 motion.

11

12 (Pause)

13

14 MS. PITKA: Did I get cut off again?

15

16 MS. LAVINE: Nope, we hear you.

17

18 MR. PELTOLA: Hear you fine.

19

20 MS. PITKA: Okay, so there's a motion  
21 on the floor to form a committee to discuss the public  
22 comment, writing process, is that correct?

23

24 MR. PELTOLA: Yes, Madame Chair, to  
25 establish a committee to establish correspondence  
26 procedures for the Federal Subsistence Program to be  
27 implemented by the Office of Subsistence Management.

28

29 MS. BOARIO: Madame Chair, are we still  
30 looking for a second.....

31

32 MS. PITKA: Yes.

33

34 MS. BOARIO: .....this is the Fish and  
35 Wildlife Service. I will second it. And am happy to  
36 work with a subcommittee on looking at this. This is  
37 my -- coming to the end of my first month in this seat  
38 and definitely want to make sure we're all on the same  
39 page with this. I'm happy to see in Sue's notes that  
40 it doesn't appear that anything has -- decisions have  
41 not been modified but I am happy to be part of a team  
42 to look at the larger process.

43

44 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

45

46 MS. PITKA: Thank you, very much for  
47 that volunteering and the second. Sue, I'm not sure  
48 what the process would be right now, would that be a  
49 roll call or just an aye vote.

50



0514

1 MS. DETWILER: Just -- well, I -- well,  
2 deferring to Ken on this but my gut reaction would be  
3 to ask for -- we have a motion and then a second and  
4 ask for any comment and if Tony were here, depending on  
5 the comment, whether there were comments or not, of any  
6 sense that anybody would disagree then he would go for  
7 a formal roll call vote but if it sounds like it's an  
8 item that everybody would agree to, he would just do a  
9 voice vote.

10

11 MS. PITKA: Oh, perfect. Does anybody  
12 have any comments on the motion that's been seconded.

13

14 MR. PELTOLA: I appreciate -- this is  
15 BIA. We appreciate the second by the Fish and Wildlife  
16 Service, who has volunteered. The BIA, Board seat  
17 would participate in the endeavor as well.

18

19 MS. PITKA: Thank you. I hear two  
20 volunteers for this, it sounds to me like overwhelming  
21 support. So can I get a voice vote on this one, so if  
22 you support say aye. If you don't support then I'll  
23 ask for that after.

24

25 Okay, all in favor say aye.

26

27 IN UNISON: Aye.

28

29 MS. PITKA: Okay, all opposed say nay.

30

31 (No opposing votes)

32

33 MS. PITKA: Oh, great, the motion  
34 passed. Okay, thank you, Sue.

35

36 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

37

38 MS. PITKA: I believe that that is all  
39 of our Board agenda items. Was there any other  
40 business.

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 MS. PITKA: Sue, am I still on?

45

46 MS. DETWILER: Oh, I -- there was no --  
47 the Board did not add any other business, or items.....

48

49 MS. PITKA: Oh, perfect.

50

0515

1 MS. DETWILER: .....unless somebody  
2 else has something now.

3  
4 MS. PITKA: Okay. Well, hearing none  
5 it's been a really great meeting. I thank Mr. Peltola  
6 for taking over in my absence this morning. I apologize  
7 for that, I was on a plane to Seattle and very shortly  
8 I'll be on a plane to Denver so a motion.....

9  
10 MS. DETWILER: A motion to adjourn  
11 someone.

12  
13 MS. PITKA: .....to adjourn. Yes, can  
14 somebody please make a motion to adjourn.

15  
16 MR. PELTOLA: Motion to adjourn, BIA.

17  
18 MS. PITKA: Thank you, BIA.

19  
20 MR. BROWER: So moved.

21  
22 MS. PITKA: Can I get a second to that  
23 motion.

24  
25 MR. BROWER: Second.

26  
27 MS. PITKA: Thank you, Charlie Brower.  
28 Okay, all in favor of adjourning the meeting say aye.

29  
30 IN UNISON: Aye.

31  
32 MR. BROWER: Happy Easter everyone.

33  
34 MS. PITKA: Oh, Happy Easter, Happy  
35 Good Friday. Okay, bye.

36  
37 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

38  
39 (Off record)

40  
41 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

