

0083

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 II

TELECONFERENCE - ALASKA  
APRIL 13, 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

0084

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 - 4/13/2022)

(On record - 9:00 a.m.)

OPERATOR: This is the operator. It is now the top of the hour. We have 29 participants in the main conference with a few more speakers coming in. Are we ready to begin or do we want to wait?

MS. DETWILER: Operator, this is Sue Detwiler. I'll be helping the Chair of the Board. I would say maybe wait another minute or so. It looks like we still have several of the Board members who aren't online. I would say a minute, but probably not much more than that.

OPERATOR: Okay. I'll go ahead and give the voice over to the main conference. We'll begin shortly.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

OPERATOR: This is the operator. Right now we do have 43 speakers in the speakers conference.

MS. DETWILER: Operator, this is Sue Detwiler. I think we can go ahead and open a line to everyone.

OPERATOR: All right. We're ready to begin. Please stand by. Good afternoon and thank you for standing by. I'd like to inform all participants that your lines have been placed on a listen only mode for the question and answer session of today's call. Today's call is also being recorded. If anyone has any objections, you may disconnect at this time.

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

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Operator. Thank you everybody for joining us today. My name is Sue Detwiler. I'm the Assistant Regional Director for the Office of Subsistence Management within Fish and Wildlife Service. I wanted to confirm -- Court Reporter Tina, have you started recording this meeting.

0085

1                   REPORTER: I am recording, Sue. Thank  
2 you.

3  
4                   MS. DETWILER: Okay. Thank you.  
5 Having confirmed that I will start going through our  
6 roll call to see who we have on. Starting with the  
7 Board members do we have National Park Service?

8  
9                   MS. CREACHBAUM: Good morning, Sue.  
10 This is Sarah. Good morning, everyone.

11  
12                   MS. DETWILER: Good morning, Sarah  
13 Creachbaum. BLM, Thomas Heinlein.

14  
15                   MR. HEINLEIN: Good morning.

16  
17                   MS. DETWILER: Good morning. Fish and  
18 Wildlife Service, Sara Boario.

19  
20                   MS. BOARIO: Good morning. Sara Boario  
21 is here.

22  
23                   MS. DETWILER: Good morning, Sara.  
24 Forest Service, Dave Schmid.

25  
26                   MR. SCHMID: Good morning, Sue. Dave  
27 is on.

28  
29                   MS. DETWILER: Good morning, Dave.  
30 BIA, Gene Peltola.

31  
32                   MR. PELTOLA: Gene is always on. Thank  
33 you, Sue.

34  
35                   MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Public  
36 Member Rhonda Pitka.

37  
38                   (No response)

39  
40                   MS. DETWILER: Public Member Charlie  
41 Brower.

42  
43                   MR. BROWER: (In Inupiaq).

44  
45                   MS. DETWILER: Morning, Charlie.  
46 Chairman Anthony Christianson.

47  
48                   (No response)

49  
50

0086

1 MS. DETWILER: The Chair may still be  
2 trying to get on. Moving forward to legal counsel from  
3 Department of Interior, Regional Solicitor's Office.  
4 Do we have Ken Lord?

5  
6 MR. LORD: Yes, ma'am. I'm here. Good  
7 morning.

8  
9 MS. DETWILER: Good morning, Ken. USDA  
10 Office of General Counsel, Jim Ustasiewski.

11  
12 (No response)

13  
14 MS. DETWILER: Liaisons to the Board,  
15 Alaska Department of Fish and Game Ben Mulligan and/or  
16 Mark Burch.

17  
18 MR. MULLIGAN: Good morning, Sue. This  
19 is Ben.

20  
21 MS. DETWILER: Good morning, Ben.

22  
23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I'm on as well,  
24 Sue. Sorry to interrupt. This is Anthony  
25 Christianson.

26  
27 MS. DETWILER: Oh, okay. Thank you,  
28 Tony. Just going through the liaisons to the Board.  
29 Regional Advisory Council Chairs. I'll start with  
30 Region 1, Southeast, Don Hernandez.

31  
32 MR. HERNANDEZ: I'm here.

33  
34 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Region 2,  
35 Southcentral. I understand Greg Encelewski is not  
36 available, but Gloria Stickwan, the Vice Chair, are you  
37 on?

38  
39 MS. STICKWAN: I am. Good morning.

40  
41 MS. DETWILER: Good morning, Gloria.  
42 Kodiak Aleutians, Della Trumble.

43  
44 (No response)

45  
46 MS. DETWILER: Bristol Bay, Nanci  
47 Morris Lyon.

48  
49 MS. MORRIS LYON: Good morning.

50

0087

1 Present and accounted for.

2

3 MS. DETWILER: Great. Thank you. Y-K  
4 Delta, Ray Oney.

5

6 MS. PATTON: Good morning, Sue. This  
7 is Eva. There's still no connectivity in Alakanuk  
8 right now. We'll keep you posted when we're able to  
9 connect with our Y-K Delta RAC Chair.

10

11 Thank you.

12

13 MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Eva. Western  
14 Interior, Jack Reakoff.

15

16 MR. REAKOFF: Jack Reakoff here. Good  
17 morning.

18

19 MS. DETWILER: Good morning. Seward  
20 Peninsula, Louis Green.

21

22 (No response)

23

24 MS. DETWILER: He wasn't able to join  
25 yesterday. Nissa Pilcher may be able to speak on his  
26 behalf when she comes on. Northwest Arctic, Thomas  
27 Baker.

28

29 (No response)

30

31 MS. DETWILER: Eastern Interior, Sue  
32 Entsminger.

33

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

36

37 MS. DETWILER: Good morning, Sue.  
38 North Slope, Gordon Brower.

39

40 (No response)

41

42 MS. DETWILER: Mr. Chair, the only  
43 member that has not signed on yet is Rhonda Pitka.  
44 Rhonda, are you on?

45

46 MS. PITKA: Yes, I'm here.

47

48 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Mr. Chair,  
49 it looks like we have all eight Board members on the  
50

0088

1 line. So I'll turn it over to you.

2

3

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right.  
4 Thank you, Sue. Thank you everybody this morning and  
5 welcome to day two of the meeting, the Federal  
6 Subsistence Board meeting. I'd just welcome everybody  
7 again and I look forward to another productive day of  
8 going through the agenda here.

9

10 As every morning, we'll provide an  
11 opportunity this morning to the public to go ahead and  
12 speak on non-agenda items. Again, this is an  
13 opportunity to speak on non-agenda items, something  
14 that might be of importance for the Board to hear.  
15 Operator, with that, I'll open it up this morning for  
16 the public. After we go through that, I'll go ahead  
17 and see if any other Board has anything to share and  
18 then we'll move on with the order of business. Thank  
19 you.

20

21 So, public. Any public wants to, you  
22 have the floor.

23

24 OPERATOR: Thank you. To ask a  
25 question, please press star, one. Please ensure that  
26 your phone is unmuted and record your name clearly when  
27 prompted.

28

29 Heather, your line is open.

30

31 MS. BAUSCHER: Good morning, everyone.  
32 Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Members of the Board.  
33 My name is Heather Bauscher. I'm here in Sitka,  
34 Alaska. I'm representing the Sitka Conservation  
35 Society and the University of Alaska Southeast.

36

37 I wanted to let everybody know about  
38 that we've continued doing the dual enrollment class  
39 around the Federal Subsistence Board process and I have  
40 four students from various schools in Sitka here  
41 participating. Two are from Mt. Edgecombe, one is a  
42 Sitka High student and one is a homeschooled student.

43

44 In other years when we were able to  
45 attend in person we usually would introduce ourselves  
46 at the beginning of the meeting and I just wanted to  
47 know if this is an appropriate time to let the kids say  
48 hello.

49

50

0089

1                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Welcome back,  
2 Heather. This is Anthony Christianson, Board Chair.  
3 We welcome anybody working in the field of recruitment  
4 and educating on our Board process. So, yes, this  
5 would be an appropriate time. Welcome and thank you  
6 for your good work. You have the floor.

7  
8                   MS. BAUSCHER: Thank you, Mr.  
9 Christianson. I also want to say thanks to the Forest  
10 Service and Mr. Schmid for the help supporting this  
11 class. Thanks to Terry Suminski over the years for his  
12 support. And a big thank you to Rob Cross for helping  
13 doing the agency presentations with the students this  
14 year. We've also had presentations from Don Hernandez,  
15 Cathy Needham and a local Advisory Committee to the  
16 State, Member Tad Fujioka.

17  
18                   Now I'm going to turn this over to each  
19 student and let them introduce themselves. Do you want  
20 to go first, Clare? Okay.

21  
22                   MS. JUNGERS: Uvlaalluataq. Good  
23 morning. (In Inupiaq). My name is Clare Jungers. I  
24 am a senior at Mt. Edgecombe High School and I'm from  
25 Shishmaref, Alaska. I decided to take this class  
26 because I thought this was a great opportunity to learn  
27 more about the process of going through a proposal. I  
28 personally hunt myself and maybe one day I'll write a  
29 proposal.

30  
31                   Quyana. Thank you, Mr. Chair and the  
32 Board.

33  
34                   MS. ZULICK: Hi. My name is  
35 (indiscernible) Zulick (ph). I'm a senior at Sitka  
36 High. I took this class to learn more about the  
37 subsistence process and I'm very excited. Thank you  
38 for this opportunity to speak.

39  
40                   MR. WILKINSON: Hello. My name is Arta  
41 (ph) Wilkinson. I'm a sophomore homeschooled student  
42 residing in Sitka, Alaska. I would like to take this  
43 class because I want to learn more about the process of  
44 policy-making and I am very glad for this opportunity.  
45 Thank you.

46  
47                   MR. CLEVELAND: Good morning. My name  
48 is Nathan Cleveland. I'm a senior at Mt. Edgecombe and  
49 I'm from Quinhagak, Alaska.

50

0090

1 MS. BAUSCHER: Okay. That's all. Just  
2 four students that we have participating. They  
3 prepared subsistence reflections and introducing  
4 themselves. If there's any questions for them, let us  
5 know.

6  
7 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
8 Heather. I appreciate you guys and your continued  
9 education and outreach. I look forward to some  
10 proposal then. I hear a policy writer there too.  
11 Always looking for people to fill jobs at OSM. Good  
12 luck to you young emerging leaders and keep it up,  
13 Heather. Thank you very much.

14  
15 Any questions from the Board for the  
16 students?

17  
18 MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chair, Forest Service.

19  
20 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have  
21 the floor, Dave.

22  
23 MR. SCHMID: Thank you, Tony. Thank  
24 you so much, Heather and the students. I sure wish we  
25 could meet together here in person and hopefully at our  
26 next meeting we'll be able to do that, but I just want  
27 to extend my gratitude as well for this program. It's  
28 a powerful program. We learn as much from the students  
29 I think as they learn from the Board.

30  
31 Thank you so much for continuing. I  
32 know our agency will continue to support you as well.  
33 Thank you.

34  
35 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right.  
36 Thank you. Any other Board.

37  
38 (No comments)

39  
40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
41 students. Thank you, Heather. Operator, is there  
42 anybody else online who would like to speak to a  
43 non-agenda item?

44  
45 OPERATOR: Yes. Next question comes  
46 from Bill. Your line is open.

47  
48 BILL: Oh, is that me? Hello?

49  
50

0091

1 OPERATOR: Your line is open.

2

3 BILL: I'm not sure if I'm speaking  
4 (indiscernible). I guess I at least have a question.  
5 I'm not, you know, familiar with the Federal  
6 Subsistence Board. So I'm -- anyway, I've been told  
7 about some proposals, but it's like grizzly bear  
8 harvest in Gates of the Arctic National Park and I  
9 guess I just want to confirm the Proposals are 22-26  
10 and 22-56.

11

12 I guess my understanding is that I  
13 shouldn't comment on those, but my question is -- and I  
14 believe this is so, but if it can be confirmed that  
15 those two proposals were moved to the non-consensual  
16 agenda. If that can be confirmed. And then also are  
17 you taking any public comments on those at the meeting  
18 or not?

19

20 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes. This is  
21 the Board Chair. Thank you for those questions. As  
22 far as the two proposals I'd have to ask staff. If  
23 they're on the non-consensus agenda item, we will  
24 provide public testimony.

25

26 Lisa, do you want to answer that.

27

28 MS. GREDIAGIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
29 This is Lisa Grediagin and, yes, both WP22-46 and 56  
30 were removed by the Park Service Board Member  
31 yesterday. So now both of those proposals are on the  
32 non-consensus agenda. The time for public testimony on  
33 those proposals will be when the Board takes them up.  
34 It is hard to say exactly when that will be, but they  
35 are towards the end of the proposals.

36

37 So if you're able to call back in and  
38 provide testimony when the Board individually considers  
39 those proposals, that would be great. We do have  
40 updates on our website and Facebook page on where the  
41 Board is at in the meeting that you're able to just  
42 quickly check those to see what proposal they're on if  
43 you're not able to stay on the phone the whole time.

44

45 Thank you.

46

47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
48 Lisa.

49

50

0092

1 BILL: I appreciate the answers. Am I  
2 correct in that the meeting goes through the 15th?

3  
4 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, we're  
5 scheduled up through the 15th. Probably these  
6 proposals more towards the end we'll be looking at  
7 probably tomorrow afternoon-ish.

8  
9 BILL: Okay, great. Thank you. I  
10 don't know that I'll be able to closely monitor what's  
11 happening, but I appreciate the work that you're doing  
12 and I appreciate the answers to my questions.

13  
14 I also appreciate from a personal  
15 perspective that those two proposals were moved to the  
16 non-consent agenda. I think they do merit discussion.  
17 Thank you very much for your time. I appreciate it.

18  
19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have a nice  
20 day. Thank you for calling in.

21  
22 BILL: Okay. Thanks. Bye.

23  
24 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Operator, is  
25 there another public that would like to speak on  
26 non-consensus this morning?

27  
28 OPERATOR: Yes. Our next question  
29 comes from Mark. Your line is open.

30  
31 MR. RICHARDS: Yeah, thank you. Can  
32 you hear me, Mr. Chairman?

33  
34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, Mark, you  
35 have the floor.

36  
37 MR. RICHARDS: Thank you. For the  
38 record my name is Mark Richards. I'm the executive  
39 director of Resident Hunters of Alaska. I'm  
40 representing over 3,000 members from across the state  
41 today.

42  
43 I wanted to comment on some Federal  
44 Subsistence Board issues in general and the recent  
45 passage of Wildlife Special Action Request 21-01A, the  
46 closure of caribou hunting in Unit 23 and 26A. We're  
47 looking forward to, you know, you guys getting back to  
48 in-person meetings, but with the Special Action Request  
49 it looks like you're not required to hold public  
50

0093

1 meetings. It's very frustrating that the Board  
2 insulates itself from the public and you don't really  
3 get to hear the public. You just see the summaries  
4 from the Office of Subsistence Management.

5

6                   Typically these special action requests  
7 are controversial and as this latest one, WSA21-01,  
8 proved, you know, there's hundreds of people that want  
9 to comment. We'd really like to see some changes in  
10 the future where you could actually allow the public to  
11 comment in front of the Board so you actually hear the  
12 public.

13

14                   Another issue we had -- and I believe  
15 after the updated population estimate of the Western  
16 Arctic Caribou Herd was released -- we were the only  
17 organization to change our opposition to the proposal.  
18 We have always supported the Western Arctic Caribou  
19 Herd Working Group management plan. With the caribou  
20 under 200,000 animals, it puts them into preservative  
21 management under that plan, which does call for  
22 restrictions.

23

24                   But what we have said in our letter,  
25 which also we were not allowed to send to you, was that  
26 there should be a shared sacrifice among all users when  
27 the population is in decline and in preservative  
28 management. The Western Arctic Caribou Herd Management  
29 Plan did call for the restriction on the taking of cows  
30 and calves. Yet the Northwest Arctic RAC that  
31 supported the closure voted to continue the taking of  
32 cows. Nothing happened at your recent meeting when you  
33 voted to accept the closure about that.

34

35                   So we're frustrated. I mean we do  
36 support subsistence and we do believe, you know, with  
37 the herd as it is now, that there does need to be some  
38 restrictions. But especially there needs to be  
39 restrictions on local Federally-qualified users on the  
40 taking of cows.

41

42                   So I know you're not going to revisit  
43 this right now and we're not going to turn in another  
44 Special Action Request about that, but it just does  
45 seem wrong that you restrict other users and at the  
46 same time with the herd in such decline there was  
47 nothing about restrictions on the taking of cows and  
48 calves by locals.

49

50

0094

1                   In closing, Mr. Christianson and  
2 members of the Board and all the RAC Chairs, I just  
3 wanted to say thank you for your service. I know it's  
4 very time consuming and we really appreciate your  
5 service and respect what you do. Again, we do respect  
6 subsistence and we do represent all Alaskans.

7  
8                   So with that I just wanted to say thank  
9 you.

10  
11                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
12 Mark, for calling in and you bring up some good points  
13 there. Some of the harder things we struggle with is  
14 trying to find a balance between the public, you know,  
15 process and the rural users, priority preference that  
16 the Board has to take up as we look at conservation  
17 measures as they come on us with these resources and  
18 they get in a certain status.

19  
20                   So I just appreciate all the support  
21 you guys have given the Western Arctic Herd there too.  
22 We lean a lot towards the information they provide to  
23 the Board and just look forward to trying to make the  
24 process here as user friendly as we can. We know  
25 sometimes it doesn't always work out the way that we  
26 want it. You know, with the various conditions in this  
27 working world we just do the best we can.

28  
29                   So I appreciate you, Mark, in your work  
30 that you continue to do out there and we'll try to  
31 continue to work towards a best system for all users.  
32 So thank you for calling in today, Mark.

33  
34                   MR. RICHARDS: Thanks, Tony.

35  
36                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Next, Operator.  
37 Was there another one on the board?

38  
39                   OPERATOR: As a reminder, to ask a  
40 question please press star, one, but at this time there  
41 are no further questions over the phone.

42  
43                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
44 Appreciate that. That concludes the non-consensus  
45 public process in the morning. At this time I'll just  
46 go ahead and open up the floor before we move on to the  
47 agenda. If there's any Board members that would like  
48 to share any information for the day, this is your  
49 time. Staff as well.

50

0095

1 (No comments)

2

3

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: It sounds like nobody drank coffee this morning, so we'll go ahead and move on. I believe we are starting on -- I will ask Sue to take over the agenda for a moment because I'm not -- I know we left off on consensus, so I think we're starting with the non-consensus agenda items.

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

MS. DETWILER: Yes, correct. We're at agenda item 7 in the main agenda and as Lisa mentioned earlier the consensus and non-consensus agendas have been updated to reflect the Board's actions yesterday and those revised agendas are on our website and also on our Facebook page. Yesterday we just started the non-consensus agenda. We finished with Wildlife Proposal WP22-01. So this morning the first one we'll start out with is WP22-02 and that will be led by Pippa Kenner.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue. Pippa, you have the floor.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Is Pippa available?

MS. DETWILER: I think she may be muted unless she dropped off.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. We'll give Pippa a minute here to get ready and then we'll get started. We'll just wait on Pippa.

MS. DETWILER: Pippa should be online here shortly. She ran into a technical difficulty.

(Pause)

OPERATOR: This is the Operator. It looks like Pippa has joined back in. She's coming into the call now. Pippa, your line is open.

MS. KENNER: Hello. Can people hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I got you loud and clear, Pippa. You have the floor.

0096

1 MS. KENNER: Well, that was  
2 unfortunate. I apologize. I'm not quite sure what  
3 happened, but I'm here now. Good morning, Mr. Chair  
4 and members of the Federal Subsistence Board and  
5 Regional Advisory Council Chairs. The analysis for  
6 Wildlife Proposal WP22-02 begins on Page 519 of Volume  
7 2A of the Board meeting materials.

8  
9 My name is Pippa Kenner and I'm an  
10 anthropologist at the Office of Subsistence Management  
11 in Anchorage. Proposal WP22-02 was submitted by the  
12 Office of Subsistence Management in a request to remove  
13 language from designated hunting regulations that  
14 prohibit the use of a designated hunter by a member of  
15 the community operating under a community harvest  
16 system.

17  
18 So yesterday afternoon we were talking  
19 about community harvest systems and now we're going to  
20 talk about the designated hunter system.

21  
22 Current designated hunter regulations  
23 begin on Page 521 of your meeting materials. It begins  
24 by saying if you are a Federally-qualified subsistence  
25 user, you may designate another Federally-qualified  
26 subsistence user to take deer, moose, and caribou on  
27 your behalf unless you are a member of a community  
28 operating under a community harvest system.

29  
30 What we propose is to remove from the  
31 language that says you may designate -- ah, okay.  
32 Sorry about that. What we are proposing is to remove  
33 from the language that says you may designate another  
34 Federally-qualified subsistence user unless you are a  
35 member of a community operating under a community  
36 harvest system.

37  
38 This is because if a person does not  
39 register to participate in the community harvest  
40 system, that person retains or still has an individual  
41 harvest limit, one moose for example, and should be  
42 able to designate that harvest limit to someone else to  
43 harvest for them under designated harvester  
44 regulations.

45  
46 Now I want to add that recommending  
47 that the Board adopt the proposal as modified by the  
48 Eastern Interior Alaska Council was considered and  
49 rejected because the Council's recommended modification  
50

0097

1 is already in regulation and, therefore, it's not  
2 necessary to incorporate here.

3

4 The OSM conclusion is to support  
5 Proposal WP22-02. Thank you for your time and this is  
6 the end of my presentation. I'm available to try  
7 answering your questions.

8

9 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
10 Pippa. Any questions for Pippa from the Board.

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
15 Hearing none. We'll go ahead and move on to the  
16 summary of written comments.

17

18 MS. KENNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
19 Again, this is Pippa Kenner with OSM. No public  
20 written comments were submitted during the public  
21 comment period. Thank you.

22

23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: At this time,  
24 Operator, we'll open up the floor for designated public  
25 testimony for this proposal.

26

27 OPERATOR: As a reminder to ask a  
28 question or comment, please press star, one.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right.  
33 Hearing no public testimony on this one, we'll go ahead  
34 and call on the Regional Advisory Council  
35 recommendations and.....

36

37 MS. GREDIAGIN: Hey, Tony, this is  
38 Lisa. There is someone in the cue for public  
39 testimony. It's just taking them a moment to get their  
40 information to the Operator.

41

42 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
43 Lisa, for that.

44

45 OPERATOR: I do have a question over  
46 the phone. It comes from Karen. Your line is open.

47

48 MS. LINNELL: Thank you. This is Karen  
49 Linnell, Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission. Again

50

0098

1 we want to thank OSM for their work on this proposal to  
2 rectify a situation that was discovered during the  
3 creation of the Ahtna Community Harvest System. While  
4 we attended several regions meetings to discuss this  
5 and clarify information on it, this proposal will do  
6 what we've told folks all along throughout the  
7 development of our Community Harvest System and which  
8 we talked with Staff about and the InterAgency Staff  
9 Committee about over the last couple years.

10

11 So we do appreciate this. This will  
12 straighten it out to where we have some hunters that  
13 will participate in the Community Harvest System they  
14 will still be able to be a designated hunter if they  
15 register at the Federal agency for Federally-qualified  
16 users that are not qualified for the Community Harvest  
17 System and we appreciate that.

18

19 I just want to say again thank you to  
20 the OSM Staff for this and thank you, Board, for your  
21 time.

22

23 OPERATOR: No further questions on the  
24 phone at this time.

25

26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
27 Karen. Thank you for calling in. Appreciate it. No  
28 other comments. We'll go ahead and move on to Regional  
29 Advisory Council recommendations and I'll call on Sue.  
30 You can call on them. Thank you.

31

32 MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
33 This is a statewide proposal, so potentially all 10  
34 Regional Councils may have comments, so I'll just start  
35 with Region 1, Southeast, Don Hernandez.

36

37 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Southeast  
38 took no action on this proposal. We don't have any  
39 Community Harvest Systems in place.

40

41 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.  
42 Southcentral, Gloria Stickwan.

43

44 MS. STICKWAN: The Council supports  
45 this proposal that will allow members of a community  
46 with a Community Harvest System to designate another  
47 person to harvest on their behalf to meet either  
48 individual harvest limit or count towards the community  
49 harvest limit.

50

0099

1                   This provides more opportunity for  
2 hunting and increases the chances that subsistence  
3 users can get meat in their freezer. The ability to  
4 meet subsistence needs benefits the subsistence users.

5  
6                   Thank you.

7  
8                   MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Gloria.  
9 Region 3, Kodiak Aleutians, Della Trumble.

10  
11                   MS. TRUMBLE: Good morning. Thank you.  
12 Our Council supports the regulatory changes as it  
13 provides more equitable harvest options and  
14 opportunities. This is one that we do make good use of  
15 and appreciate that we have it.

16  
17                   Thank you.

18  
19                   MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Bristol Bay,  
20 Nanci Morris Lyon.

21  
22                   MS. MORRIS LYON: Yes, good morning.  
23 Bristol Bay Subsistence Regional Advisory Council also  
24 supported this with Eastern Interior's modification  
25 with the understanding that the modification is already  
26 in place. I'm sure we would have no hard feelings on  
27 the Board's part. They just wanted the clarification  
28 in there. They felt like the regulation would protect  
29 the rights and opportunities of the individual who  
30 cares to hunt separately and knowing that those are  
31 protected.

32  
33                   We would be pleased with that. The  
34 pending regulations would be simpler, provides clarity  
35 and protect the hunting opportunity of individual  
36 Federally-qualified subsistence users.

37  
38                   Thank you.

39  
40                   MS. DETWILER: Thank you. YKDelta, Eva  
41 Patton.

42  
43                   MS. PATTON: Yes, good afternoon. Eva  
44 Patton, Council Coordinator for the Yukon Kuskokwim  
45 Delta Subsistence Regional Advisory. The YKDelta RAC  
46 voted to support WP22-02. The Council supports the  
47 Ahtna people and their community harvest system. And  
48 while there isn't a harvest system currently in place  
49 in the YKDelta region this proposal would be of  
50

0100

1 benefit if one were adopted there.

2

3 Thank you.

4

5 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Western  
6 Interior, Jack Reakoff.

7

8 MR. REAKOFF: Western Interior Regional  
9 Advisory Council supported the proposal basically in  
10 support of our Ahtna neighbors but in the future this  
11 would be a fair and equitable way to administer the  
12 community hunts.

13

14 Thank you.

15

16 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Seward  
17 Peninsula, Nissa Pilcher, Louis Green, did anybody sign  
18 on this morning.

19

20 MS. PILCHER: Yes, this is Nissa  
21 Pilcher. Mr. Chairman. Members of the Board. For the  
22 record my name is Nissa Pilcher, the Council  
23 Coordinator for the Seward Peninsula Council. I don't  
24 believe that Louis Green was able to call in yet today.  
25 So for the Seward Peninsula Council, voted unanimously  
26 to defer. The Council was presented with the proposal  
27 and discussed it but deferred the decision to the home  
28 region as there are no community harvest systems in the  
29 Seward Peninsula region.

30

31 Thank you.

32

33 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Northwest  
34 Arctic, Brooke.

35

36 MS. MCDAVID: Thank you. Brooke  
37 McDavid, Northwest Arctic Council Coordinator standing  
38 in for Chairman Baker. The Northwest Arctic Council  
39 supported WP22-02. The proposal clarifies how these  
40 systems work and concurs with the recommendations of  
41 other Councils.

42

43 Thank you.

44

45 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Eastern  
46 Interior, Sue Entsminger, have you joined.

47

48 MS. ENTSMINGER: Yes, I have.

49

50

0101

1 MS. DETWILER: Okay.

2

3

4 MS. ENTSMINGER: I had to find my mute  
5 button. Okay. The Eastern Interior supports WP22-02  
6 with the modification to clarify participants in a  
7 community harvest system cannot designate another  
8 Federally-qualified subsistence user to take wildlife  
9 on their behalf. The modification was recommended by a  
10 representative of AITRC, Ahtna InterTribal Resource  
11 Commission and also by the Wrangell-St. Elias Resource  
12 Commission. This modification will allow people  
13 outside of a community harvest system to have a  
14 designated hunter to meet their subsistence needs.  
15 This will be beneficial to those users.

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

And then the -- the language is different, though, what Pippa said and what we were talking about doing I feel is a little bit different so I'm confused to what Pippa said. Because if you look at the modified regulation it should read, in all of the things -- in Pages 34 -- 534 and 535, if you are a Federally-qualified subsistence user you may designate another Federally-qualified subsistence user to take species on your behalf unless you are a participant in a community harvest system, so I'm a little bit confused because I thought we were taking that out.

I don't -- I might need some help from Staff.

MS. GREDIAGIN: Mr. Chair, this is Lisa. I can address Sue's question unless Pippa would like to address it.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor.

MS. GREDIAGIN: Okay, yeah, Pippa said she could fill in if I miss something here. But I think what Pippa was trying to say is that WP22-02 is a statewide regulation that would affect community harvest systems across the entire state -- or I mean designated harvest permit systems across the entire state including, you know, the general regulations in Section 25E of the Federal regulations. And, for example, what happened with the AITRC administered community harvest system is that there's a framework associated with that harvest system, so within that framework and the unit-specific regulations we kind of

0102

1 make that clarification that the Eastern Interior  
2 Council has in their modification. So it just seemed a  
3 little simpler to OSM, since it again affects the  
4 designated harvest permits across the entire state to  
5 just take out completely the language of, unless you  
6 are a member of a community operating under a community  
7 harvest system and then make that distinction that the  
8 Eastern Interior made in their modification about  
9 participants in a community harvest system versus non-  
10 community harvest systems and more on a case by case  
11 basis, through either the framework or unit-specific  
12 regulations about that community harvest system.

13

14 So hopefully that makes sense and,  
15 Pippa, please fill in if I missed something.

16

17 Thank you.

18

19 MS. KENNER: Mr. Chair, this is Pippa  
20 Kenner with OSM.

21

22 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Pippa, you  
23 have the floor.

24

25 MS. KENNER: Yes, I'd like to add, Lisa  
26 -- I agree with Lisa, Lisa is correct.

27

28 The way the regulations read is that  
29 members of a community -- members of -- participants in  
30 a community harvest system can harvest only as part of  
31 the community harvest system. It has to do with  
32 accumulating harvest limits. One cannot accumulate an  
33 individual harvest with a community harvest limit.  
34 Also there are several reasons why a Federally-  
35 qualified subsistence users may not be able to  
36 designate a hunter. One is they may not have the  
37 required permit, so there's a lot of reasons why a  
38 person might not be able to designate someone. This is  
39 only one of the reasons and, therefore, it could create  
40 confusion and conflict in the regulations.

41

42 Thank you.

43

44 MS. ENTSMINGER: And I think it has  
45 created confusion.

46

47 MS. KENNER: This is Pippa again and  
48 maybe I'll just add one more clarification, that at the  
49 time the Eastern Interior Council deliberated and was  
50

0103

1 responding to a representative of AITRC, we did not at  
2 -- you know, we did not object or say this is in  
3 conflict but later on when we were considering it and  
4 in conversation with the Solicitor's office, it was  
5 determined it would be better to not add the language  
6 because it already exists in regulation.

7

8 Thank you.

9

10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
11 And, Sue, I think we were still going around the table.

12

13 MS. ENTSMINGER: Okay.

14

15 MS. DETWILER: Yes. Oh, yes, two  
16 Sue's. Yes, we were just getting to North Slope,  
17 Gordon Brower.

18

19 MS. PATTON: Yes, good afternoon, this  
20 is Eva Patton, Council Coordinator for North Slope.  
21 I'll be presenting for our Chair Gordon Brower. He  
22 wasn't able to connect at the moment.

23

24 And the North Slope Subsistence  
25 Regional Advisory Council supports WP22-02. The  
26 community of Anaktuvuk Pass within the North Slope  
27 region does have a community harvest system for sheep  
28 and this proposal is beneficial to meeting subsistence  
29 needs because that need, sometimes, is not met by  
30 elders and those who are disabled and this would allow  
31 for designated hunters to assist even if there is a  
32 community harvest system in place.

33

34 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

35

36 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
37 Sue, do you have who is next.

38

39 MS. DETWILER: Yes, excuse me, Mr.  
40 Chair, that would be tribal and Alaska Native  
41 Corporation comments. Orville.

42

43 MR. LIND: Good morning, Mr. Chair.  
44 Federal Subsistence Board members. This is Orville  
45 Lind, Native Liaison for Office of Subsistence  
46 Management. And during consultation sessions there  
47 were no comments or recommendations.

48

49 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

50

0104

1                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
2 Orville. Then next we'll call on the Alaska Department  
3 of Fish and Game comments, State Liaison.

4  
5                   MR. MULLIGAN: Good morning, Mr.  
6 Chairman. For the record this is Ben Mulligan from  
7 Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

8  
9                   The Department supported the action  
10 being taken in this proposal. We viewed it as a  
11 clarification in the fairness issue as it pertained to  
12 the designated hunter rule.

13  
14                   And then just given that it's up, I  
15 will just one last time stress that when you guys look  
16 at these community harvest systems, that the same  
17 diligence and regularity of making sure that harvest  
18 data is reported maintains that same level so when  
19 necessary to make in-season management decisions that  
20 information is there.

21  
22                   Thank you, sir.

23  
24                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Mr.  
25 Mulligan. We'll move on to InterAgency Staff Committee  
26 comments, ISC Chair.

27  
28                   MS. LAVINE: Thank you. Good morning,  
29 Mr. Chair. This is Robbin LaVine, Policy Coordinator  
30 and ISC Chair. For Wildlife Proposal 22-02 the  
31 InterAgency Staff Committee provided the standard  
32 comments. That was the comment that I read to you last  
33 evening.

34  
35                   Thank you, Mr. Chair.

36  
37                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
38 That now will open up the floor for Board discussion  
39 with Council Chairs and State Liaison. Any questions  
40 from the Board.

41  
42                   (No comments)

43  
44                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,  
45 hearing no questions from the Board we'll open up the  
46 floor for Board action.

47  
48                   MR. HEINLEIN: Mr. Chair, Tom Heinlein,  
49 Bureau of Land Management.

50

0105

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

3  
4 MR. HEINLEIN: Mr. Chair, I move to  
5 adopt Proposal WP22-02 and if I get a second I'll  
6 explain why I intend to vote in support of my motion.

7  
8 MR. BROWER: Second, Public Member  
9 Brower.

10  
11 MR. HEINLEIN: Thank you. Adoption of  
12 this proposal will allow those living in communities  
13 with a community harvest system to designate someone to  
14 harvest on their behalf in order to meet their  
15 individual harvest limit or to count toward the  
16 community harvest limit, depending on whether or not  
17 they choose to participate in the community harvest  
18 system. It will also help to provide more harvest  
19 options and opportunities for Federally-qualified  
20 subsistence users. Adoption of this proposal is also  
21 consistent with the recommendations of seven the 10  
22 Subsistence Regional Advisory Councils.

23  
24 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

25  
26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
27 questions, comments, discussion.

28  
29 OPERATOR: Just a reminder to ask a  
30 question please press star, one.

31  
32 (No comments)

33  
34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,  
35 hearing none, we'll call for the question.

36  
37 MR. BROWER: Question.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been  
40 called. I guess we'll go ahead, all in favor of this  
41 one signify by saying aye.

42  
43 IN UNISON: Aye.

44  
45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Opposed, same  
46 sign.

47  
48 (No opposing votes)

49  
50

0106

1                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion carries  
2 unanimously. And, thank you, for that. That was a  
3 quick one to get us started for the day. We'll go  
4 ahead and move on to the next proposal. Sue.

5

6                   MS. DETWILER: Yes, that would be WP22-  
7 03 and Tom Plank will be kicking that one off.

8

9                   MR. PLANK: Good morning, Mr. Chair.  
10 Members of the Board. My name is Tom Plank and I am a  
11 wildlife biologist in the Office of Subsistence  
12 Management and I will be presenting a summary of the  
13 analysis for Wildlife Proposal WP22-03 submitted by  
14 ADF&G which begins on Page 542 of your meeting books.

15

16                   The proponent states current Federal  
17 sealing regulations no longer align with new State  
18 sealing regulations designed to gather more precise  
19 information from harvested wolves for use in ADF&G's  
20 annual population estimates. It was not understood in  
21 2019 to what extent the change in the sealing  
22 requirements from within 14 days of harvest to within  
23 30 days after the season closed would have on data used  
24 for population estimates. The purpose of this proposal  
25 is to correct that error.

26

27                   Of note, Unit 2 wolves are part of the  
28 Alexander Archipelago sub-species which occupy  
29 Southeastern Alaska and coastal British Columbia. In  
30 1993, 2011 [sic], and 2020 the Alexander Archipelago  
31 wolf was petitioned to be listed under the Endangered  
32 Species Act. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service found the  
33 listing not to be warranted on both 1993 and the 2016  
34 [sic] petitions as a range wide population appeared  
35 stable. On July 27th, 2021, Fish and Wildlife Service  
36 announced a 90 day finding that the petition to list  
37 the Alexander Archipelago wolves presented substantial  
38 information indicating that the petition action may be  
39 warranted. Therefore, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife  
40 Service will initiate a status review to determine  
41 whether the petition action is warranted.

42

43                   In 1997 the Board of Game and Federal  
44 Subsistence Board adopted harvest guideline levels to  
45 manage the Unit 2 wolf population, which established  
46 annual harvest quotas based on wolf population  
47 estimates. Seasons would close early if quotas were  
48 expected to be met. Between 2013 and 2018 seasons  
49 closed early with reported harvest well exceeding  
50

1 quotas in some years. In 2018 ADF&G submitted Proposal  
2 43 to the Board of Game to change the harvest  
3 management strategy from using the harvest management  
4 guidelines to meet population objectives. The Board of  
5 Game adopted the proposal in January 2019, establishing  
6 the Unit 2 population objective range as 150 to 200  
7 wolves. The Board of Game also extended the season,  
8 the State's trapping season aligning Federal and State  
9 seasons. In 2020 the Board approved a proposal  
10 extending the sealing permit from within 14 days of  
11 harvest to within 30 days of the end of the season.  
12 This proposal also removed the harvest quota and  
13 increased harvest limits to no limit with wolf hunting  
14 in Unit 2. In March 2021 the Board of Game adopted  
15 Proposal 194, as amended, requiring all wolves taken in  
16 Unit 2 to be sequentially marked, numbered by the  
17 hunter or trapper and required hunters and trappers to  
18 call to ADF&G within seven days of take to report the  
19 date and location of take for each wolf and that all  
20 hides must be sealed within 15 days of take.

21  
22 Before 2013 Unit 2 wolf abundance was  
23 uncertain but since 2013 a method using DNA from fur  
24 samples has been used to generate population estimates.  
25 Between 2013 and 2020 wolf population estimates have  
26 ranged from a low of 89 wolves in 2014 to a high of 386  
27 wolves in the fall of 2020. Human harvest accounts for  
28 the vast majority of wolf mortality in Unit 2, however,  
29 wolves are very resilient to high harvest levels due to  
30 their high reproductive potential and ability to  
31 disperse long distance. Past research indicates that  
32 greater than 38 percent total annual mortality is  
33 likely unsustainable. In Unit 2 wolf abundance is  
34 closely linked with deer abundance, their primary prey,  
35 deer are primarily limited to habitat which is being  
36 negatively affected by logging of old growth forest in  
37 Unit 2. Logging operations also construct roads  
38 providing easy hunter and trapper access in previously  
39 remote areas. The new harvest management strategy  
40 consists of four zones as you could see on Figure 2 of  
41 Page 557. Different zones correspond to different  
42 population levels. Zone 3 is a desirable zone, where  
43 the wolf populations within the objective range of 150  
44 to 200 wolves and season of up to two months would be  
45 announced. The fall 2020 wolf population estimated at  
46 386 wolves placing it in Zone 4, however, for the 2021  
47 season, citing recent uncertainty about early  
48 population estimates and their influence on population  
49 objectives, a conservation approach was taken and State  
50

0108

1 and Federal trapping seasons was open from November  
2 15th to December 15th and the hunting season also  
3 closed on December 15th.

4  
5 Harvest primarily occurs on non-Federal  
6 lands under a combination hunting trapping license and  
7 typically little harvest occurs before mid-November,  
8 when only the Federal hunting season is open. From  
9 1997 to 2018 when the harvest guideline level was  
10 initiated, annual reported harvest has ranged from  
11 seven to 76 wolves averaging 50 wolves and the annual  
12 harvest quota has been exceeded five times. High  
13 unreported harvest rates of 38 to 47 percent have  
14 likely resulted in the unsustainable harvest in some  
15 years. Between 1997 and 2018 total trapper numbers in  
16 Unit 2 averaged 14.5 trappers per year. With Unit 2  
17 residents primarily from Klawock and Craig harvesting  
18 89 percent of the wolves on average. Over this time  
19 catch per trapper averages 3.4 wolves, however, usually  
20 just two to three skilled trappers harvest more of the  
21 wolves. In 2019, the first year under the new harvest  
22 management strategy without quotas 165 wolves were  
23 reported harvested, which was the highest number of  
24 recorded in Unit 2. This is possibly a result from a  
25 doubling of the normal trapping efforts. But in 2021  
26 reported harvest was 64.

27  
28 Adopting 22-03 would align Federal and  
29 State regulations by requiring Federally-qualified  
30 subsistence users to sequentially mark, number hides,  
31 call within 7 days of take to report the date and  
32 location of take for each wolf and seal all hides  
33 within 15 days of take. Effective wolf management in  
34 Unit 2 depends upon coordination between State and  
35 Federal regulations, managers and users. The  
36 requirement to sequentially marking and numbering hides  
37 along with a 7 day call in requirement will aid in  
38 minimizing lost or incorrect data. Having the hides  
39 sequentially numbered or marked will allow data  
40 acquired during the 7 day call in to be correctly  
41 correlated and each individually harvested wolves hair  
42 sampled taken during the sealing process. The sealing  
43 requirement is shorter than the current regulation but  
44 is one day longer than the sealing requirement prior to  
45 the regulation change in 2020. Sequentially numbering  
46 and marking hides and reporting in 7 days will also  
47 help increase the accuracy of hunters and trapper  
48 reports, records, when the hides are sealed especially  
49 if there is a delay due to weather or access to a  
50

0109

1 sealer. While these important sealing requirements  
2 will be more burdensome to hunters and trappers is  
3 essential to allow the management agencies to acquire  
4 the most precise data possible to aid in estimating the  
5 wolf populations with more precision and defensibility  
6 in Unit 2. However, reporting harvest at 7 days and  
7 again at 15 days after harvest could result in  
8 regulatory fatigue for subsistence users and confusion  
9 relating to the reporting requirements.

10

11 In response to the 2020 petition, U.S.  
12 Fish and Wildlife Service announced a 90 day finding  
13 that the petition to list the Alexander Archipelago  
14 wolf presented substantial information indicating that  
15 a petition action may be warranted. One reason a  
16 species can be listed under the ESA is inadequate or of  
17 existing regulatory mechanisms.

18

19 The OSM's conclusion is to support  
20 WP22-03 with modification to remove the 7 day reporting  
21 requirement.

22

23 Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the  
24 Board. I'd be happy to field any questions.

25

26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
27 questions for Staff.

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,  
32 we'll move on to summary of written public comments.

33

34 MR. PLANK: Again, for the record this  
35 is Tom Plank with OSM. And there were no written  
36 public comments.

37

38 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Tom.  
39 We'll go ahead, Operator, open up the floor to any  
40 public online that may want to comment on this.

41

42 OPERATOR: And as a reminder, to ask a  
43 question please press star, one.

44

45 (Pause)

46

47 OPERATOR: There's no questions over  
48 the phone at this time.

49

50

0110

1                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
2 We'll go ahead and move on to Regional Advisory Council  
3 recommendations. I'll have Sue call on them.

4  
5                   (Pause)

6  
7                   MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, this is Don  
8 Hernandez with the Southeast Council, are you ready for  
9 my comment.

10  
11                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Don, you  
12 have the floor.

13  
14                   MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, okay. The  
15 Southeast Council did support this proposal with the  
16 modification to remove the 7 day reporting requirement.  
17 The Council was concerned that numerous changes in  
18 regulations applied to hunters and trappers may result  
19 in regulatory fatigue and confusion. Double reporting  
20 of data is an unnecessary burden on the subsistence  
21 users and may produce inaccurate information. The  
22 Council recommends removing the 7 day phone reporting  
23 requirement recognizing that hunters and trappers will  
24 still be required to provide date and location of  
25 wolves within 15 days to help address the need for  
26 collecting this information. This reporting helps  
27 successfully manage wolf populations within Unit 2 to  
28 prevent the need to list the Alexander Archipelago wolf  
29 as an endangered species.

30  
31                   So thank you.

32  
33                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Don.  
34 Any questions for Don.

35  
36                   (No comments)

37  
38                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Moving on,  
39 tribal Alaska Native Corp comments. Native Liaison.

40  
41                   MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
42 Orville Lind, OSM. There were no recommendations or no  
43 comments during the consultation.

44  
45                   Thank you, Mr. Chair.

46  
47                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Alaska  
48 Department of Fish and Game comments. State Liaison.

49  
50

0111

1 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
2 For the record ADF&G supports the proposal as submitted  
3 to align Federal regulations with the changes the Board  
4 of Game made to the State sealing requirements for  
5 wolves harvested in GMU2. More precise information on  
6 when and where each wolf is harvested should contribute  
7 toward a more accurate and precise Unit 2 wolf  
8 population estimate. More accurate population  
9 estimates will enable State and Federal managers to be  
10 better regulate the wolf population through harvest to  
11 meet the fall population objective of 150 to 200  
12 wolves. Maintaining the population within that range  
13 is intended to balance the need for a sustainable wolf  
14 population with the effect of wolf predation on deer.  
15 This regulatory change would reduce regulatory  
16 confusion, ease enforcement burden and promote sound  
17 management practices within the Game Management Unit.

18  
19 Thank you, sir.

20  
21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Go  
22 on to the InterAgency Staff Committee, ISC Chair.

23  
24 MS. LAVINE: Good morning, Mr. Chair,  
25 this is Robbin LaVine. For Wildlife Proposal 22-03 the  
26 InterAgency Staff Committee provided the standard  
27 comment.

28  
29 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

30  
31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
32 We'll go on to Board discussion with Chairs, State  
33 Liaison, any questions, comments.

34  
35 (No comments)

36  
37 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, that  
38 opens up the floor for Federal Board action on this  
39 proposal.

40  
41 MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chair, this is Forest  
42 Service.

43  
44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the  
45 floor, Dave.

46  
47 MR. SCHMID: Thank you. I move to  
48 adopt Wildlife Proposal 22-03 as submitted by the  
49 Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Following a second  
50

0112

1 I will explain why I intend to support my motion with  
2 the Southeast RAC's modification and OSM's conclusion  
3 to remove the 7 day reporting period.

4

5 MR. BROWER: Second by Public Member  
6 Brower.

7

8 MR. SCHMID: Thank you, Charlie. The  
9 Forest Service agrees that harvest reporting is  
10 important for monitoring wolves in Unit 2. However,  
11 reporting harvest at seven days and then again at 15  
12 days after harvest is unnecessary and redundant, it  
13 could also result in confusion and regulatory fatigue  
14 by subsistence users. Reporting harvest within 15 days  
15 of take, including the date and location of take is  
16 sufficient to provide the data needed to allow  
17 management agencies to estimate the wolf population  
18 effectively in Unit 2 without the added burden for  
19 subsistence users having to report their harvest twice.

20

21 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

22

23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
24 Dave. Any questions, comments or discussion.

25

26 (Teleconference interference -  
27 participants not muted)

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the  
32 question.

33

34 (No comments)

35

36 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the  
37 question from the Board.

38

39 MR. PELTOLA: BIA. Question.

40

41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
42 Gene. All in favor of the motion say aye.

43

44 IN UNISON: Aye.

45

46 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Opposed, same  
47 sign.

48

49 (No opposing votes)

50

0113

1                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion carries  
2 unanimously to support the proposal. Thank you. We'll  
3 go ahead and call on the Staff for the next proposal,  
4 Sue, thank you.

5  
6                   (Pause)

7  
8                   MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chair, I think Sue may  
9 have gotten dropped.

10  
11                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank  
12 you. Lisa, are you still on.

13  
14                   MS. GREDIAGIN: Hi, Mr. Chair, yep. I'm  
15 here.

16  
17                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,  
18 Lisa, I'll just call on you to call the next wildlife  
19 proposal and the Staff up, please. Thank you.

20  
21                   MS. GREDIAGIN: Okay. Yeah, the next  
22 proposal is WP22-04 and that would be Rob Cross.

23  
24                   MR. CROSS: Hello, Mr. Chair and  
25 members of the Board. Can you hear me okay.

26  
27                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Loud and clear,  
28 you have the floor, Rob. Thank you.

29  
30                   MR. CROSS: All right, thank you, Mr.  
31 Chair. My name is Robert Cross and I'm the Subsistence  
32 Coordinator for the Tongass National Forest.

33  
34                   Wildlife Proposal W22-04 submitted by  
35 the Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory  
36 Council can be found on Page 572 of your meeting book.  
37 The proposal requests the establishment of a year-round  
38 Federal elk hunt in Units 1, 2, 3 and 4, except on  
39 Etolin, Zarembo, Bushy, Shrubby and Kashevarof Island  
40 in Unit 3 with a harvest limit of one elk by Federal  
41 registration permit. The proponent requests that a  
42 Federal general season be established to aid in the  
43 control of non-Native elk and to provide a meaningful  
44 subsistence hunting opportunity. The proponent cites  
45 the previous State general elk season that encompassed  
46 the proposed area and was closed in November of 2018.

47  
48                   Elk were transplanted to Etolin Island  
49 in 1987 and became established on both Etolin and  
50

0114

1 Zarembo Islands. An Elk hunting season began in 1997  
2 and remained open on Etolin Island through draw and  
3 registration hunts. Elk hunting on Zarembo Island was  
4 closed after the 2005 draw hunt remained closed due to  
5 conservation concerns. In 2001 ADF&G attempted to  
6 limit the dispersal of elk outside of the Zarembo and  
7 Etolin Island's population by instituting a general elk  
8 season for Units 1, 2 and the remainder of Unit 3. Six  
9 elk were harvested in the general season from 2004 to  
10 2005 and they were all cows taken from the neighboring  
11 Bushy and Shrubby Islands. In 2012 Bushy and Shrubby  
12 -- sorry, Bushy, Shrubby and Kashevarof Islands were  
13 added to the restricted area due to concerns of false  
14 reporting and illegal harvesting of Zarembo Island elk.  
15 In 2018 the State issued an emergency order to  
16 discontinue the general elk hunt due to concerns that  
17 one or more of the elk harvested during the general  
18 season had been harvested illegally from Zarembo or  
19 Etolin Islands. The State was not able to verify  
20 harvest locations of elk taken during the general  
21 season and believe that hunters may have been killing  
22 elk in the closed or managed areas and then submitting  
23 false reports or not reporting.

24  
25 The proposed regulation would allow  
26 Federally-qualified subsistence users of Units 1  
27 through 5 to harvest one elk by Federal registration  
28 permit from Units 1, 2, 4 and the remainder of Unit 3.  
29 The proposed harvest would provide additional  
30 subsistence opportunity for residents of Units 1  
31 through 5, however, 35 years after being planted  
32 sightings of elk on islands other than Etolin and  
33 Zarembo have been rare and anecdotal suggesting that  
34 the harvest opportunity would be very limited. The  
35 State management goal for elk in Unit 3 includes  
36 limiting the dispersal of elk to islands other than  
37 Etolin and Zarembo.

38  
39 The OSM conclusion is to support WP22-  
40 04. Again there are no conservation concerns for elk  
41 outside of the Unit 3 elk management area. The Federal  
42 general elk season may provide limited subsistence  
43 opportunity to residents of the area while helping to  
44 manage the spread of elk.

45  
46 Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the  
47 Board. And I'm happy to address any questions.

48  
49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Tom  
50

0115

1 [sic]. Any questions for Tom [sic]

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. Move on  
6 to summary of written public comments.

7

8 MR. CROSS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This  
9 is Rob Cross again, for the record. And there were no  
10 written public comments submitted during the comment  
11 window.

12

13 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. At  
14 this time we'll open up the floor to any public online  
15 who wants to be recognized.

16

17 OPERATOR: If you would like to make a  
18 public comment over the phone please press, star, one.  
19 Again, that is star, followed by one, make sure your  
20 phone is unmuted and record your name properly. Thank  
21 you.

22

23 (Pause)

24

25 OPERATOR: No comments coming in at  
26 this time.

27

28 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. No  
29 comments, Operator, is that what you said?

30

31 OPERATOR: Yes, sir, there is no  
32 comments at this time.

33

34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
35 Regional Advisory Council recommendation.

36

37 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
38 Don Hernandez, for the record, from Southeast Advisory  
39 Council. The Council supported this proposal.

40

41 The Council submitted this proposal to  
42 create a subsistence harvest opportunity while avoiding  
43 restrictions to non-Federally-qualified harvesters or  
44 harvest closures. The Council recognized local  
45 knowledge of elk existing outside of the elk management  
46 area and believes that a Federal season would control  
47 the spread of elk. The proposed Federal elk season is  
48 in line with the established fish and wildlife  
49 principles and would stop elk from spreading to  
50

0116

1 neighboring islands and potentially out competing deer.  
2 There are no conservation concerns and this opportunity  
3 would be beneficial to subsistence users.

4

5 Thank you, very much.

6

7 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Don.  
8 Tribal Alaska Native Corp comments. Native liaison.

9

10 MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
11 Again, Orville Lind, Native Liaison for OSM. During  
12 the consultation session there were no comments or  
13 recommendations. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

14

15 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Alaska  
16 Department of Fish and Game comments. State Liaison.

17

18 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
19 For the record, Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
20 opposes the proposal.

21

22 It's been over 30 years since elk were  
23 introduced and there's still no verified accounts of  
24 elk become established outside of Etolin and Zarembo  
25 Islands. Consequently this hunt is unnecessary for  
26 confining the elk to those islands and provides no real  
27 opportunity for subsistence harvest but as -- you know,  
28 we've had concerns in the past and will if this  
29 proposal passes, would, again, invite unlawful harvest  
30 from those two island populations.

31

32 As you heard earlier the State general  
33 season hunt for elk was eliminated because of concern  
34 that elk were being unlawfully harvested from Etolin  
35 and Zarembo Islands and reported as harvested during  
36 the general season hunt outside the GMU 3 elk drawing  
37 hunt area. Unlawful take of elk from these islands  
38 remains a concern for us. And we had an example, even  
39 just last winter when a joint enforcement action -- or  
40 patrol found the remains of a cow elk on Beach Road in  
41 northern Zarembo Island and so that's -- I mean this  
42 seems like this is a very real concern for us, but if  
43 passed, this would -- we feel this would enable some  
44 illegal take to resurface and it would be important for  
45 the U.S. Forest Service to make sure that they're  
46 enforcing those regulations and making sure that that  
47 does not happen.

48

49 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

50

0117

1                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
2 questions from the Board.

3  
4                   (No comments)

5  
6                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. ISC  
7 Staff Committee recommendations.

8  
9                   MS. LAVINE: Good morning, Mr. Chair.  
10 This is Robbin LaVine. For Wildlife Proposal 22-04 the  
11 InterAgency Staff Committee provided the standard  
12 comment. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

13  
14                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
15 We'll move on with Board discussion with Council Chair,  
16 State Liaison, any questions.

17  
18                   (No comments)

19  
20                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,  
21 we'll open up the floor for Federal Board action.

22  
23                   MS. PITKA: No, wait, this is Rhonda, I  
24 do have a question.

25  
26                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Rhonda,  
27 you have the floor.

28  
29                   MS. PITKA: So in the book it's a  
30 little bit confusing because it shows 22-04/22-05 but  
31 this is specifically on 22-04, right?

32  
33                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Lisa.

34  
35                   MS. GREDIAGIN: This is Lisa Grediagin  
36 for the record. And, yeah, Rhonda, the analysis for  
37 22-04 and -5 are combined because they both concern elk  
38 in Unit 3, but 22-05 is on the consensus agenda,  
39 whereas 22-04 is on the non-consensus agenda since the  
40 State and the Regional Advisory Council's  
41 recommendations were different. So, yes, this is only  
42 on 22-04.

43  
44                   MS. PITKA: Thank you.

45  
46                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
47 Lisa. Any other Board discussion or questions.

48  
49                   (No comments)

50

0118

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The floor is  
2 open for Board action.

3  
4 MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chair, Forest Service.

5  
6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the  
7 floor, Dave.

8  
9 MR. SCHMID: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I  
10 move to adopt Proposal -- Wildlife Proposal 22-04  
11 submitted by the Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional  
12 Advisory Council. And following a second I will  
13 explain why I intend to support my motion.

14  
15 MR. PELTOLA: BIA with a second.

16  
17 MR. SCHMID: Thank you, Gene. I  
18 support my motion with the reasons given by the  
19 Southeast Regional Advisory Council. Specifically, the  
20 Council has traditional ecological knowledge  
21 establishing that elk occur outside the State elk  
22 management area. These elk could provide additional  
23 harvest opportunity when incidentally encountered by  
24 Federally-qualified subsistence users. The proposed  
25 season could also help reduce the spread of non-Native  
26 elk outside the elk management area and, thereby,  
27 reduce competition with Native deer and also commit --  
28 in response to ADF&G's comments, that the Forest  
29 Service will continue to commit to enforcing any  
30 illegally harvest on those islands.

31  
32 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

33  
34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
35 Dave. Any questions or comments, discussion from the  
36 Board.

37  
38 (No comments)

39  
40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the  
41 question.

42  
43 MR. PELTOLA: Question.

44  
45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been  
46 called. All in favor of this proposal signify by  
47 saying aye.

48  
49 IN UNISON: Aye.

50

0119

1 (Pause)

2

3

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hello -- motion  
4 carries unanimously. Sorry, I had my phone on mute  
5 there. How about we take a 10 minute break and come  
6 back at 10:30. 10:30. I need to take a 10 minute break  
7 so we'll reconvene -- please don't hang up -- reconvene  
8 at 10:30.

9

10 (Off record)

11

12 (On record)

13

14

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hello, Sue,  
15 we'll go ahead and come back from the meeting and we'll  
16 just make sure that Sue is back on and make sure we  
17 have a quorum and we'll get back to business this  
18 morning and we'll start off with the lead off for the  
19 next proposal.

20

21 MS. DETWILER: Okay.

22

23 OPERATOR: Do you want me to open the  
24 lines -- oh, sorry, go ahead.

25

26 MS. DETWILER: Yeah, is -- is --  
27 Operator, is everybody online now to listen into this,  
28 both the speakers and the listeners rooms open.

29

30 OPERATOR: I'm going to open it right  
31 now for you.

32

33 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

34

35 OPERATOR: On a count down from five.  
36 Five, four, three, two, one.

37

38 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Are -- is  
39 everybody online now, Operator, everybody can hear?

40

41 OPERATOR: Yes, ma'am.

42

43 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you. And,  
44 Tina, is -- are you recording now.

45

46 REPORTER: Yes, I am, Sue.

47

48 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you. I'll  
49 just quickly go through and make sure we have a quorum

50

0120

1 back online.

2

3 Park Service, Sarah Creachbaum.

4

5 MS. CREACHBAUM: I'm here, thank you,

6 Sue.

7

8 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

9

10 Tom Heinlein, BLM.

11

12 MR. HEINLEIN: Good morning. Tom's

13 here.

14

15 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

16

17 Fish and Wildlife Service, Sara Boario.

18

19 MS. BOARIO: I'm back.

20

21 MS. DETWILER: Great. Forest Service,

22 Dave Schmid.

23

24 MR. SCHMID: Dave's back, thanks.

25

26 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

27

28 Gene Peltola, BIA.

29

30 MR. PELTOLA: Present.

31

32 MS. DETWILER: Public Member Rhonda

33 Pitka.

34

35 MS. PITKA: I am here.

36

37 MS. DETWILER: Public Member Charlie

38 Brower.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 MS. DETWILER: And Chair Anthony

43 Christianson.

44

45 (No comments)

46

47 MS. DETWILER: Tony, did we lose you.

48

49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No, I'm here,

50

0121

1 thank you, Sue. I was just literally chapping my lips.

2

3 MS. DETWILER: Okay.

4

5 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Sorry about  
6 that. I'm ready.

7

8 MS. DETWILER: So we have everybody on,  
9 Charlie -- waiting for Charlie.

10

11 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll just give  
12 Charlie another minute and then we'll go ahead and move  
13 on to the next proposal.

14

15 Thank you, Sue.

16

17 (Pause)

18

19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I'm sure  
20 Charlie will come on pretty quick there, Sue, we better  
21 go ahead and just get started. We'll go ahead and call  
22 on the next lead author for the next proposal in line.

23

24 Thank you.

25

26 MS. DETWILER: Okay, that would be Jake  
27 Musslewhite for WP22-07.

28

29 MR. CROSS: Mr. Chair, this is Robert  
30 Cross with the Forest Service. Jake Musslewhite is off  
31 the call right now so I will be presenting WP22-07 if  
32 that's okay.

33

34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the  
35 floor.

36

37 MR. CROSS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
38 Members of the Board. Again, for the record my name is  
39 Robert Cross and I'm the Subsistence Coordinator for  
40 the Tongass National Forest.

41

42 Wildlife Proposal 22-07 request that  
43 the Federal public lands of Admiralty Island draining  
44 into Chatham Strait between Point Marsden and Point  
45 Gardner in Unit 4 be closed to deer hunting September  
46 15 to November 30 except to Federally-qualified  
47 subsistence users. It was submitted by the Southeast  
48 Regional Advisory Council. The Staff analysis of the  
49 proposal begins on Page 595 of the meeting book.

50

1                   The proponent states that it has become  
2 more challenging for subsistence harvesters in Angoon  
3 to harvest sufficient deer to meet their subsistence  
4 needs due to increased hunting pressure from non-  
5 Federally-qualified users. They state that regulatory  
6 change is needed to protect the deer population from  
7 further depletion and increase opportunity for  
8 Federally-qualified subsistence users. The portion of  
9 Unit 4 covered by the proposal consists of the majority  
10 of the west coast of Admiralty Island. The area is  
11 primarily Federal public lands within the Admiralty  
12 Island National Monument and the Kootznoowoo  
13 Wilderness, with the exception of land surrounding  
14 Angoon and a strip along the shoreline of Mitchell Bay.

15  
16                   Rural residents of Units 1 through 5  
17 have a customary and traditional use determination for  
18 deer in Unit 4.

19  
20                   The current Federal season for deer in  
21 Unit 4 is August 1 to January 31 with a limit of six  
22 deer. Antlerless deer may be taken after September 15.  
23 The State general season runs from August 1 to December  
24 1 and also allows antlerless deer to be taken only  
25 after September 15. In 2019 the State bag limit was  
26 increased from four to six deer.

27  
28                   Based on the available data, deer  
29 populations in Unit 4 appear to be healthy. To assess  
30 the deer population ADF&G uses pellet count transects  
31 and aerial surveys. While no pellet counts have been  
32 done in the proposed area recently, pellet counts  
33 conducted in 2019 in Pivats Bay on the eastern side of  
34 Admiralty Island increased by 106 percent from the  
35 previous survey in 1998. Data from aerial surveys also  
36 indicate an increasing trend in deer populations with  
37 Admiralty Island having the highest aerial survey  
38 counts within Unit 4. The amount of deer hunting  
39 effort within the proposal area was measured using both  
40 the number of hunters and the number of hunter days.  
41 Graphs of the hunting effort data are on Page 604 of  
42 your meeting materials. The amount of effort has been  
43 relatively stable from 2000 to 2019. The majority of  
44 effort is by non-Federally-qualified users, most of  
45 which reside in Juneau. Most of the Federally-  
46 qualified hunters using the area reside in Angoon.  
47 The success rate and harvest was measured using the  
48 number of days hunted per deer harvested and the number  
49 of deer harvested per hunter. Graphs for those  
50

1 measures are on Page 605 of your materials. The days  
2 per deer have been variable but stable with Federally-  
3 qualified hunters consistently taking less time to  
4 harvest a deer. The number of deer per Federally-  
5 qualified hunter declined somewhat over the early 2000s  
6 but has been stable for the last decade and is roughly  
7 comparable to the non-Federally-qualified rate.  
8 Overall, the number of deer harvested within the  
9 proposal area has been fairly stable over recent years  
10 as shown in Figure 10 on Page 606 of your materials.  
11 There appears to be a decline in the total harvest by  
12 Federally-qualified users since the early 2000s but  
13 that's largely the result of Angoon users shifting  
14 effort out of the proposal area into other areas as  
15 shown in Figure 11.

16  
17 This proposal would restrict non-  
18 Federally-qualified users hunting deer on portions of  
19 Admiralty Island during the months of peak effort and  
20 harvest. Currently non-Federally-qualified users  
21 represent roughly 50 to 70 percent of the hunting  
22 effort and harvest in the proposal area, which is  
23 comprised almost entirely of Federal public land. The  
24 proposed September 15 to November 30 of non-Federally-  
25 qualified users would likely eliminate over half of the  
26 hunter effort and harvest of deer in the proposed area.  
27 Non-Federally-qualified users would likely shift their  
28 efforts to other areas of Unit 4 leading to increased  
29 competition with hunters in these other areas. It  
30 could also lead to increased effort in the proposal  
31 area during the month of December after the closed  
32 period has ended.

33  
34 Deer populations within the proposal  
35 area appear to be healthy and close to carrying  
36 capacity, therefore, eliminating -- the elimination of  
37 a substantial portion of the harvest is unlikely to  
38 result in a significant increase in the deer population  
39 and may even increase the risk of population -- of the  
40 population exceeding its carrying capacity. Thus, the  
41 proposal does not appear to significantly improve the  
42 ability of Federally-qualified subsistence users to  
43 meet their needs for deer. The proposal may also have  
44 the unintended consequence of preventing non-Federally-  
45 qualified subsistence users with local ties to the area  
46 from participating in subsistence activities. Many  
47 people from Angoon and other rural areas move to Juneau  
48 to seek employment but return to these communities to  
49 participate in subsistence harvesting with family and  
50

0124

1 friends. Under the proposed regulations these users  
2 would be prevented from hunting deer in the area during  
3 the closed season.

4

5 The OSM conclusion for WP22-07 is to  
6 oppose the proposal. Section .8 of ANILCA provides  
7 that the Board may restrict non-subsistence uses on  
8 Federal public lands if necessary for the conservation  
9 of healthy fish and wildlife, or to continue  
10 subsistence uses of such populations. Based on  
11 available data, hunting effort and harvest success  
12 rates of subsistence users have been stable and  
13 favorable for the last 20 plus years, suggesting that  
14 the closure is not necessary to continue the  
15 subsistence uses of deer -- of the deer population.  
16 Deer populations within the area are healthy and there  
17 is no conservation concern for deer on the west coast  
18 of Admiralty Island indicating a closure is not  
19 necessary for conservation reasons. Thus, the proposed  
20 regulation does not meet the criteria identified in  
21 Section .815 of ANILCA for the closure or restriction  
22 of non-subsistence uses.

23

24 Thank you, Mr. Chair. I can field any  
25 questions at this time.

26

27 (Pause)

28

29 MS. DETWILER: Tony, did we drop you or  
30 are you on mute.

31

32 MR. LIND: I think he's dropped.

33

34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No, I'm right  
35 here. Sorry, it was taking me a second, my fingers are  
36 sweaty, I couldn't get my phone to work. So, yeah,  
37 thank you, we'll move on to the next, which is summary  
38 of written public comment. Thank you.

39

40 MR. CROSS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This  
41 is Robert Cross again. There were 57 written public  
42 comments opposing the proposal and one neutral comment.  
43 The one neutral comment from the Sportsmens Alliance  
44 asked the Board to only approve the proposal if it was  
45 supported by scientific evidence.

46

47 And then among the concerns commonly  
48 brought up in the 57 comments opposing the proposal  
49 were;

50

0125

1                   The proposal will force non-Federally-  
2 qualified hunters into a smaller area leading to over  
3 crowding and unsafe conditions;

4  
5                   The deer population is unhealthy making  
6 a closure on -- the deer population is healthy making a  
7 closure unwarranted;

8  
9                   The proposal is not based on sound  
10 science or justified by data;

11  
12                   The proposal will further divide user  
13 groups;

14  
15                   The assertion that Federally-qualified  
16 subsistence users have had trouble meeting their needs  
17 is not supported by evidence;

18  
19                   Environmental conditions such as harsh  
20 winters are the primary drivers of deer abundance  
21 rather than hunting so the proposal will not increase  
22 the availability of deer;

23  
24                   The area covered under the proposal is  
25 too large;

26  
27                   The proposal would exclude non -- non-  
28 qualified family members from qualified -- of qualified  
29 users from hunting together;

30  
31                   The existing January season for  
32 Federally-qualified users provides them with sufficient  
33 priority for deer.

34  
35                   And that's all, Mr. Chair.

36  
37                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
38 questions from the Board.

39  
40                   (No comments)

41  
42                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll move on  
43 to -- we'll open the floor to public testimony so,  
44 Operator, anybody online who would like to speak to  
45 this make the line available.

46  
47                   OPERATOR: If you would like to make a  
48 public comment over the phone, again that's star,  
49 followed by one. Please make sure your phone is  
50

0126

1 unmuted and record your name when prompted. Please  
2 allow a moment for me to get the names, thank you.

3

4 (Pause)

5

6 OPERATOR: First public comment comes  
7 from Mike, your line is open, sir.

8

9 MR. BETHERS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm  
10 Mike Bethers from Auke Bay. Proposal 22-07 presently  
11 involves a huge area of southwest Admiralty Island.  
12 It's located at least 50 miles from Juneau. It's huge.  
13 Many thousands of acres with a large robust deer  
14 population and almost -- very few non-qualified hunters  
15 using is. I know of only a couple of Juneau families  
16 that hunt in Angoon and some of that is with local  
17 residents. The non-qualified hunters hunting Federal  
18 lands in this area are not impacting Angoon subsistence  
19 deer hunting and I don't think they ever will because  
20 the area is just too remote.

21

22 And, further, qualified-users need to  
23 understand that, if passed, this proposal would  
24 displace non-qualified hunters from hunting in the  
25 Federal uplands. These hunters displaced from those  
26 Federal uplands could then only hunt locally on State  
27 managed beaches in the subject area where they would be  
28 allowed a limit of six deer of any sex or size. This  
29 proposal could actually cause more hunting pressure and  
30 possible conflict on the local beaches than the  
31 qualified hunters are having at the present time.  
32 Wildlife Proposal 22-07 will not solve any perceived  
33 problem and it may actually increase possible hunter  
34 conflict on the beaches. I think the qualified-users,  
35 understanding this impact, would not support it, and I,  
36 too, would urge you not to support this proposal.

37

38 Thank you, very much, Mr. Chair.

39

40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
41 Appreciate you taking the time to call in today.  
42 Operator, are there any other public online.

43

44 OPERATOR: Yes, sir. The next one  
45 comes from Kevin, your line is open.

46

47 MR. MEYER: Thank you. For the record  
48 my name is Kevin Meyer and I'm here representing the  
49 ADF&G Juneau/Douglas Advisory Committee. I want to

50

0127

1 thank the Staff and members of the Board for the  
2 opportunity to briefly comment on Proposal 22-07. And  
3 I'd like to ask that these comments be considered when  
4 you deliberate on Proposal WP22-08 and 22-10 as well as  
5 all three impact deer hunting in Southeast Alaska.

6  
7 We're hoping today that you help  
8 maintain consistent and equitable access to deer  
9 hunting opportunity for all residents of our sparsely  
10 populated region by opposing these three proposals. A  
11 full version of our written comments can be found in  
12 the meeting materials on Pages 658 to 659.

13  
14 For background, our 15 member citizen  
15 volunteer represents diverse user groups and  
16 perspectives. We have designated seats for commercial,  
17 sport and charter fishing, hunting and hunting guiding,  
18 trapping as well as non-consumptive users. We strive  
19 to represent the interests of our diverse constituents  
20 holding a half dozen meetings each year to both discuss  
21 fish and game issues as well as to create a public  
22 forum for consideration of proposed regulations that  
23 impact our region. Most importantly like the Federal  
24 Subsistence Board we believe we need to support rules  
25 and regulations that create equitable and sustainable  
26 fishing and hunting opportunity well into the future.

27  
28 And in this instance, we seen that  
29 there are legitimate concerns raised by those who  
30 participated in the RAC Process that led to these  
31 proposals and, indeed, the lack of ferry service and  
32 broader impacts from the Pandemic have created real  
33 impacts on food security in rural communities. We are  
34 not convinced, however, that these proposals best  
35 address the issues raised in the comments. Instead of  
36 addressing these very real food security hardships we  
37 worry the proposals could, instead, amplify tensions  
38 between Federally-qualified and non-Federally-qualified  
39 hunters and straining family ties between communities  
40 in Southeast Alaska. In each of these proposals we  
41 also concur with the position of the Department of Fish  
42 and Game as well as the Forest Service that the  
43 proposals with respect to non-Federally-qualified users  
44 are not warranted for conservation concerns. As the  
45 meeting materials note as well, the Unit 4 deer  
46 populations appear to be doing quite well and are near  
47 carrying capacity.

48  
49 So we look forward to continuing to  
50

0128

1 listen and to better understand -- understanding the  
2 concerns raised by Federally-qualified hunters and we  
3 stand ready to create a forum to discuss ways to  
4 address these issues. We did meet with the RAC briefly  
5 this fall but before adopting drastic measures like  
6 these we would prefer to work with the RAC or the  
7 Federal Board to propose and champion changes through  
8 the Alaska Board of Game process that could alleviate  
9 some of the problems.

10

11 So to conclude, we hope that you vote  
12 to maintain consistent access to deer hunting  
13 opportunity for all residents of the region by opposing  
14 Proposals 22-07, 22-08 and 22-10.

15

16 I'm available to answer questions and I  
17 look forward to your deliberations.

18

19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
20 Appreciate you taking the time to call in and present  
21 your comments today. Any questions.

22

23 OPERATOR: Question over the phone from  
24 Ryan. Your line is open.

25

26 MR. BEASON: Thank you for the  
27 opportunity to speak. My name is Ryan Beason and I'm  
28 representing the Territorial Sportsmen out of Juneau  
29 Alaska. We are an outdoor conservation group that  
30 represents over a thousand members in Juneau and  
31 surrounding communities.

32

33 Like the similar individual who spoke  
34 we oppose 22-07, 22-08 and 22-10 based on the merits  
35 that were previously given. I'll try to keep this  
36 brief as I know some of this may be repetitive.

37

38 But there is no proven conservation  
39 issue based on the data from the Alaska Department of  
40 Fish and Game, Office of Subsistence Management and the  
41 numerous comments opposing this, I think these are  
42 drastic measures that should not happen at this time.  
43 I think there needs to be further work on this with,  
44 you know, the user groups that are currently being  
45 affected, come -- and if needed come to a compromise on  
46 this. Again, if there's no deemed conservation issue,  
47 there's -- you know, under Section .815 of ANILCA it is  
48 not allowed to close these areas.

49

50

0129

1                   Again, as Mike Bethers previously  
2 mentioned, this could create the opposite and have more  
3 conflicts on, you know, as users are still able to hunt  
4 the beach and have larger conflicts with beach hunters,  
5 as I know a lot of the aging populations in these small  
6 communities rely on the beach hunting and if the non-  
7 Federally-qualified users are limited to the beach it  
8 can only increase that and potentially backfire on what  
9 their ultimate goal is here.

10

11                   I think all of us here listening in  
12 would agree that if there is a conservation issue  
13 proven through scientific data, we all agree that there  
14 should be some sort of conservation measures but that  
15 has not been proven here. I feel these proposals are  
16 being fast-tracked with very little public input.  
17 Again, like I know up north where there have been  
18 numerous meetings on issues of closing lands, I think  
19 if they're going to close these to non-Federally-  
20 qualified users there needs to be a lot more user group  
21 input, a lot of work on both sides to really value and  
22 see if there is a deemed conservation issue.

23

24                   With that, I'll just leave it that we  
25 are continuing to oppose 22-07, 22-08 and 22-10 and if  
26 there's any questions I'll be happy to answer those.  
27 I'll thank everybody for your time.

28

29                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
30 Appreciate you taking the time to call in today.  
31 Operator, is there any other public testimony.

32

33                   OPERATOR: No questions or comments  
34 over the phone at this time. As a reminder, please  
35 press star, one.

36

37                   (Pause)

38

39                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,  
40 next, we'll call on the Regional Advisory Council  
41 recommendation. Chair.

42

43                   MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
44 Don Hernandez for the Southeast Regional Advisory  
45 Council. Our Council spent a lot of time deliberating  
46 on this proposal and the other two dealing with Unit 4.  
47 I would say that we considered most of the factors that  
48 the public testimony, those 57 letters brought out.  
49 The Council ultimately supported the proposal with some  
50

0130

1 modifications.

2

3

4                   We removed some of the areas that were  
5 less -- used less by local Angoon hunters from the  
6 closed area. So this proposal restricts the deer  
7 hunting season for non-Federally-qualified users. The  
8 harvest data have shown a decline in deer harvest by  
9 subsistence users and the local Council member  
10 testified that Angoon residents are having a hard time  
11 getting deer. Decrease in competition from other non-  
12 Federally-qualified users will be beneficial to  
13 subsistence users. The proposed closure is not  
14 necessary for conservation purposes but it will be  
15 necessary to ensure continued subsistence uses by  
16 residents of Angoon whose harvest levels have fallen in  
17 recent years.

18

19                   The Council removed sections from the  
20 original proposed closure area that have the highest  
21 rates of use by non-Federally-qualified users. The  
22 intent of the modification was to reduce the impact of  
23 the closures on those users. The Council acknowledged  
24 that wildlife analysis areas could not be used in  
25 Federal regulation, the OSM Staff developed a modified  
26 regulatory language to reflect the Council's intent.  
27 And that language -- instead of using wildlife analysis  
28 areas, the wording that the Staff was able to come up  
29 with to reflect those areas was Federal public lands of  
30 Admiralty Island draining into Chatham Strait between  
31 Fishery Point and Point Gardner in Unit 4, except lands  
32 draining into Fair Lake, Hasselborg Lake, and  
33 Hasselborg Creek are closed to deer hunting from  
34 September 15th to November 30th except by Federally-  
35 qualified subsistence users hunting under these  
36 regulations.

37

38                   And we did end up having a split vote  
39 on this but it did pass by a vote of 8 in favor and 2  
40 opposed.

41

42                   Thank you.

43

44                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
45 questions for the Board Chair.

46

47                   (No comments)

48

49                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, hearing  
50 none, thank you, Don. We'll move on to tribal, Alaska

0131

1 Native Corporation comments. Native Liaison.

2

3 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

4

5 MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Board  
6 Members. Orville Lind, Native Liaison. We did not  
7 have any recommendations or comments. Thank you, Mr.  
8 Chair.

9

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

13

14 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
15 For the record, Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
16 opposes this proposal as originally submitted as well  
17 as with the changes suggested by the Southeast RAC  
18 during their October 2021 meeting.

19

20 There is no evidence that hunting by  
21 non-Federally-qualified users has negatively impacted  
22 Federally-qualified users overall ability to harvest  
23 deer. Adopting this proposal would deprive non-  
24 Federally-qualified users of sustainable [sic] deer  
25 hunting opportunity contrary to the terms laid out in  
26 Title VIII of ANILCA. This proposal would also  
27 unnecessarily restrict Alaskans, who many are former  
28 residents of the area. who have had to move away for a  
29 variety of reasons. They would then be put into a  
30 situation where they would be restricted in their  
31 ability to come back to their home communities to  
32 practice their traditional and cultural way of life  
33 with family and friends. Approximately 90 percent of  
34 land within GMU 4 is Federally-managed and current  
35 Federal regulations provide greater opportunity to  
36 Federally-qualified deer hunters compared to non-  
37 Federally-qualified users. Federally-qualified users  
38 are eligible to hunt an entire month longer than non-  
39 Federally-qualified users with a season extending  
40 through the month of January as well as the liberal  
41 designated hunter program, giving people the ability to  
42 have someone hunt for them.

43

44 As directed by Congress in Section .802  
45 of ANILCA, subsistence uses of wildlife shall be the  
46 priority consumptive use on Federal public lands when  
47 it is necessary to restrict taking in order to assure  
48 the continued viability of fish or wildlife population  
49 or the continuation of subsistence uses of such

50

0132

1 population. Section .815 of ANILCA provides that a  
2 restriction on taking wildlife for non-Federally-  
3 hunters is only authorized if necessary for the  
4 conservation of healthy populations of fish and  
5 wildlife for the reasons in Section .816 to continue  
6 subsistence uses of such populations, or pursuant to  
7 other applicable law.

8  
9 When being discussed at the Southeast  
10 RAC we heard statements of folks wanting to hunt in  
11 peace, or if going to their favorite spot, seeing  
12 another boat there, it doesn't matter whether or not  
13 they're successful hunters or not, it's just the fact  
14 that they're there alter the way you hunt. Based on  
15 the ADF&G's analysis of the available data none of  
16 these conditions apply from ANILCA. There is no  
17 conservation concern for the deer population and the  
18 continued subsistence uses of deer are not being  
19 impacted by non-Federally-qualified users.

20  
21 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

22  
23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. And  
24 I did get a mention that there is one more public  
25 comment, so thank you for that State, and we will go  
26 ahead and back up there, and there was also a Board  
27 member who would like to be recognized. So first we'll  
28 call upon the Board member and then we'll recognize the  
29 public.

30  
31 Gene, you have the floor.

32  
33 MR. CHEN: Hello, Tony, this is Glenn  
34 Chen from the BIA. Gene wanted me to speak on his  
35 behalf briefly -- oh, he's right here actually -- so  
36 Mr. Chair, Mr. Peltola was wanting to ask Mr.  
37 Hernandez, the Chair of the Southeast Council to  
38 provide some additional information as to why the folks  
39 from Angoon were not being able to get the deer that  
40 they need.

41  
42 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, Glenn.  
43 So, Don, if you're available it sounds like BIA would  
44 like to know, you know, the specified reasons that  
45 Angoon was struggling with their deer and to meet their  
46 needs. If Don could elaborate on that question. Thank  
47 you, Don.

48  
49 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, thank you, Mr.

50

0133

1 Chair. Yeah, I can elaborate on that a little more. I  
2 think the main issue here with the folks in Angoon is  
3 this factor of competition. And, you know, they like  
4 to point out that they, for the most part, hunt fairly  
5 close to home, they don't have a lot of means to go  
6 further away from home, they don't feel that they  
7 should need to go further away from home to do their  
8 harvesting. And their factors that they consider is,  
9 you know, what the State mentioned, essentially,  
10 competition, and they see it as a significant factor  
11 if, you know, they go to a spot where they have gone,  
12 you know, for generations and they expect a successful  
13 hunt and if there is competition it does affect their  
14 ability to harvest. They may not want to hunt there at  
15 all, there's lots of reasons for that. There may be  
16 some issues of some potential, you know, local  
17 depletions if a particular area gets impacted too much,  
18 even though the overall unit has no conservation  
19 concerns, there is some potential for specific areas  
20 that are popular for hunting to be somewhat depleted by  
21 intensive use, you know, areas that have good  
22 anchorages in particular get harder.

23

24 So the main issue here with the folks  
25 in Angoon is competition. And, you know, as has been  
26 pointed out, there are two provisions, you know, for a  
27 closure. One is a conservation concern and the other  
28 is the continuation of subsistence users -- uses. And  
29 how you want to interpret that provision, of course,  
30 leaves a lot of leeway as to what is required to  
31 continue a subsistence use. Does that mean the ability  
32 to go out and harvest in the most efficient way close  
33 to home, is that important for continuing subsistence  
34 uses. The folks in Angoon would say it is. And the  
35 Council, after a lot of discussion, agreed with them on  
36 that.

37

38 So I think that's the best explanation  
39 I can give.

40

41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Don.  
42 Gene, I hope that helped answer your question.

43

44 MR. PELTOLA: Yes, it did, Mr. Chair.  
45 And thank you much, appreciate the effort.

46

47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
48 And, again, Operator, we had somebody online from the  
49 public who would like to be recognized.

50

0134

1 OPERATOR: Yes. We have a question or  
2 comment from Todd. Your line is open.

3  
4 MR. SHARP: Thank you. I'm asking the  
5 Board to reject this proposal and I didn't submit any  
6 letter previously. My name is Todd Sharp. I'm  
7 currently residing in Juneau. I, myself, have hunted  
8 deer and met my needs in this specific area for over 40  
9 years. Angoon, in the western shore of Admiralty  
10 Island is where my family, my father, my grandfather  
11 and ancestors have hunted deer. I've hunted this area  
12 mostly during the months of August and November,  
13 sometimes in September, and I've hunted this area also  
14 several times in October and December over the years.

15  
16 First, I'd like to address the section  
17 of the proposal stating why this regulation should be  
18 changed. The statement is over the past years it has  
19 become more challenging for subsistence hunters in  
20 Angoon to harvest sufficient deer. Over the past  
21 several years, the winters have generally been milder  
22 which has resulted in an increased deer population, but  
23 due to these mild winters the majority of deer have not  
24 been forced to the beach and estuaries. This is most  
25 likely the major factor that has reduced harvest by  
26 local subsistence hunters. There are many times in  
27 late November and early December when I harvest deer at  
28 or well above 1,200 feet. I find a very good number of  
29 deer residing high on the terrain as possible and I've  
30 noted this by citing deer, taking deer and observing a  
31 great deal of fresh pellets at these higher elevations.

32  
33 There's also the statement that  
34 statement says, as hunting pressure from non-  
35 subsistence hunters has increased, concern has risen  
36 for the future prospects of local subsistence hunters.  
37 One this one I'm wondering and questioning what data  
38 was used to determine the increased use by non-  
39 subsistence hunters. But my statement, personal kind  
40 of observations, during the periods of time in the area  
41 where I've been hunting which is generally from south  
42 of Cube Cove to Whitewater Bay in the last four years,  
43 I have rarely and almost never seen any other hunters  
44 other than local hunters. Two years ago, in November,  
45 there was a big game guide vessel anchored in the south  
46 arm of Hood Bay, which appeared to have been deploying  
47 a couple of hunters there in the south arm.

48  
49 As a side arm, I think, and agree  
50

0135

1 moving forward with this proposal could have some  
2 unintended consequences, specifically for tribal  
3 members and others who presently are not qualified as  
4 subsistence hunters due to the location of their  
5 residences based on economic and other reasons that  
6 require them to live outside of the area that they  
7 traditionally hunt and gather.

8  
9 Also, if this proposal does move  
10 forward I question why the month of December has been  
11 excluded. The proposal states, the regulation change  
12 includes the dates closing deer hunting to non-  
13 subsistence hunters between September 15 and November  
14 30th, excluding the month of December seems counter-  
15 productive to the objective of this proposal by not  
16 allowing non-qualified hunters to hunt deer in  
17 December. The month of December should be one of the  
18 most concern for external hunting pressure by non-  
19 qualified Federal subsistence hunters due to urban  
20 hunters having holidays, time off work, et cetera, and  
21 the greater potential of heavier snowfall that forces  
22 deer on to the beach where they're more easily  
23 harvested. If non-qualified Federal subsistence  
24 hunters are responsible for reduced harvest by  
25 qualified Federal subsistence hunters, it seems more  
26 appropriate to close during the month of December than  
27 any other time.

28  
29 Thank you for the opportunity to  
30 comment.

31  
32 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
33 Todd, for taking the time to call in today.

34  
35 MR. SHARP: Yeah.

36  
37 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Operator, is  
38 there anybody else in the public who would like to be  
39 recognized.

40  
41 OPERATOR: No further questions on the  
42 phone at this time. And as a reminder to ask a  
43 question or comment, please press star, one.

44  
45 (Pause)

46  
47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,  
48 we'll get back to the order of the agenda, which was  
49 the InterAgency Staff Committee comments. ISC Chair.

50

0136

1 (Teleconference interference -  
2 participants not muted)

3

4 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
5 Members of the Board. This is Robbin LaVine. For  
6 Wildlife Proposal 22-07, the InterAgency Staff  
7 Committee acknowledges the extensive discussion by the  
8 Council members about the closure policy application to  
9 this situation. This was one of four proposals for  
10 Unit 4, which overall has a healthy population deer,  
11 but is experiencing sub-areas where subsistence users  
12 are not able to harvest enough deer for their needs.

13

14 The Council submitted this proposal  
15 because of concerns brought to them by the affected  
16 Federally-qualified subsistence users in Angoon about  
17 not meeting subsistence needs for deer.

18

19 The proposal review process allowed  
20 them to review the available data and hear testimony  
21 from all affected users of the resources. During the  
22 meeting they acknowledged that the data and the State  
23 reporting system used to measure effort does not  
24 reflect success in subsistence hunting because  
25 subsistence hunting of deer is opportunistic and users  
26 generally only report when they are successful. They  
27 crafted a modification in area and season that limits  
28 the impacts to the non-Federally-qualified users and  
29 addresses the needs of subsistence users.

30

31 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

32

33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, ISC.  
34 At this time I'm going to recognize, Operator, I hear  
35 there is one more public commenter online so we want to  
36 make sure we give everyone the opportunity so I'll  
37 entertain it again at this time.

38

39 OPERATOR: Yes, sir, just a moment.

40

41 (Pause)

42

43 OPERATOR: The question or comment over  
44 the phone comes from Steve, your line is open.

45

46 MR. HOFFMAN: Yes, this is Steve  
47 Hoffman. I live in Ketchikan, Alaska. And I want to  
48 address the Chairman and the Board members concerning  
49 Proposals 22-07, 08 and 10. I've hunted in those areas

50

0137

1 for the last 40 years and stuff and I've never seen a  
2 shortage of deer for both rural and urban residents  
3 except following the heavy winter kill that we all  
4 experienced in '07/08, therefore I'm encouraging the  
5 Board to vote these proposals down because I think it's  
6 unwarranted and ADF&G's data indicates that the deer  
7 populations in all these areas are doing quite well and  
8 I think it would be unfair to pass these proposals.

9

10 Thank you.

11

12 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,  
13 thank you for taking the time to call in today. That  
14 opens up the floor for Board discussion with Council  
15 Chair and State Liaison. Any questions from the Board,  
16 any further discussions, questions, comments.

17

18 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

19

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

22

23 MR. PELTOLA: How am I coming through,  
24 I was told we were really weak on the volume earlier.

25

26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, you were  
27 a little bit, now you sound a lot better. Thank you.

28

29 MR. PELTOLA: Okay. I think we found  
30 -- located the speaker in the ceiling in our office  
31 building, apologize for that. I'd like to put forth  
32 something for the Board's consideration on this  
33 proposal as well as a couple others.

34

35 I, as a Board member and the Bureau of  
36 Indian of Affairs has been supportive of closures in  
37 the past although like when we've discussed other  
38 closures we wanted to be as specific as we can be. In  
39 light of the testimony we've received and the analysis  
40 which is given and discussion with some of my  
41 colleagues I would like to put forth to the Board for  
42 their consideration to defer Wildlife Proposals 07, 08  
43 and 10, excluding 09 which is on the consensus agenda  
44 and that would be taken up for consideration in the  
45 winter meeting, in addition to, I do not want to speak  
46 on behalf of the Forest Service, but I think they would  
47 be willing to facilitate with OSM a group of users  
48 together to try to fine-tune something for our  
49 consideration in the immediate future.

50

0138

1 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

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

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Gene. Any other Board wish to discuss. Dave, any comments.

MR. SCHMID: Yes, this is Forest Service. Dave. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I concur here, I believe, with BIA and Gene Peltola. Based on our OSM analysis, based on some of the testimony we've heard, I would -- I'm going to -- or ask BIA to maybe put a motion forth here to move to defer those deer proposals, I believe it is 07, 08 and 10 until we can see if there's opportunity to work between some of the user groups and some of the members there on the RAC to see if we can't come up with a little bit better solution that's supported more by some of the evidence here. And so that's what I'm looking forward to moving forward with.

I do certainly appreciate the testimony that was given to the Southeast RAC from members but at this time I'd like to put some more work in and I do commit to working with OSM and working with the RAC and the other user groups here in Southeast Alaska to see if we can't craft a proposal that might work a bit better.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

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

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. BIA moves to defer as stipulated.

MR. SCHMID: Forest Service seconds.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: There's been a motion made and seconded to defer this wildlife proposal -- I have a question, as the Chair, now we have four of these proposals before us, are we looking at a suite of these or are we looking at specific -- this proposal?

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA, if I may.

0139

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

3  
4                   MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My  
5 motion was to defer '07, 08 and 10, with 09 being on  
6 the consensus agenda so therefore impacting and  
7 potentially deferring the three proposals in question  
8 -- 07, 08 and 10.

9  
10                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. I  
11 was just trying to make sure everyone was clear on the  
12 record. Thank you for that, Gene. Any other Board  
13 comments, questions or discussion about the motion to  
14 defer as specified.

15  
16                   (No comments)

17  
18                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing no  
19 comments we'll call for the question.

20  
21                   MR. SCHMID: Question.

22  
23                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All in favor of  
24 the motion to defer signify by saying aye.

25  
26                   IN UNISON: Aye.

27  
28                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Opposed, same  
29 sign.

30  
31                   (No opposing votes)

32  
33                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion carries  
34 unanimously to defer these proposals to a future  
35 meeting so we get more time to work out some specifics  
36 that might incorporate a little more of the user groups  
37 of the area and give us a better handle on all the --  
38 all that it entails, and so I appreciate the leadership  
39 on the Board here in wanting to fine-tune something  
40 that doesn't create additional user problems but may  
41 clearly find a priority use for the rural residents of  
42 Angoon and so just thanks everybody. Also keep in mind  
43 that we want to still keep this on top of the plate and  
44 make sure that we can pull this together sooner than  
45 later.

46  
47                   So thank you guys.

48  
49                   (Teleconference interference -  
50

0140

1 participants not muted)

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll go ahead  
4 and move on to the next proposal. Sue, could you call  
5 up that one, thank you.

6

7 MS. DETWILER: Yes, it's Wildlife  
8 Closure Review 22-01 and the lead for that is Greg  
9 Dunn.

10

11 MR. DUNN: Hello, Mr. Chair, can you  
12 hear me this is Greg Dunn.

13

14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have  
15 the floor.

16

17 MR. DUNN: Thank you. Mr. Chair.  
18 Members of the Board. My name is Greg Dunn and I'm a  
19 Wildlife Biologist with the Tongass National Forest.

20

21 Wildlife Closure WCR22-01 is a review  
22 of the closure to non-Federally-qualified subsistence  
23 users for deer from August 1st to August 15th in Unit 2  
24 and can be found on Page 912 of your meeting books.

25

26 Federal public lands in Unit 2 are  
27 closed to deer hunting in early August to non-  
28 Federally-qualified users.....

29

30 (Teleconference interference -  
31 participants not muted)

32

33 MR. DUNN: .....for the continuation of  
34 subsistence uses. A number of reasons were discussed  
35 for the justification for the closure. The long-term  
36 trend of declining deer habitat, which we only have 6  
37 percent of clear-cuts remaining huntable; size of deer  
38 population in Unit 2; apparent increase in hunter  
39 participation and the competition between user groups  
40 that resulted in a decline in subsistence opportunity,  
41 especially in the most road accessible portion of  
42 Prince of Wales Island and to coincide with the earlier  
43 July 24th start date for Federally-qualified users.

44

45 (Teleconference interference -  
46 participants not muted)

47

48 MR. DUNN: In 2003 the Federal  
49 Subsistence Board adopted WP03-05 which initially

50

0141

1 closed Federal public lands for deer hunting August 1st  
2 through August 21st. August was chosen to coincide  
3 with the earlier start date of July 24th with Proposal  
4 WP03-04 to provide a total of 28 days to hunt for  
5 Federally-qualified subsistence users. In 2004 the  
6 Board adopted Proposal WP04-15 with modification to  
7 change the Federal public lands closure date from  
8 August 1st to August 21st -- from August 1st to the  
9 21st to August 1st to the 15th and to keep the closure  
10 in perpetuity.

11

12 (Teleconference interference -  
13 participants not muted)

14

15 MR. DUNN: So Prince of Wales has the  
16 highest amount of old growth Forest in Southeast  
17 Alaska. Since 1954 Prince of Wales has received the  
18 most logging activity (indiscernible - interference)  
19 which resulted in a 94 percent reduction of contiguous  
20 (indiscernible - interference) production. Logging  
21 activity has reduced deer habitat in north central  
22 Prince of Wales by 46 percent and in south Prince of  
23 Wales by 18 percent.

24

25 Pellet group data in Unit 2 suggests an  
26 increasing population trend since the lows in 1990s  
27 when it was developed, you can see that in Figure 2.  
28 Recent indices and harvest statistics suggest the deer  
29 population is currently stable. Both pellet count data  
30 of 1.4 and deer harvest data have exceeded minimum  
31 objectives since 2008.

32

33 (Teleconference interference -  
34 participants not muted)

35

36 MR. DUNN: Alaska Board of Game in fall  
37 2000 established a harvest objective of 2,700 deer for  
38 Unit 2 and a population goal of 75,000 deer and  
39 considered the population as important for satisfying  
40 high levels for human consumption. The estimated  
41 average total annual harvest of 3,467 deer in Unit 2  
42 from 2005 to 2018 and you can see those in Figure 5.  
43 Harvests were at or above the Unit 2 harvest objective  
44 in 2005 to 2016 but fell below harvest objectives  
45 during the.....

46

47 (Teleconference interference -  
48 participants not muted)

49

50

0142

1 MR. DUNN: .....2017 through '19  
2 season. Deer harvest reached historically high levels  
3 in 2015 and then began to decline. There's a similar  
4 pattern seen with hunter participation in the Unit 2  
5 deer hunt, also you can see that in Figure 5.

6  
7 (Teleconference interference -  
8 participants not muted)

9  
10 MR. DUNN: Much of the harvest in Unit  
11 2 takes place during three time periods. Late July or  
12 August, October and November. This is when competition  
13 is greatest between user groups. July/August is the  
14 opening of the hunt in Unit 2 and people are in alpine  
15 areas looking for mature bucks. November is the most  
16 popular month to hunt because it coincides with the  
17 rut. Federally-qualified subsistence users in Unit 2  
18 had a higher success rate than other hunters from '97  
19 to 2017 with an average success rate of 74 percent  
20 compared to 60 percent success rate for non-Federally-  
21 qualified and you can see that in Table 3.

22  
23 (Teleconference interference -  
24 participants not muted)

25  
26 MR. DUNN: Rescinding the closure would  
27 increase opportunities on Federal public lands for non-  
28 Federally-qualified users during August. This could  
29 increase both the number of non-Federally-qualified  
30 users and encounters between Federally-qualified  
31 subsistence users and non-Federally-qualified  
32 subsistence users. This could potentially decrease  
33 harvest opportunity for Federally-qualified subsistence  
34 users (indiscernible - interference)

35  
36 (Teleconference interference -  
37 participants not muted)

38  
39 MR. DUNN: Long-term trend of declining  
40 deer habitat, decreasing deer population size of Unit  
41 2, increase in hunter participation, competition  
42 between user groups on the most road accessible  
43 portions of Prince of Wales Island have affected  
44 perception of increased competition between Federally-  
45 qualified users and non-Federally-qualified users. The  
46 harvest objective has not been met since  
47 (indiscernible) 2017 and the deer per user has dropped  
48 as well. Finding deer in traditional areas has  
49 decreased because of weather, competition, stem  
50

0143

1 exclusion, predation and road access. This shows there  
2 may be less deer on the landscape and could be a reason  
3 to maintain the closure.

4

5 And the OSM preliminary conclusion was  
6 to maintain the status quo. That is all I have.

7

8 Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the  
9 Board. I'd be happy to address to any questions.

10

11 (Teleconference interference -  
12 participants not muted)

13

14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
15 questions from the Board for Staff.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,  
20 thank you. We'll move on to summary of written public  
21 comment.

22

23 MR. DUNN: Thank you, Mr. Chair this is  
24 Greg Dunn again. We had one written comment and it  
25 opposed so it -- we should rescind the closure order is  
26 what they came -- is -- because people want to hunt in  
27 June and July and July and August again.....

28

29 (Teleconference interference -  
30 participants not muted)

31

32 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. And  
33 there is somebody with a line open, if you can please  
34 mute it.

35

36 (Pause)

37

38 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. We'll go  
39 ahead at this time and open up the floor for public  
40 testimony on this proposal.

41

42 OPERATOR: As a reminder to ask a  
43 question or comment, please press star, one. As of now  
44 there are no questions or comments over the phone.

45

46 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
47 We'll go ahead and move to the Regional Advisory  
48 Council recommendation.

49

50

0144

1 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. This  
2 is Don Hernandez for the Southeast RAC. The Council  
3 voted to maintain the status quo on this closure. This  
4 season closure has been in place for a good number of  
5 years. It was originally recommended by a stakeholders  
6 group that sought solutions to Federally-qualified  
7 subsistence users needs for deer not being met in Unit  
8 2.

9  
10 So I just want to point out on that  
11 statement that much like was suggested on the previous  
12 deferrals on Unit 4 deer proposals, for a stakeholders  
13 group, we did convene a stakeholders group, I think it  
14 was 18 years ago now. Chairman Christianson and myself  
15 both took part in that stakeholders group and this --  
16 this closure policy was initiated from that effort and  
17 it was an effort that had participation from all users.  
18 So that's the history behind that.

19  
20 So this closure is one of the solutions  
21 crafted by that group, which is a compromise of both  
22 Federally-qualified subsistence users and non-  
23 Federally-qualified hunters. This closure is in align  
24 with recognized principles of fish and wildlife  
25 management. It doesn't exclude non-subsistence  
26 hunters, they still have opportunity but it does  
27 provide a meaningful priority for subsistence users.

28  
29 In addition to the seasonal closure  
30 there is also a harvest limit restriction for non-  
31 Federally-qualified users. That was implemented by the  
32 Board just several years ago. A harvest limit  
33 restriction has resulted in less hunter effort from  
34 non-Federally-qualified subsistence users, most of whom  
35 live in Ketchikan. Ketchikan is in Unit 1, which has a  
36 greater harvest limit as well as a good success rate  
37 for deer hunters so the harvest limit restriction in  
38 Unit 2 may have shifted some effort to Unit 1. All of  
39 this has worked towards solving a problem in Unit 2  
40 where there was a lot of competition which resulted in  
41 subsistence users having a hard time meeting their  
42 needs. The seasonal closure and harvest restriction,  
43 collectively, have been a good, successful strategy  
44 ensuring that subsistence needs are being met.

45  
46 That concludes our comments.

47  
48 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Don.  
49 Thank you for the shout out there too. That was always  
50

0145

1 a fond memory of mine getting involved in the Unit 2  
2 subcommittee work and trying to find a user group  
3 conflict resolution so I am a believer in that being  
4 part of the process. So thank you for your position  
5 there. Any questions for Don.

6

7

(No comments)

8

9 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,  
10 we'll move on to tribal, Alaska Native Corporation  
11 comments. Native Liaison, we'll be calling on Ms.  
12 LaVine at this time.

13

14 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
15 Members of the Board. This is Robbin LaVine standing  
16 in for Tribal Liaison Orville Lind. There were no  
17 comments or recommendations during the consultation.

18

19

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

20

21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
22 We'll call on the Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
23 comments. State Liaison.

24

25 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
26 For the record, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
27 supports eliminating the restricted bag limit for non-  
28 Federally-qualified deer hunters in GMU 2. Those  
29 restrictions have never been and cannot be justified as  
30 necessary to assure the continued viability of a fish  
31 or wildlife population or the continuation of  
32 subsistence uses of such population. Maintaining this  
33 closure will continue to deprive non-Federally-  
34 qualified users of deer harvest opportunity in GMU 2.

35

36 Over 70 percent of land in the unit is  
37 Federally-managed and the pre-2018 Federal regulations  
38 already provided a greater opportunity to Federally-  
39 qualified deer hunters compared to non-Federally-ones.  
40 Those advantages included a season with 54 days when  
41 only Federally-qualified users were eligible to hunt, a  
42 higher Federal bag limit, including one doe, harvested  
43 after October 15th and a Federal season that extended  
44 through January when deer are at low elevations. In  
45 contrast, non-Federally-qualified users hunt under  
46 State regulations with an open season from August 1 to  
47 December 31 and a bag limit of four bucks -- four male  
48 deer, however, currently only two bucks may be taken on  
49 Federal land and most Federal public lands are closed

50

0146

1 to hunting by non-Federally-qualified users in the  
2 month of August.

3

4

5 As directed by Congress in Section .802  
6 of ANILCA, subsistence uses of wildlife shall be the  
7 priority consumptive use on Federal public lands when  
8 it is necessary to restrict taking in order to assure  
9 the continued viability of a fish or wildlife  
10 population as a continuation of subsistence uses of  
11 such population. Section .815 of ANILCA provides that  
12 a restriction on taking wildlife for non-Federally-  
13 qualified users is only authorized if necessary for the  
14 conservation of healthy populations of fish and  
15 wildlife for the reasons in .816 to continue  
16 subsistence uses of such populations, or pursuant to  
17 other applicable law. ADF&G can find where none of  
18 these reasons applied. There is no conservation  
19 concern for GMU 2 deer populations and no restrictions  
20 are needed to continue subsistence use of deer in GMU 2  
21 as ANS has consistently been met. The deer population  
22 continues to be viable and productive.

22

23

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

24

25

26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
27 questions for the State.

27

28

(No comments)

29

30

31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,  
32 we'll move on to InterAgency Staff Committee comments.  
33 ISC Chair.

33

34

35 MS. LAVINE: Good morning, again, Mr.  
36 Chair. This is Robbin LaVine, Policy Coordinator and  
37 the InterAgency Staff Committee Chair.

37

38

39 For Wildlife Closure Review 22-01 the  
40 InterAgency Staff Committee provided the standard  
41 comment.

41

42

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

43

44

45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
46 We'll move on to Board discussion and Council Chair and  
47 State Liaison.

47

48

(No comments)

49

50

0147

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,  
2 we'll go ahead and open up the floor for Board action.

3  
4 MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chair, Forest Service.

5  
6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the  
7 floor Dave.

8  
9 MR. SCHMID: Yeah, Mr. Chair, I move to  
10 maintain status quo for the WCR22-01. Following a  
11 second I will explain why I intend to support my  
12 motion.

13  
14 MR. PELTOLA: Second.

15  
16 MR. SCHMID: Thank you. So my  
17 justification is based on the analysis by OSM and the  
18 comments given by the Southeast Alaska Subsistence  
19 Regional Advisory Council. Overall, the long-term  
20 trend in the deer population on Prince of Wales can be  
21 summarized by declining deer habitat, decreasing deer  
22 population size, increase in hunter participation,  
23 decreased harvest success, inability to meet the  
24 harvest objective since 2017 and increased competition  
25 between user groups in the most road accessible  
26 portions of Prince of Wales Island in Unit 2. Based on  
27 the testimony from Federally-qualified subsistence  
28 users the current seasonal closure and harvest  
29 restriction appears to be a successful strategy that is  
30 helping meet subsistence needs.

31  
32 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

33  
34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
35 Dave. Any comments, questions, discussion.

36  
37 OPERATOR: No questions over the phone.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,  
40 we'll call for the question.

41  
42 MR. SCHMID: Question.

43  
44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
45 Dave. All in favor of the motion to keep status quo  
46 signify by saying aye.

47  
48 IN UNISON: Aye.

49  
50

0148

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Opposed same  
2 sign.

3  
4 (No opposing votes)

5  
6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion carries  
7 unanimously. Thank you, guys. We'll move on to the  
8 next proposal on the agenda. Sue.

9  
10 MS. DETWILER: Yes, that action closes  
11 out the non-consensus agenda items for the Southeast  
12 region and so we'll now be moving into the  
13 Southcentral proposals starting out with Wildlife  
14 Proposal 22-12. And I believe Milo Burcham is going to  
15 be presenting that one.

16  
17 MR. BURCHAM: Can you hear me.

18  
19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Milo, you  
20 have the floor.

21  
22 MR. BURCHAM: Hello. This is Milo  
23 Burcham of the Chugach National Forest and I'm here to  
24 present a summary of the analysis of WP22-12. The full  
25 analysis begins on Page 941 in your book.

26  
27 Proposal WP22-12 submitted by the  
28 Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory  
29 Council request that the deer season in Unit 6 be  
30 extended from the current closing date of December 31st  
31 to January 31st. The proponents believe that  
32 lengthening the deer season in Unit 6 from December  
33 31st to January 31st should be authorized because many  
34 subsistence users are not able to harvest enough deer  
35 to feed their families due to mild winters which  
36 decreases hunter success. Winter snows that push deer  
37 to the beaches where they are more easily accessed by  
38 hunters have occurred later in recent winters. Hunters  
39 that cannot participate in early season hunts must wait  
40 until later in the season when reduced foliage allows  
41 deer to be more easily seen and heavy snow-pak forces  
42 deer down near the coast where they are more  
43 accessible.

44  
45 In 1990 the Board adopted subsistence  
46 regulations for deer hunting from State regulations.  
47 The initial Federal deer season was August 1st to  
48 December 31st with a limit of five deer but antlerless  
49 deer could only be taken September 15th to December  
50

1 31st. The current season dates, including the October  
2 through December 31 antlerless deer season was adopted  
3 in 1991.

4  
5 Sitka black-tailed deer were introduced  
6 to Unit 6 between 1916 and 1923. The deer population  
7 in Prince William Sound is limited by snow depth and  
8 duration. Heavy snow events have caused major winter  
9 mortality in the area. Deep snow concentrates deer  
10 along beaches and if deer are forced to remain there  
11 for an extended period of time can -- it can result in  
12 starvation. Deer are also more vulnerable to harvest  
13 while concentrated on beaches and harvesting under  
14 these circumstances could -- harvest under these  
15 circumstances could become additive mortality rather  
16 than compensatory mortality and result in higher total  
17 winter mortality. Approximately 45 percent of the  
18 reported harvest -- reported resident harvest is by  
19 local Federally-qualified subsistence users and that  
20 would be residents of Cordova, Chenega Bay, Tatitlek  
21 and Whittier and 50 percent is by non-Federally-  
22 qualified Alaska residents and five percent by non-  
23 local Federally-qualified subsistence users.  
24 Approximately 98 percent of the reported harvest by  
25 local Federally-qualified subsistence users are from  
26 Cordova residents.

27  
28 From 2006 to 2012, the sex ratio of the  
29 harvest was approximately 63 percent male and 38  
30 percent female. Harvest reports between 2005 and 2006  
31 and 2009 and '10 show that most of the annual deer  
32 harvest occurred during October and that was 19 to 35  
33 percent; November 25 to 35 percent and December 18 to  
34 24 percent. Few deer have been harvested during the  
35 extended January season since the season was lengthened  
36 in 2016. A large proportion of the yearly take of deer  
37 by residents of Cordova, the largest of the three  
38 communities occurs on Hawkins Island which is in  
39 relative close proximity to town.

40  
41 If this proposal is adopted it would  
42 lengthen the deer season by one month through January  
43 31st in Unit 6. A longer season would provide  
44 increased opportunity for Federally-qualified  
45 subsistence users to harvest deer during the winter  
46 when they are more accessible because snow often pushes  
47 deer to lower elevations and on to beaches in Prince  
48 William Sound. By allowing the harvest of either sex  
49 deer during the extended season, hunters would not have  
50

0150

1 to discriminate between does and bucks that have  
2 already shed their antlers. Although the deer  
3 population in Unit 6 has largely recovered from the  
4 decline after the severe winter of 2011/12, deer are  
5 more vulnerable to harvest when pushed to beaches where  
6 they are easily accessed by hunters on boats. It is  
7 thought that when winter conditions are severe hunter  
8 harvest can become additive source of mortality to  
9 winter kill, additionally heavy harvest of does can  
10 slow the recovery of deer after severe winter events.  
11 Federally-qualified subsistence users, especially  
12 residents of Cordova, harvest a significant portion of  
13 the deer taken in Prince William Sound and are  
14 responsible for most of the harvest from Hawkins and  
15 Hinchbrook Islands. While few bucks have been  
16 harvested from 6D during the -- the January season  
17 since 2016, increasing the harvest limit and allowing  
18 the harvest of does late in the season would likely  
19 increase participation in the late season hunt.

20

21                   The OSM preliminary conclusion of this  
22 -- from this analysis was to support WP22-12 with  
23 modification, to restrict the harvest limit during the  
24 January season to two deer rather than the five  
25 proposed. And the justification is that while  
26 lengthening the deer season by one month through  
27 January 31st and allowing the harvest of does would  
28 provide additional opportunity to harvest red meat. It  
29 also increases harvest pressure at a time when deer  
30 could be pushed to beaches by deep snow where they are  
31 most vulnerable. Qualified rural residents already  
32 have a long and liberal season for deer in Unit 6  
33 extending five months from the 1st of August through  
34 the 31st of December for up to five deer, and an  
35 additional month through January 31st for up to one  
36 buck. The proposed modification would reduce the  
37 impact to deer populations by limiting the harvest  
38 during the time when they are most vulnerable but still  
39 provide additional opportunity for qualified rural  
40 residents. This would also reduce additive mortality  
41 during more severe winters and speed recovery of the  
42 deer population following these events.

43

44                   That concludes my presentation of the  
45 analysis.

46

47                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
48 questions for the Staff.

49

50

0151

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

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll move on to summary of written public comments.

MR. BURCHAM: There were two -- the Federal Subsistence Board received public comments in the form of two letters on WP22-12 both in opposition. While both letters focused on issues surrounding Southeast Alaska deer proposals, they included concerns that non-Federally-qualified hunter opportunity was being unfairly reduced and that extending the season in Unit 6 would harm deer populations there.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. We'll move on to open the floor to public testimony. Anybody online Operator that would like to speak.

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

23 (No comments)

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

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. We'll move on to Regional Advisory Council recommendation.

MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, this is DeAnna Perry, Council Coordinator. I believe Vice Chair Gloria Stickwan is online to provide that.

MS. STICKWAN: Yes. Yes, I am, I'm just waiting to be -- I thought -- okay, the Council supported this proposal with modification to restrict the harvest limit during the January season to one deer in all of Unit 6. Lengthening the season better serves the Federally-qualified user in adapting to climate change situations and increase harvest opportunities. It also recognizes the mobility issues of some hunters and allows more choice for timing the hunt, youth tend to climb mountains and hunt easier and elders tend to hunt during the second phase of the season when deer are in the lower lands. Removing the buck only requirement will lessen the likelihood of unintentional illegal harvest and decreasing the number of deer to be

0152

1 harvested in January, from OSM's suggested -- suggested  
2 two deer -- Council's suggestion -- one deer should  
3 address any conservation concerns with the deer  
4 population in Unit 6. This action is supported by  
5 local knowledge and biological information presented in  
6 the analysis including consideration of weather  
7 conditions during the hunting season and it benefits  
8 subsistence users.

9

10 Thank you.

11

12 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
13 Gloria. Moving on tribal, Alaska Native Corp comments.  
14 Native Liaison. Robbin.

15

16 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
17 This is Robbin LaVine standing in for Native Liaison  
18 Orville Lind. There were no comments or  
19 recommendations during the consultation.

20

21 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

22

23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
24 We'll move on to Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
25 comments. State Liaison.

26

27 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
28 For the record, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
29 opposes this proposal. Excessive harvest of female  
30 deer resulting in this proposal is likely to affect  
31 sustainability of the current level of deer in GMU 6  
32 and cause conservation concerns for the population  
33 which runs contrary to ANILCA. Deer were introduced to  
34 Prince William Sound and occur at the northern most  
35 extent of their range. As a result the population is  
36 very susceptible to mortality during extreme weather  
37 events. Snow accumulation that could lead to major  
38 concentrating events at sea level is far more common  
39 after January than in the last two months of the  
40 existing season. Harvest of females is higher in years  
41 with significant late winter harvest which can slow  
42 population rebounds following large snow events. With  
43 the high number of Federally-qualified users in close  
44 proximity to Federal public land harvest in January  
45 could be very high and potentially detrimental to the  
46 population. The existing season on bucks only in GMU  
47 6D provides reasonable opportunity while slowing  
48 harvest and protecting females. Analysis given  
49 indicate recent harvest is normal although available

50

0153

1 household survey data -- survey data and harvest data  
2 were not included in the analysis. There's also little  
3 information to suggest that users are not able to meet  
4 their needs with the existing season.

5

6 And one last important point to make is  
7 that, you know, acknowledged by the proponent of the  
8 proposal as well as OSM, that you just heard, often  
9 times deer during this time of year during the proposed  
10 extension are located on the beaches below the ordinary  
11 high water mark and, therefore, cannot be legally  
12 harvested as that would be the jurisdiction of State  
13 regulations.

14

15 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16

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

19

20 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
21 This is Robbin LaVine, Policy Coordinator and ISC  
22 Chair. For Wildlife Proposal 22-12 the ISC provided  
23 the standard comments.

24

25 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

26

27 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
28 Robbin. We'll move to Board discussion with Council  
29 Chair and State Liaison.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We will open up  
34 the floor for Board action.

35

36 MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chair, Forest Service.

37

38 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the  
39 floor, Dave.

40

41 MR. SCHMID: Thank you. I move to  
42 adopt Wildlife Proposal 22-12 as modified by the  
43 Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory  
44 Council to extend the deer season through the end of  
45 January while restricting the January season harvest  
46 limit to one deer in all of Unit 6. Following a second  
47 I will explain why I support my motion.

48

49 MR. PELTOLA: BIA seconds.

50

0154

1 MR. SCHMID: Thank you. My  
2 justification is based on the analysis by OSM and as  
3 modified by the Southcentral Alaska Subsistence  
4 Regional Advisory Council. Lengthening the deer season  
5 by one month through January 31st but limiting the  
6 harvest to either one buck or one doe would provide  
7 additional opportunity to harvest red meat by  
8 Federally-qualified subsistence users while minimizing  
9 pressure at a time when deer are most vulnerable.

10

11 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

12

13 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
14 Dave. Any Board discussion, comments.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the  
19 question.

20

21 MR. SCHMID: Question.

22

23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
24 Dave. All in favor of the proposal as presented  
25 signify by saying aye.

26

27 IN UNISON: Aye.

28

29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Opposed, same  
30 sign.

31

32 (No opposing votes)

33

34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion carries  
35 unanimously. I think we're moving right along, thank  
36 you guys for this diligence this morning. We'll go  
37 ahead and come back at 1:20 so if we could have  
38 everybody coming back after lunch at 1:20 that'll give  
39 us a few minutes to get everybody online, check our  
40 quorum and get back with the order of business in the  
41 Southwest there. So we'll take a quick lunch break and  
42 be back at 1:20. Thank you all.

43

44 MR. SCHMID: Thanks, Tony.

45

46 (Off record)

47

48 (On record)

49

50

0155

1 MS. DETWILER: Tina, are you on, have  
2 you started recording.

3  
4 REPORTER: Sue, I am on and ready to  
5 go.

6  
7 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you. I'll  
8 start going through the roll call but first, Tony  
9 Christianson, Chair, have you called in yet.

10  
11 (No comments)

12  
13 MS. DETWILER: Okay, while we're  
14 waiting for Tony we'll see what other Board members we  
15 have online starting with the Park Service, Sarah  
16 Creachbaum.

17  
18 MS. CREACHBAUM: Good afternoon, Sue,  
19 and everyone. I'm present.

20  
21 MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Sarah.

22  
23 Thomas Heinlein, BLM. I think I heard  
24 you earlier. Are you still on.

25  
26 MR. HEINLEIN: BLM is still on.

27  
28 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

29  
30 Fish and Wildlife Service, Sara Boario.

31  
32 MS. BOARIO: Hi, Sue.

33  
34 MS. DETWILER: Hi, Sara.

35  
36 Forest Service, Dave Schmid.

37  
38 MR. SCHMID: I'm on, Sue, thanks.

39  
40 MS. DETWILER: Thanks, Dave.

41  
42 BIA, Gene Peltola.

43  
44 (No comments)

45  
46 MS. DETWILER: Public Member Rhonda  
47 Pitka, I heard you earlier, are you still on.

48  
49 MS. PITKA: I am on.

50

0156

1 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Public  
2 Member Charlie Brower. I heard you also, are you still  
3 on.

4  
5 MR. BROWER: I'm here.

6  
7 MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Charlie.

8  
9 Chair Anthony Christianson.

10  
11 (No comments)

12  
13 MS. DETWILER: Okay, and so we're  
14 waiting for Chair Christianson and Gene Peltola.

15  
16 OPERATOR: This is the Operator, so  
17 there are about three speakers coming in right now,  
18 they're being prompted.

19  
20 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

21  
22 (Pause)

23  
24 MS. DETWILER: We're just waiting on  
25 Tony Christianson and Gene Peltola.

26  
27 MR. CHEN: Good afternoon, Sue. This  
28 is Glenn Chen with the BIA.

29  
30 MS. DETWILER: Uh-huh.

31  
32 MR. CHEN: And I'm calling in on behalf  
33 of Gene Peltola until he's available to join the  
34 meeting. Thank you.

35  
36 MS. DETWILER: Okay. So we're just  
37 waiting on Tony Christianson for now. And if Tony  
38 Christianson is having troubles logging on, the default  
39 would be to go next to Rhonda Pitka as the Chair.

40  
41 MS. PITKA: Absolutely. So I believe  
42 that we are on Wildlife Proposal WP22-20; is that  
43 correct?

44  
45 MS. DETWILER: Yes, that is correct.  
46 Would you like us to get started with that, Madame  
47 Chair.

48  
49 MS. PITKA: Yes, is Member Charlie

50

0157

1 Brower on?

2

3

MS. DETWILER: I believe Charlie is on.

4

5

6

MS. PITKA: Okay, cool. Okay, yeah,  
let's get started then. Thank you.

7

8

9

MS. DETWILER: And that would be -- I  
believe that's Hannah Voorhees presenting that  
proposal.

10

11

12

MS. VOORHEES: Good afternoon.....

13

14

MS. PITKA: Go ahead, Hannah.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. VOORHEES: .....Mr. Chair -- Madame  
Chair. Good afternoon, Madame Chair. Members of the  
Board. This is Hannah Voorhees, Anthropologist with  
OSM and I'll be presenting Wildlife Proposal WP22-20.  
This proposal was submitted by Michael Adams and the  
analysis begins on Page 158 of the Board book.

22

23

24

25

This proposal requests that the Board  
recognize the customary and traditional use of moose in  
Unit 15C by residents of Cooper Landing.

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

The proponent states that residents of  
Cooper Landing have a history of customary and  
traditional use of resources including moose throughout  
Unit 15. He indicates that Cooper Landing residents  
participate in all subsistence opportunities in the  
region. The proponent argues that exclusion from these  
customary and traditional use determinations has denied  
Cooper Landing residents subsistence opportunity.

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

Currently the customary and traditional  
use determination for moose in Unit 15C includes  
residents of Ninilchik, Nanwalek, Port Graham and  
Seldovia. Cooper Landing's use of -- customary and  
traditional use of moose has been recognized by the  
Board for much of the Kenai Peninsula. In 2008 the  
Board recognized the customary and traditional use of  
moose in Unit 7, 15A and 15B by residents of Cooper  
Landing. In 2014 the Board rejected a proposal  
requesting the recognition of Cooper Landing's  
customary and traditional use of moose in 15C. At that  
time the Southcentral Council did not support the  
proposal due to lack of information and testimony from  
residents of Cooper Landing. In 2020 the Board

0158

1 recognized customary and traditional use of caribou in  
2 Unit 15D and 15C and use of goat in all of Unit 15 by  
3 residents of Cooper Landing.

4  
5 Therefore, customary and traditional  
6 use determinations have previously been made for  
7 residents of Cooper Landing for other wildlife species  
8 in Unit 15C specifically for goat and caribou.

9  
10 When conducting a customary and  
11 traditional use determination analysis eight factors  
12 are holistically considered. These are listed started  
13 on Page 163 of the Board book but please note that this  
14 is not a checklist.

15  
16 C&T determinations are made for  
17 recognizing the pool of users who generally exhibit the  
18 eight factors and not for resource management or  
19 restricting harvest. Of note, at the fall 2013 meeting  
20 the Southcentral Council made a recommendation to,  
21 "change the way determinations are made by making area-  
22 wide customary and traditional use determinations for  
23 all species."

24  
25 In June 2016 the Board clarified that  
26 the eight factor analysis applied when considering  
27 customary and traditional use determinations is  
28 intended to protect subsistence use, rather than limit  
29 it.

30  
31 In terms of Cooper Landing's use of  
32 moose, ADF&G, Division of Subsistence conducted a  
33 subsistence survey in Cooper Landing in 1991. 28  
34 percent of surveyed households hunted moose and moose  
35 were shared among residents. As part of the same study  
36 ADF&G matched 50 Cooper Landing household's use area  
37 for moose during their lifetime living in the  
38 community. Mapped community use areas should not be  
39 considered exhaustive but do provide some useful  
40 information. Cooper Landing residents harvest  
41 resources most intensively in areas closest to the  
42 community typical of a subsistence practice  
43 characterized by efficiency of effort and cost,  
44 however, they also harvest resources throughout the  
45 Kenai Peninsula. Areas used for moose hunting by  
46 residents of Cooper Landing included the far northern  
47 portion of Unit 15C. You can see the map on Page 166  
48 of the Board book. From 1987 through 2019.....

49  
50

0159

1 (Teleconference interference -  
2 participants not muted)

3  
4 MS. VOORHEES: . . . . State harvest  
5 records show there were 14 hunts for moose in Unit 15C  
6 by residents of Cooper Landing.

7  
8 (Teleconference interference -  
9 participants not muted)

10  
11 MS. VOORHEES: The OSM conclusion is to  
12 support WP22-20 with the following justification. The  
13 Board has previously recognized Cooper Landing's  
14 customary and traditional use of other wildlife in Unit  
15 15C. Based on these previous determinations Cooper  
16 Landing has already established a recognized pattern of  
17 harvest and use of wild resources in these areas  
18 consistent with the eight factors. Cooper Landing  
19 residents pattern of moose hunting and harvest  
20 generally exhibits the characteristics of customary and  
21 traditional use as shown through subsistence surveys  
22 and data from residents hunting under State  
23 regulations.

24  
25 Thank you, that concludes my  
26 presentation.

27  
28 MS. PITKA: Thank you, Hannah.

29  
30 MS. DETWILER: I believe -- is Charlie  
31 back on, I got a text he was on, I'm not sure if he's  
32 in the speaker's room -- I mean not Charlie, I'm sorry,  
33 Tony.

34  
35 MS. PITKA: Oh, okay, I'm not sure, I  
36 haven't heard anybody come on. The next, I believe,  
37 we're on the summary of written public comments.

38  
39 MS. DETWILER: Yes.

40  
41 MS. VOORHEES: Madame Chair, for the  
42 record this is Hannah Voorhees again. Two written  
43 public comments were received on this proposal. Both  
44 in opposition.

45  
46 The Alaska Kenai Chapter of the Safari  
47 Club International stated that they do not support a  
48 subsistence priority for rural residents on road  
49 connected portions of the Kenai Peninsula.

50

0160

1                   The Alaska Outdoor Council specifically  
2 states that providing a priority to certain users on  
3 the Kenai Peninsula exacerbates conflict between  
4 Federally-qualified hunters and Alaskans living in  
5 non--Federally-qualified areas of the state.

6  
7                   MS. PITKA: Thank you. Was that it for  
8 written public comments.

9  
10                  MS. VOORHEES: Yes, that completes the  
11 comments.

12  
13                  MS. PITKA: Thank you very much. At  
14 this time I'd like to open the floor to public  
15 testimony on Wildlife Proposal 22-20.

16  
17                  OPERATOR: Thank you. As a reminder to  
18 ask a question or give a testimony please press, star,  
19 one.

20  
21                  (No comments)

22  
23                  OPERATOR: We do have a comment.....

24  
25                  MS. PITKA: Operator.....

26  
27                  OPERATOR: .....Mr.....

28  
29                  MS. PITKA: .....any testimony.

30  
31                  OPERATOR: Yes, ma'am, just a moment.

32  
33                  MS. PITKA: Thank you.

34  
35                  OPERATOR: First question or comment  
36 comes from Darrel, your line is open.

37  
38                  MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. I hope  
39 everyone can hear me. My name is Darrel Williams. I'm  
40 here today representing Ninilchik Traditional Council.  
41 And I'd like to be able to speak to Wildlife Proposal  
42 WP22-20 regarding Cooper Landing's C&T for moose in  
43 Unit 15C. And I want to be able to -- since this was a  
44 discussion item that was brought up from the comments  
45 from yesterday morning, I wanted to communicate our  
46 position and contribute to this discussion.

47  
48                  I guess the place to start is that this  
49 proposal had been reviewed by the Southcentral Regional  
50

0161

1 Advisory Council and was voted down. We've had several  
2 of these kind of proposals over the years we've had to  
3 deal with. For example, Ninilchik, when we presented  
4 our information, gosh, it was like 2006, 2007, our C&T,  
5 or the -- the data supported C&T much, much further  
6 than what anybody even asked for. However, when we  
7 start looking at this particular proposal, we start  
8 looking at this idea of historical use, I remember some  
9 of the conversations we had at the Regional Advisory  
10 Council was that most of the use seemed to be indicated  
11 that it was on State land versus Federal lands and, of  
12 course, we know that Federal lands is where subsistence  
13 takes place. We also saw that there was some really  
14 clear delineation in use when we look at the material  
15 that was presented at the Federal Subsistence Board we  
16 can see that delineation in the maps on Page 166 and  
17 167. Page 166 shows the Game Management Units and how  
18 they're laid out and on Page 167 is the results from  
19 the survey information. And it's pretty clear that it  
20 doesn't look like any harvest goes down beyond Game  
21 Management Unit -- beyond 15B. So that was -- I  
22 remember that was a big part of that discussion that we  
23 had.

24  
25                   There was also some questions in the  
26 analysis that was discussed at the Regional Advisory  
27 Council here they did not feel that the eight factors  
28 were supported well enough to provide the C&T  
29 determination and there's also the issue of the data  
30 that was used. And we've made this argument for many,  
31 many years, where data that's prepared by the State of  
32 Alaska, tends, you know, to be referred to as a  
33 stratified random sample and, really, it's a way to  
34 stratify random sample, it's different. There's some  
35 interesting quirks on how data is managed. And it's  
36 actually -- it shows up in the stuff that's submitted  
37 to the Board, if you look at the table on Page 168, you  
38 know, it's really interesting because you have 13 years  
39 of reported harvest activity, right, with zero harvest,  
40 however, it also details that there was one moose  
41 taken. Well, you know, I mean there's a big question  
42 there how do you have zero harvest and then all of a  
43 sudden say, oh, yeah, we took a moose. I mean you got  
44 to be real careful with that. This is where these  
45 weights and types of evaluations start to show up.

46  
47                   It changes how subsistence is looked at  
48 and how it's evaluated. Especially from the Federal  
49 Subsistence Board, you know, it's not really clear on  
50

0162

1 how that's actually put together.

2

3

4 So we want to look at that carefully,  
5 you know, when we're viewing this kind of stuff. But  
6 at the same time, this is one of the reasons why we  
7 really oppose this kind of proposal, there is an awful  
8 lot of area that is open in Game Management Units that  
9 is supported by the data. It seems like we're just  
10 starting to reach further and further and further into  
11 things. You know the example that we had, that we  
12 experienced many, many years ago was, you know, some of  
13 our data supported subsistence use in Kodiak, strong  
14 support for it, significant, and there was an awful lot  
15 of trouble because that didn't work well with how the  
16 Regional Advisories are set up and how these decisions  
17 were made and it wasn't something that we wanted, it  
18 was supported by the information and that was really  
19 good support. But the difference here is is that this  
20 information demonstrates zero with an implied value of  
21 one which really doesn't -- I don't think it meets that  
22 criteria very well.

22

23

24 You know, the other thing I think is  
25 worth talking about that is part of this discussion is  
26 that the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council also  
27 went through another rigorous set of proposals for  
28 Moose Pass and they were Proposals 22-16 through 26 and  
29 this is the kind of discussion, same kind of  
30 evaluation, where we had to do due diligence in looking  
31 at what the proposals are and where these areas are and  
32 how this is going to work.

32

33

34 So, in short, the Ninilchik Traditional  
35 Council, the tribe, we oppose the C&T determination.

35

36

37 But I also want to comment about, you  
38 know, this can be to get to be a really slippery slope  
39 when we start doing things like this because somebody  
40 may go to the Regional Advisory Council and not get the  
41 answer that they like and then they call the Federal  
42 Subsistence Board and it gets brought back up and put  
43 into the process and, you know, there is a due  
44 diligence to the RACs for a reason, it's actually  
45 there, but when we start using weighted averages, and  
46 applied numbers and things like that, it's a slippery  
47 slope, because when you have no harvest that  
48 statistically becomes harvest it's a different problem  
49 and we're going to end up reinventing how subsistence  
50 works and how it's measured by making these kind of

50

0163

1 determinations and I think that's a larger issue when  
2 we're looking at proposals like this. I think the  
3 weight and the review process needs to really be looked  
4 at before we pick up different proposals because it  
5 seems to be something that somebody would like.

6  
7 Mr. Chair. Members of the Board.  
8 Thank you very much. If you have questions or  
9 comments.

10  
11 MS. PITKA: Thank you, Mr. Williams.  
12 Just to clarify Ninilchik opposes, the tribe opposes.

13  
14 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, that is correct.

15  
16 MS. PITKA: Thank you. Is there any  
17 other additional public testimony or questions for  
18 this.

19  
20 (No comments)

21  
22 MS. PITKA: Operator, do we have any  
23 additional public comments.

24  
25 OPERATOR: Yes, we have a question or  
26 comment from Michael, your line is open.

27  
28 MS. PITKA: Thank you. Go ahead,  
29 Michael.

30  
31 MR. ADAMS: Good afternoon, Madame  
32 Chair and the Board. Thank you for the chance to speak  
33 in favor of Proposal 20. I spoke about this yesterday  
34 but I know that since then the Board has heard  
35 testimony on lots of proposals so I hope you'll forgive  
36 me if I repeat some of the points that I mentioned  
37 before. Can everyone hear me okay.

38  
39 MS. PITKA: Yes, please go ahead.

40  
41 MR. ADAMS: Okay, thank you. I'd like  
42 to start by pointing out that the OSM findings do  
43 support this proposal and that this proposal was also  
44 initially supported as written by the Southcentral RAC  
45 with the majority of votes in favor to one against.

46  
47 After being modified by the RAC, the  
48 RAC -- or excuse me, after being modified the RAC seems  
49 to have voted on three proposals all at once, not  
50

0164

1 taking up Proposal 20 individually. They voted five  
2 votes in favor to four against with two abstentions and  
3 the modification effectively killed Proposal 20, which  
4 the RAC had already voted strongly in favor of. So  
5 although this resulted in a RAC recommendation against  
6 the proposal, I think that this shows that the RAC was  
7 not strongly or unanimously opposed to it. In fact, it  
8 appears that they didn't vote on this proposal on its  
9 own and their votes were for support of three proposals  
10 together. It just came out that this ended up being  
11 opposed so I just don't see that as a very clear  
12 position against the proposal by the RAC.

13

14 I can tell you that from my own  
15 personal experience, Cooper Landing community members  
16 do have a history of traveling to Unit 15C to harvest  
17 game, including moose, shellfish, ocean fish and gather  
18 products from the Forest, and this is supported by the  
19 OSM conclusion.

20

21 You know we'd all like to provide food  
22 from the land close as possible to home. The nature of  
23 subsistence has always required people to travel to  
24 areas of greater abundance and Cooper Landing residents  
25 have and do travel to Unit 15C to hunt and gather just  
26 as Ninilchik residents travel to Cooper Landing to  
27 harvest salmon, and we also travel to Kasilof and  
28 Ninilchik and Deep Creek and Anchor River and Homer and  
29 other areas of the Peninsula to hunt and to gather.  
30 And I can tell you that myself and many of my neighbors  
31 in Cooper Landing do travel to those areas to put up  
32 food under existing regulations. Wildlife populations  
33 fluctuate over time and regional subsistence users  
34 should be allowed to exercise their time honored  
35 practice of traveling within the region to feed  
36 themselves and the community members by utilizing the  
37 areas of populations of greater abundance in accordance  
38 with their customary and traditional practices. And  
39 there does seem to be consensus on this point  
40 demonstrated by the OSM findings and their statement  
41 justifying support.

42

43 I also agree with the OSM that the data  
44 does show proof of use. I also don't think the data  
45 tells the whole story. I think there's probably more  
46 moose hunting -- well, I'm sure there's probably more  
47 moose hunting in Unit 15C by Cooper Landing residents  
48 than is reflected in the data. I also think that many  
49 hunters hunting on a State harvest ticket might hunt  
50

0165

1 several different areas and it's possible that not all  
2 areas hunted are reported when those hunts are not  
3 successful. I also feel that the lack of a subsistence  
4 priority for Cooper Landing residents has contributed  
5 to lower participation in sections of Unit 15C and that  
6 additional community members would like to participate,  
7 especially during the late season hunt, if given the  
8 opportunity. And I've personally known several people  
9 who travel to Tustumena Lake to hunt for moose and  
10 under current regulations we have the opportunity for  
11 subsistence moose harvest on one side of the lake and  
12 not the other.

13

14 As I mentioned yesterday, I wrote this  
15 proposal as a result of multiple conversations with  
16 Cooper Landing community members and I can attest that  
17 many subsistence users on Cooper Landing do support the  
18 proposal. I'd also like to point out that Cooper  
19 Landing is a small community and many community members  
20 are older and do not hunt for themselves anymore so  
21 even one moose harvest is significant and can provide  
22 meat for several community members.

23

24 Furthermore, a decision to not support  
25 a C&T determination in this case seems out of balance.  
26 In the past the Board has approved proposals to allow  
27 subsistence harvest of fish and wildlife resources in  
28 Unit 7 by residents of Unit 15C sometimes despite very  
29 strong opposition from Cooper Landing community  
30 members. The case in point is the subsistence dipnet  
31 fishery at the Russian River Falls. Unit 7 is in a  
32 period of historical low moose abundance and non-  
33 subsistence hunters from other areas besides the Kenai  
34 Peninsula seem to be hunting here more often. This  
35 proposal will create opportunity for subsistence  
36 harvest for community members that might not otherwise  
37 have that opportunity, particularly in the late season  
38 hunt when fewer hunters are on the landscape  
39 encouraging greater subsistence community  
40 participation. I believe this proposal will restore  
41 some balance of the sharing of resources between  
42 communities on the Kenai Peninsula and that Board  
43 support for this proposal would show fairness to both  
44 communities in Unit 7, and 15C.

45

46 And, once, again, thank you to the  
47 Board for your time and for the chance to speak today.

48

49 MS. PITKA: Thank you, very much for

50

0166

1 your comment. Do we have any additional public  
2 comments, Operator.

3

4 OPERATOR: No further comments over the  
5 phone at this time. As a reminder press, star, one to  
6 ask your question or comment.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 MS. PITKA: Okay. Then.....

11

12 OPERATOR: No questions or comments  
13 over the phone at this time.

14

15 MS. PITKA: Oh, sorry, go ahead.

16

17 OPERATOR: No questions or comments  
18 over the phone.

19

20 MS. PITKA: Oh, there are none, okay.  
21 At this time I'd like to ask the Regional Advisory  
22 Council recommendation.....

23

24 MS. STICKWAN: The Council on  
25 reconsideration.....

26

27 MS. PITKA: .....Southcentral.....

28

29 MS. STICKWAN: .....supported WP22-20,  
30 25(a), 27 with modification to include only those lands  
31 within Unit 7, 15A and 15B. Initially the Council  
32 supported all proposals but then realized that  
33 reconsideration was necessary to address an  
34 inconsistency between the Council C&T recommendation  
35 for Moose Pass and those for moose -- for Cooper  
36 Landing. As with the decision on Moose Pass C&T and  
37 WP22-16 plus it provides resources needed by Cooper  
38 Landing subsistence users. The Council supported  
39 granting C&T for Cooper Landing in Units 7, 15A and 15B  
40 but felt that the data showing proof of use did not  
41 support granting C&T in Unit 15C. The Council found  
42 that the combination of these proposals were a little  
43 confusing but did eventually support WP22-20, 25(a)/27  
44 to include only those lands in Unit 7, 15A and 15B.  
45 The vote passed 5/4 with two abstentions.

46

47 Thank you.

48

49 MS. PITKA: Thank you. And I believe

50

0167

1 Chairman Christianson's back on the line so please take  
2 it away.

3

4 (Pause)

5

6 MS. PITKA: Okay, maybe he's not online  
7 again. Okay, so just to clarify, Gloria, the  
8 Southcentral Regional Advisory Council supported.....

9

10 OPERATOR: Mr. Christianson is on the  
11 line.

12

13 MS. PITKA: .....WP22-20; is that  
14 correct?

15

16 MS. STICKWAN: I would like you to have  
17 DeAnna Perry answer that question, she's online.

18

19 MS. PITKA: Oh, okay. Because in our  
20 Board book it says opposed so I just want to make sure  
21 that we're clear on that.

22

23 MS. PERRY: Madame Chair, this is  
24 DeAnna Perry, Council Coordinator for the  
25 Southcentral.....

26

27 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: They were  
28 having problems with my line being muted so.....

29

30 MS. PERRY: .....Council.....

31

32 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: .....I  
33 appreciate everybody -- Rhonda, picking up on this  
34 proposal. So DeAnna, you have the floor.

35

36 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I  
37 could clarify that, Rhonda. When these proposals came  
38 before the Southcentral Council, they came combined,  
39 20, 25(a) and 27. When the Council gave its  
40 recommendation, it supported that group of proposals  
41 with modification to include only those lands in 7, 15A  
42 and 15B. So in a sense it actually opposed 20 because  
43 20 only addresses Unit 15C. Does that help?

44

45 MS. PITKA: Yes, thank you, I  
46 appreciate that.

47

48 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
49 other questions from the Board.

50

0168

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: All right, thank you, hearing none, where does that put us on the agenda, Sue.

MS. DETWILER: Next would be tribal corporation comments, ANCSA Corporation comments.

MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the Board. This is Robbin LaVine standing in for Tribal Liaison Orville Lind. There were no comments or recommendations during the consultation.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Robbin. Next will be State Liaison.

MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the record ADF&G is neutral when it comes to the eligibility to participate in Federal subsistence hunting opportunities. I will say, though, that we do encourage that additional subsistence harvest and use research for Kenai Peninsula residents be conducted to provide adequate data when assessing subsistence harvest needs before any C&T use determinations are made.

Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions for the State.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll go on to the InterAgency Staff Committee recommendation.

MS. LAVINE: Yes, hello again Mr. Chair, this is Robbin LaVine. For Wildlife Proposal 22-20 the InterAgency Staff Committee provided the standard comment. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Open up the floor for discussion or a Board motion.

(No comments)

0169

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No discussion,  
2 the floor is open for a motion.

3  
4 MS. BOARIO: Mr. Chair (indiscernible -  
5 breaking up)

6  
7 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Somebody's  
8 breaking up there, the floor is open for a motion.

9  
10 MS. BOARIO: Mr. Chair.

11  
12 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have  
13 the floor.

14  
15 MS. BOARIO: Mr. Chair.

16  
17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Whoever's  
18 trying to be recognized keeps breaking up.

19  
20 (No comments)

21  
22 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Sue, can you  
23 hear me on this one?

24  
25 MS. DETWILER: Yes, I can hear you and  
26 I can also hear whoever is trying to speak is breaking  
27 up.

28  
29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, so I  
30 believe this is the time for Board action and somebody  
31 is trying to be recognized at this time but -- I'll  
32 call again for a Board motion on this.

33  
34 MS. DETWILER: Mr. Chair, I believe it  
35 might be Sara Boario trying to call in.

36  
37 (No comments)

38  
39 MS. DETWILER: Okay. So, yes, I  
40 understand Sara Boario is trying to ask a question but  
41 she can't get through. So we need to figure out a way  
42 to get her question asked and so -- so that she can  
43 hear the answer so if someone.....

44  
45 OPERATOR: If she.....

46  
47 MS. DETWILER: .....could forward that  
48 question we'll.....

49  
50

0170

1 OPERATOR: .....would.....

2

3 MS. DETWILER: .....get it out on the  
4 floor.

5

6 (No comments)

7

8 MS. DETWILER: Mr. Chair, may I read  
9 the question I'm seeing it on my screen here?

10

11 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, please,  
12 Sue, do.

13

14 MS. DETWILER: Okay. The question is  
15 from Board Member Sara Boario, Fish and Wildlife  
16 Service. The question is Mr. William with Ninilchik  
17 Traditional Council related the data that was included  
18 in the analysis for the decisionmaking of the eight  
19 factors that show use patterns, can OSM respond to Mr.  
20 Williams with respect to the data used in the analysis,  
21 and that is question one.

22

23 I can read that question again while  
24 folks are pulling their thoughts together on this one.

25

26 MS. VOORHEES: Sue, this.....

27

28 Mr. Williams with NTC -- I'm sorry, was  
29 somebody trying to interject there.

30

31 MS. VOORHEES: Sue, this is Hannah and  
32 I am looking forward to responding but I'm not sure I  
33 understand the question completely and was hoping that  
34 maybe Member Boario could clarify what she's looking  
35 for.

36

37 Thank you.

38

39 (Pause)

40

41 MS. DETWILER: I also see a message  
42 that Member Boario is also trying to join in on a  
43 different phone now so maybe that connection will be  
44 better. So maybe there was -- maybe there was another  
45 Board question or comments in the interim if somebody  
46 wanted to jump in.

47

48 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, the floor  
49 is open for Board deliberation or discussion as we're

50

0171

1 waiting for Sara.

2

3 MS. VOORHEES: Through the Chair, this  
4 is Hannah again.

5

6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the  
7 floor, Hannah.

8

9 MS. VOORHEES: Thank you. So I will try  
10 to just give an overview of the data that we use when  
11 making -- when doing analysis for C&T determinations.

12

13 The primary data source that we'll go  
14 to are subsistence surveys that are conducted by ADF&G.  
15 Those are surveys conducted approximately every 10  
16 years for communities, in which we -- is separate from  
17 harvest reporting. House -- very high percentage of  
18 households in a community are surveyed and from that  
19 data we are able to see -- we're able to develop a good  
20 sense of what the overall harvest patterns are for a  
21 community, what percentage of households might attempt  
22 to harvest and actually harvest a particular species  
23 and what percent is using and sharing species. Those  
24 surveys often also include key informant interviews  
25 that might give us a picture of long-term use for  
26 resources in that community. Traditional means of  
27 harvest and preserving, patterns of seasonal harvest et  
28 cetera. And I can list the eight factors but I don't  
29 want to necessarily belabor the point. But another  
30 feature of those surveys is that we often get search  
31 and use areas for a particular species, so there's maps  
32 data that shows, you know, within a certain time span  
33 where people have looked for species and have harvested  
34 a species, and that's not considered exhaustive but it  
35 is -- it is very useful for this kind of an analysis.

36

37 I'm happy to answer further if that  
38 hasn't hit the nail on the head.

39

40 Thank you.

41

42 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for  
43 that discussion. I believe Sara's on now as well.

44

45 MS. BOARIO: Yes, Mr. Chair, and,  
46 Hannah my apologies for the technical difficulties on  
47 my end. I think I heard some of your answer. I  
48 apologize Hannah, Mr. Chair, I have another question  
49 maybe that will be a little clearer, if I may.

50

0172

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the  
2 floor, Sara.

3  
4 MS. BOARIO: I understand in 2014 the  
5 Board voted down something similar due to lack of  
6 information and testimony and I was wondering if there  
7 is new information from that time, and maybe Hannah you  
8 already answered that but I didn't catch all of it if  
9 you did.

10  
11 MS. VOORHEES: Through the Chair.  
12 Thank you, Member Boario. And so the primary  
13 subsistence survey that was used in this analysis dates  
14 to 1991. It -- well, that was when the study year was  
15 and there hasn't been any significant new data since  
16 2014. There's, I believe one more year of data on  
17 harvest reported from the State in 15C but other than  
18 that, no, no new significant data.

19  
20 Thank you.

21  
22 MS. BOARIO: Thank you.

23  
24 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other Board  
25 questions or discussion.

26  
27 (No comments)

28  
29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll open up  
30 the floor for Board action.

31  
32 MS. BOARIO: Mr. Chair, Fish and  
33 Wildlife Service.

34  
35 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have  
36 the floor.

37  
38 MS. BOARIO: I move to adopt Proposal  
39 22-20. Following a second I will explain why I oppose  
40 the motion -- my motion.

41  
42 MR. BROWER: Second. Public Member  
43 Brower.

44  
45 MS. BOARIO: Thank you. I recog -- am  
46 I still there, I apologize.

47  
48 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you're  
49 still on.

50

0173

1 MS. BOARIO: Yes. I recognize that the  
2 Board has a history of inclusiveness on C&T proposals  
3 and the OSM analysis does show a history of use for  
4 residents in 15C for Cooper Landing and deference  
5 provided from the RAC, the Southcentral RAC citing  
6 insufficient evidence, and while new significant data  
7 would be useful, we would want to provide -- or, excuse  
8 me -- and the lack of insufficient evidence -- or new  
9 information since the last vote.

10

11 And I oppose.

12

13 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The floor is  
14 open for discussion, comments, questions from the  
15 Board.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the  
20 question.

21

22 MR. BROWER: Question.

23

24 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been  
25 called. Sue, do you want to do a roll call on this  
26 one, please.

27

28 MS. DETWILER: Yes. The motion is to  
29 adopt WP22-20. I will start out with the maker of the  
30 motion. Sara Boario, Fish and Wildlife Service.

31

32 MS. BOARIO: No.

33

34 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

35

36 Sarah Creachbaum, National Park  
37 Service.

38

39 MS. CREACHBAUM: Yes.

40

41 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

42

43 Gene Peltola, BIA.

44

45 MR. CHEN: Hello, Sue, this is Glenn  
46 Chen. And Mr. Peltola has asked me to sit in for him  
47 for this vote.

48

49 MS. DETWILER: Okay.

50

0174

1 MR. CHEN: The BIA votes to oppose this  
2 motion for the reasons articulated by Board Member --  
3 from the Fish and Wildlife Service. Thank you.

4  
5 MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Glenn.

6  
7 Thomas Heinlein, BLM.

8  
9 MR. HEINLEIN: Yes, adopt.

10  
11 MS. DETWILER: Okay.

12  
13 Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

14  
15 MR. SCHMID: The Forest Service will  
16 oppose the motion as with the justification provided by  
17 the Fish and Wildlife Service.

18  
19 MS. DETWILER: Okay. Thank you.

20  
21 Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

22  
23 MS. PITKA: I oppose based on the  
24 justification by the Fish and Wildlife Service. Thank  
25 you.

26  
27 MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Rhonda.

28  
29 Public Member Charlie Brower.

30  
31 MR. BROWER: I oppose for the same  
32 reason. Thank you.

33  
34 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

35  
36 And, finally, Chair Christianson.

37  
38 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I oppose as  
39 stated.

40  
41 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. So the  
42 motion fails six to -- or fails, two yea's, and six  
43 no's.

44  
45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue.  
46 We'll go ahead and -- I'll just call on you to call on  
47 the Staff for the next proposal. Thank you.

48  
49 MS. DETWILER: And that would be

50

0175

1 Wildlife Proposal 22-25(b) and I'm not sure who's --  
2 that would be Brian Ubelaker would be presenting that  
3 one.

4

5 MR. UBELAKER: Correct. Hello. Good  
6 afternoon, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. For the  
7 record my name is Brian Ubelaker, I'm a Wildlife  
8 Biologist with the Office of Subsistence Management. I  
9 will be presenting the summary of the analysis for  
10 Wildlife Proposal 22-25(b), which was submitted by  
11 Michael Adams of Cooper Landing and WP22-26(b) which  
12 was submitted by Lisa Slepetski of Moose Pass. The  
13 analysis begins on Page 5 -- I mean 958 of your meeting  
14 books.

15

16 Both of these proposals requested a  
17 Federal subsistence sheep season be established in Unit  
18 7. Proposal WP22-26(b) asks for just that, and while  
19 Proposal WP22-25(b) specifically requests establishing  
20 a season of August 10th through September 20th with a  
21 harvest limit of one dall sheep and that the Kenai  
22 National Wildlife Refuge Manager be delegated authority  
23 to open and close the season in consultation with ADF&G  
24 and the Chair of the Southcentral Alaska Subsistence  
25 Regional Advisory Council.

26

27 The proponent state these changes are  
28 needed to provide Federal subsistence opportunity to  
29 harvest sheep in Unit 7 and that there is a history of  
30 sheep harvest by rural residents of Unit 7. The  
31 proponents further state that the requested change  
32 would provide opportunity for rural residents of Unit 7  
33 to engage in subsistence sheep hunting and provide a  
34 meaningful subsistence priority.

35

36 Historically, sheep hunting has  
37 occurred on the Kenai Peninsula for as long as it has  
38 been inhabited, however, sheep hunting was closed in  
39 1942 due to a conservation concern. Since then, sheep  
40 hunting has changed little to the recognized  
41 regulations of today. In 1959 a three-quarter curl  
42 harvest limit was established. Then in 1964 the season  
43 was extended and a 7/8ths curl harvest limit was  
44 established. In 1989 the harvest limit was changed to  
45 a full-curl. Sheep populations had recovered enough by  
46 2016 for the Board of Game to establish a non-resident  
47 and a youth only hunt. No Federal sheep hunts existed  
48 on the Kenai Peninsula prior to 2020 when WP20-24  
49 established a Federal sheep hunt in Unit 15 for  
50

1 residents of Ninilchik.

2

3

4 The Kenai Peninsula sheep population  
5 experienced a sharp decline in the early 20th century.  
6 The population then increased through 1968 to 2,190  
7 individuals before declining to 1,600 sheep in 1992.  
8 There has been an estimated population decline of 80  
9 percent since the 1960s. The 2011 to 2020 population  
10 estimate on the Kenai Peninsula ranged from 379 to 644  
11 individuals. As of 2015 the sub-population estimates  
12 for the Kenai Peninsula -- excuse me -- as of 2015 the  
13 sub-population estimates were 163 for the Kenai  
14 National Wildlife Refuge, 165 for the Resurrection  
15 Trail sub-population, 77 to the Grant Lake sub-  
16 population and 50 for the Cooper Mountain and Crescent  
17 Lake sub-populations. It is not believed that harvest  
18 is limiting the population but rather results of  
19 climate change and habitat loss.

19

20 As stated before, historically, there  
21 has never been a Federal sheep hunt in Unit 7.  
22 Federally-qualified subsistence users have had to  
23 compete with sport hunters for a limited number of  
24 State sheep permits which currently total nine. A  
25 full-curl management plan has been in place since 1989.  
26 Average harvest from 2010 to 2019 is 3.9 sheep, while  
27 from 2000 to 2009 the average was 6.9 sheep. Since  
28 2000 the number of sheep hunters on the Kenai  
29 Peninsula has decreased by roughly half. Reported  
30 harvest over the last 10 years is broken down to 10.2  
31 percent non-resident harvest, 15.7 percent rural  
32 resident, and 74.1 percent non-rural resident.

33

34 Other alternatives considered included  
35 setting a harvest limit of three-quarter curl horn or  
36 greater by Federal drawing permit and another was to  
37 delegate authority to an in-season manager who would  
38 set harvest limits, sex restrictions and quotas.

39

40 If this proposal is adopted the  
41 established Federal sheep hunt would provide additional  
42 opportunity to Federally-qualified subsistence users.  
43 However, declining sheep populations are susceptible to  
44 overharvest if not managed carefully, therefore,  
45 Federal drawing permits should be established within  
46 the harvest framework used by the State. In-season  
47 management should be delegated to the Seward District  
48 Ranger to set harvest quotas, number of permits, and  
49 any needed permit conditions.

50

0177

1                   The OSM conclusion is to support WP22-  
2 25(b) with modification to establish a Federal drawing  
3 permit hunt for sheep in Unit 7 with a harvest limit of  
4 one ram with full-curl horn or larger and to delegate  
5 authority to the Seward District Ranger of the Chugach  
6 National Forest and to take no action on WP22-26(b).

7

8                   That concludes my summary. I would be  
9 happy to answer any questions anyone might have.

10

11                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
12 questions.

13

14                   (No comments)

15

16                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: If not we'll  
17 move on to summary of public comments.

18

19                   MR. UBELAKER: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair,  
20 was that somebody trying to ask a question or just  
21 background noise?

22

23                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: That was me  
24 saying the floor was open for questions and if there  
25 was none we could move on to summary of public  
26 comments.

27

28                   MR. UBELAKER: Okay. Brian Ubelaker,  
29 OSM. The only submitted written comment was one letter  
30 in opposition and that letter came from the Kenai  
31 Chapter of the Safari Club International. They were  
32 opposed because they do not support any rural  
33 determinations or subsistence priorities for the road-  
34 connected Kenai Peninsula.

35

36                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
37 Appreciate that. We'll move on to open up the lines  
38 for any public who wants to comment on this proposal.  
39 Thank you, Operator.

40

41                   OPERATOR: Yes, sir. If you would like  
42 to make a public comment please press, star followed by  
43 one. Please make sure that your phone is unmuted and  
44 record your name when prompted. Thank you.

45

46                   (Pause)

47

48                   OPERATOR: The first comment comes from  
49 Michael, your line is open.

50

0178

1 MR. ADAMS: Thank you. I'd like to  
2 once again thank the Board for the opportunity to  
3 provide testimony. I'm testifying in support of  
4 Proposal 25(b). I strongly support a subsistence  
5 priority on sheep in Unit 7 for the Cooper Landing  
6 community. However, in consideration of the current  
7 sheep population in Unit 7 I think it is appropriate to  
8 modify the proposal. While I do not feel that the  
9 modified language provides for a subsistence priority,  
10 it does provide for a subsistence opportunity. I  
11 believe a three-quarter curl regulation would provide a  
12 subsistence priority and would support that  
13 modification instead but I understand the current  
14 conservation concerns for sheep and I trust the  
15 discretion of the Board. I believe that any  
16 subsistence hunt should take into account the  
17 conservation of the sheep population and harvest  
18 opportunity should err on the side of caution so that  
19 opportunity will continue to exist in the future.

20  
21 I would fully expect that delegating  
22 authority to manage this hunt in such a manner as to  
23 protect the resource for future generations while  
24 providing opportunity when possible. And I hope the  
25 Board will be very conscious of the language adopted so  
26 that the manager will have the ability to manage the  
27 hunt with a conservation priority including the ability  
28 to cancel or close the hunt if necessary.

29  
30 If the Board, at their discretion,  
31 decides to wait until a future cycle to establish a  
32 subsistence season in light of current population  
33 concerns I would also support that decision. However,  
34 I believe that if the population is considered healthy  
35 enough for a State season to occur, a subsistence  
36 opportunity should also exist.

37  
38 Thank you.

39  
40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

41  
42 OPERATOR: There are no other.....

43  
44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any questions.

45  
46 (Teleconference interference -  
47 participants not muted)

48  
49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other

50

0179

1 public to comment on the line, Operator. Thank you for  
2 calling in Mike.

3

4 OPERATOR: No, sir, there is not. No  
5 other public comment at this time.

6

7 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
8 Operator. We'll go ahead and move on to the tribal  
9 consultation. Native Liaison.

10

11 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
12 This is Robbin LaVine standing in for Tribal Liaison  
13 Orville Lind. There were no comments or  
14 recommendations during the consultation. Thank you,  
15 Mr. Chair.

16

17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
18 Robbin. Moving on to the ISC recommendation -- or RAC  
19 Chair -- sorry, sorry, RAC -- Regional Advisory  
20 Council.

21

22 MS. STICKWAN: The Council supported it  
23 with OSM modification of one ram with full-curl horn or  
24 larger by Federal drawing permit and to provide for  
25 delegated authority. The Council believes that a  
26 Federal drawing permit is warranted because of the  
27 significant interest of hunting sheep in Unit 7. There  
28 are a few permits given by the State and under ANILCA a  
29 priority needs to be extended to the Federal  
30 subsistence user. With the declines in sheep  
31 population in recent years, establishing a preference  
32 for rural residents to meet their subsistence needs and  
33 delegating authority to a manger to protect the sheep  
34 populations will provide a priority and additional  
35 opportunity for Federally-qualified subsistence users.

36

37 Thank you.

38

39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
40 questions from the Board.

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,  
45 we'll move on to the InterAgency Staff Committee  
46 recommendation.

47

48 MS. LAVINE: Mr. Chair, this is Robbin.  
49 Did we miss State Liaison response -- thank you, Mr.

50

0180

1 Chair.

2

3

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, we did.  
4 Sorry about that, Mr. Mulligan. State Liaison. I'm  
5 operating off memory today so sorry -- my computer just  
6 crashed on me -- sorry.

7

8

MR. MULLIGAN: No worries, Mr. Chair.  
9 If you don't mind, did we miss -- oh, never mind, we  
10 did get the RAC, my apologies, I'm going off of memory  
11 myself. So for the record, the Alaska Department of  
12 Fish and Game opposes this proposal.

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

Any additional harvest jeopardizes the  
population of dall sheep in the area. If a Federal  
season is established, current harvest restrictions  
only one ram, full-curl horn ram with both horns broken  
or a ram at least eight years old as determined by  
counting annual horn rings should be maintained.  
Harvest should only be allowed in areas where a  
harvestable surplus is available as indicated by an  
open State season. Allowing Federally-qualified users  
to hunt within boundaries of closed areas could lead to  
these hunts never again being opened under a State  
permit system and would disrupt the current State  
management system.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
questions for the State.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,  
hearing none, we'll move on. Thank you.

MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For  
the record, again, this is Robbin LaVine, Policy  
Coordinator and InterAgency Staff Committee Chair. For  
Wildlife Proposal 22-25(b) and 26(b), the InterAgency  
Staff Committee provided the standard comment.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
Robbin. Appreciate that. That opens up the floor for  
Board discussion, deliberation.

0181

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The floor is  
4 open for Board action.

5

6 MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chair, the Forest  
7 Service.

8

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

11

12 MR. SCHMID: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I  
13 move to adopt WP22-25(b)/26(b) as modified by OSM to  
14 establish a Federal drawing permit hunt for sheep in  
15 Unit 7 with a harvest limit of one ram with full-curl  
16 horn or larger and delegate authority to the Seward  
17 District Ranger of the Chugach National Forest to close  
18 the season, set the harvest quota and number of permits  
19 to be issued and any needed permit conditions via  
20 delegation of authority letter. Following a second I  
21 will explain why I support my motion.

22

23 MS. BOARIO: Second.

24

25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
26 There's a motion that's been made and seconded, the  
27 floor is open for discussion.

28

29 MR. SCHMID: Yeah, thank you, Mr.  
30 Chair. My justification is based on the analysis by  
31 OSM as modified and the comments given by the  
32 Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory  
33 Council. Currently there is no Federal subsistence  
34 season for sheep in Unit 7 and Federally-qualified  
35 subsistence users must rely on the limited number of  
36 State drawing permits in Unit 7 or use a harvest ticket  
37 in Unit 7 remainder in order to harvest sheep.  
38 Establishing a Federal sheep season in Unit 7 would  
39 provide additional opportunity for Federally-qualified  
40 subsistence users consistent with Section .804 of the  
41 Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act which  
42 calls for a priority consumptive use of fish and  
43 wildlife populations by rural Alaska residents. In  
44 addition, delegating authority to the Seward District  
45 Ranger of the Chugach National Forest to open and close  
46 the season, set harvest quota, determine the number of  
47 permits to be issued and any needed permit conditions  
48 would be the most efficient way to implement the  
49 proposed Federal sheep season.

50

0182

1 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
4 Dave. The floor is open for discussion, questions.

5

6 (No comments)

7

8 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the  
9 question.

10

11 MR. SCHMID: Question.

12

13 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,  
14 question's been called. We'll go ahead and do roll  
15 call on this one, Sue. Thank you.

16

17 MS. DETWILER: Okay, will do. The  
18 motion is to adopt as -- as modified by OSM. Start  
19 with Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

20

21 MR. SCHMID: Yes, thanks. I support the  
22 motion that I -- with the justification I just  
23 provided.

24

25 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

26

27 Thomas Heinlein, BLM.

28

29 MR. HEINLEIN: BLM supports.

30

31 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

32

33 BIA, Glenn or Gene.

34

35 MR. CHEN: Yes, Sue, this is Glenn Chen  
36 from BIA. I'll be casting the vote for Regional  
37 Director Gene Peltola. And the BIA votes to support  
38 the Forest Service motion which also concurs with the  
39 recommendation from the Southcentral Regional Advisory  
40 Council. Thank you.

41

42 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

43

44 Sara Boario, Fish and Wildlife Service.

45

46 MS. BOARIO: The Fish and Wildlife  
47 Service supports.

48

49 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

50

0183

1 Sarah Creachbaum, Park Service.

2

3 MS. CREACHBAUM: National Park Service  
4 supports.

5

6 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

7

8 Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

9

10 MS. PITKA: I support in deference to  
11 the Regional Advisory Council. Thank you.

12

13 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

14

15 Public Member Charlie Brower.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 MS. DETWILER: May be on mute or trying  
20 to get back in.

21

22 Chair Anthony Christianson.

23

24 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, I support.

25

26 MS. DETWILER: Charlie Brower, did you  
27 come back on.

28

29 MR. BROWER: Yeah, I'm back on, I had  
30 to step out real quick.

31

32 MS. DETWILER: Okay. We are taking a  
33 vote on WP22-25(b)/26(b) and the motion to adopt as  
34 modified by OSM has been made and all seven members who  
35 have voted so far have voted in favor of the proposal.  
36 So yours is the last vote Mr. Brower.

37

38 MR. BROWER: I support.

39

40 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you. So the  
41 motion passes unanimously. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

42

43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue.  
44 We'll go ahead and call on Staff to move on to the next  
45 proposal.

46

47 MS. DETWILER: That would be WP22-28  
48 and 29 and that would be Mr. Ubelaker, I believe,  
49 presenting that.

50

1 MR. UBELAKER: Yes, good afternoon  
2 again. Mr. Chair. Members of the Board. For the  
3 record, my name is Brian Ubelaker and I am a Wildlife  
4 Biologist with OSM. I will be presenting a summary for  
5 the analysis of Wildlife Proposal WP22-28, which was  
6 submitted by Michael Adams of Cooper Landing and WP22-  
7 29, which was submitted by Seth Wilson of Glennallen.  
8 And this analysis begins on Page 983 of your meeting  
9 books.

10  
11 Both of these proposals request to  
12 extend the length of the length of the moose season in  
13 Unit 7 remainder from September 20th to September 25th.  
14 The proponent state the Federal subsistence season  
15 should not be more restrictive than the State season,  
16 which currently closes five days later than the Federal  
17 season and that this proposal would allow more  
18 opportunity for participation by Federally-qualified  
19 subsistence users.

20  
21 Relevant regulatory history includes a  
22 Board of Game adoption in 2015 where the moose season  
23 was shortened and shifted to later, from August 20th  
24 through September 20th to September 1st through  
25 September 25th. This caused the season closing dates  
26 between Federal and State regulations to be misaligned.  
27 Then in 2018 the Board of Game established a 50-inch  
28 plus or three or more brow tine harvest limit.

29  
30 A unit-wide survey and population  
31 estimate has never been conducted in Unit 7 but the  
32 population trend has decidedly declining and has been  
33 since the '70s. The most recent trend count conducted  
34 in Unit 7 has a bull to cow ratio of 25 to 100, which  
35 is within ADF&G's management objective. Moose harvest  
36 in Unit 7 has been declining since 2000 with the  
37 average harvest from 2015 to 2019 being 20 moose per  
38 year.

39  
40 Another alternative to consider was  
41 suggested by the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge. It  
42 stated that since the current Federal season is longer  
43 than the State season, the season opener should be  
44 shifted from August 10th to August 20th but still  
45 maintain the proposed close date of September 25th.  
46 While this would shorten the overall Federal season by  
47 five days, it would move it closer to when the rut  
48 occurs which should allow for hunter success more like  
49 current levels, plus Federally-qualified subsistence  
50

0185

1 users would still be able to hunt without State  
2 competition for 12 days at the beginning of the season.

3  
4 Adopting the proposal and extending the  
5 season would allow Federally-qualified subsistence  
6 users greater access to the resource. It would also  
7 allow for the alignment of Federal and State seasons.

8  
9 Therefore, it is OSM's conclusion to  
10 support Proposal WP22-28 and to take no action on WP22-  
11 29.

12  
13 That is the end of my summary. If  
14 anybody has any questions I would be happy to answer  
15 them.

16  
17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
18 questions for Staff.

19  
20 (No comments)

21  
22 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
23 We'll go ahead and move on to any public comment.  
24 Thank you.

25  
26 OPERATOR: If you.....

27  
28 MR. UBELAKER: Yes, Mr. Chair, Brian  
29 Ubelaker once again. There was one letter submitted in  
30 opposition to this proposal and it also came from the  
31 Kenai Chapter of Safari Club International who were  
32 opposed because they do not support any rural  
33 determinations or subsistence priorities for the road-  
34 connected Kenai Peninsula.

35  
36 Thank you.

37  
38 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
39 Operator, at this time if there's anybody who would  
40 like to be recognized online this is time for public  
41 comment online.

42  
43 Thank you.

44  
45 OPERATOR: Thank you, sir. If you  
46 would like to make a public comment, again, that's  
47 star, one. Please unmute your phone and record your  
48 name when prompted. Thank you.

49  
50

0186

1 (Pause)

2

3 OPERATOR: First public comment comes  
4 from Michael, your line is open.

5

6 MR. ADAMS: Thank you. I'm speaking in  
7 support of Proposals 28 and 30. These proposals seek  
8 to provide additional opportunity for subsistence moose  
9 hunting in Unit 7 and 15.

10

11 We just heard, I guess, the existing  
12 regulation compared to the proposed regulation. I,  
13 personally, support both proposals as written and  
14 believe that this will provide a meaningful subsistence  
15 priority. The amended proposals will eliminate the  
16 first 10 days of the existing subsistence season.  
17 While I would prefer the proposals to pass as  
18 originally written, I do think that the amended  
19 proposals do increase the opportunity in comparison to  
20 the existing regulation.

21

22 In addition to my personal position on  
23 these proposals I've also been asked to read the  
24 following statement on behalf of the Cooper Landing  
25 Fish and Game Advisory Committee. Would it be all  
26 right if I read the proposals for both -- or excuse me,  
27 the comment for both proposals, Proposal 28 and 30 now  
28 or would it be more appropriate for me to call back for  
29 the comment period on Proposal 30?

30

31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

32

33 MR. ADAMS: I was asking a question to  
34 the Board if that's all right. I was wondering if it  
35 would be more appropriate to read the Fish and Game  
36 Advisory Committee for Proposal 30 separately or would  
37 it be all right to read the statement for Proposal 28  
38 and 30 right now.

39

40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Well, if you  
41 plan on coming back -- they're all pertinent -- I mean  
42 if you -- if you're going to come back and do it then,  
43 or do it now, they're all related.

44

45 MR. ADAMS: Okay. So on behalf of the  
46 Cooper Landing Fish and Game Advisory Committee I've  
47 been asked to read the following statement.

48

49 The Cooper Landing Fish and Game

50

0187

1 Advisory Committee unanimously supports Proposal --  
2 WP20-28 [sic] as amended by the Southcentral Regional  
3 Advisory Council to include the following language:  
4 With modification of season dates as August 20 to  
5 September 25th.

6

7

8 And the Cooper Landing Fish and Game  
9 Advisory Committee unanimously supports Proposal WP20-  
10 30 [sic] as amended by the Southcentral Regional  
11 Advisory Council to include the following language:  
12 With modification of season dates of August 20th to  
13 September 25th.

13

14

Thank you.

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

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
Thank you for calling in. Operator, are there any  
other public online who would like to be recognized at  
this time.

OPERATOR: Not at this time, sir.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
That concludes the public testimony part of this.  
We'll next call on our tribal, ANCSA Corporation  
consultation.

MS. DETWILER: Mr. Chair, actually I  
think it would be RAC recommendations before the  
tribal.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, sorry,  
about that Sue. Yeah, I'm just -- the sun's shining  
down here so it keeps making my head jump ahead.  
Sorry.

MS. DETWILER: All right.

MS. STICKWAN: Council supported with  
modification of season as August 20 to September 25th.  
The Council believes this proposal as modified provides  
a priority to Federally-qualified subsistence users by  
having an extended hunting season. Although this would  
result in 10 days eliminated from the beginning of the  
season from August 10th to August 20th there would  
still be ample opportunity for subsistence users  
harvest before the State opens. Addition of extra days  
towards the end of the season during prime hunting time  
with cooler temperatures is better for subsistence

0188

1 users having harvesting -- users harvesting meat.

2

3 Thank you.

4

5 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
6 questions for the Regional Advisory Council.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none  
11 we'll move on to the tribal consultation.

12

13 MS. LAVINE: Hello, Mr. Chair. Members  
14 of the Board. This is Robbin LaVine and I have been  
15 standing in for Tribal Liaison Orville Lind. I believe  
16 Orville has rejoined us, Orville are you on the line.

17

18 MR. LIND: Yes, Robbin, I'm on now.  
19 Thank you.

20

21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Welcome back,  
22 Orville, you have the floor.

23

24 MR. LIND: And this is for  
25 Proposal.....

26

27 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 28/29.

28

29 MR. LIND: Okay. 28/29. We had no  
30 comments or recommendation on that proposal. Thank  
31 you, Mr. Chair.

32

33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
34 Orville. And then we'll move to the next on, State  
35 Liaison.

36

37 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
38 For the record, ADF&G opposes this proposal this  
39 proposal as Federal subsistence regulations already  
40 provide a significant advantage for Federally-qualified  
41 users over non-Federally-qualified users. Federal  
42 subsistence regulations in GMU 7 provide for an extra  
43 17 days on the front end of the season already and so  
44 we feel that that's enough of a priority already within  
45 the existing regulations.

46

47 Thank you.

48

49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

50

0189

1 Moving on to InterAgency Staff Committee comments.

2

3 MS. LAVINE: Yes, hello, Mr. Chair.

4 This is Robbin LaVine. For Wildlife Proposal 22-28 and  
5 29, the InterAgency Staff Committee provided the  
6 standard comment. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

7

8 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

9 We'll open the floor now for Board discussion,  
10 deliberation.

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The floor is  
15 open for Board action.

16

17 MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chair, Forest Service.

18

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

21

22 MR. SCHMID: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I  
23 move to adopt WP22-28/29 as modified by the  
24 Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory  
25 Council to shift the moose hunting season in Unit 7  
26 remainder to August 20th through September 25th.  
27 Following a second I will explain why I support my  
28 motion.

29

30 MR. BROWER: Second, Public Member  
31 Brower.

32

33 MR. SCHMID: Thank you, Charlie. My  
34 justification is based on the comments and modification  
35 by the Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional  
36 Advisory Council. Recently moose harvest in Unit 7 has  
37 decreased during the early part of the season because  
38 of warming climatic conditions that make meat spoilage  
39 more likely. Extending the shifting moose season in  
40 Unit 7 remainder until later in the fall will continue  
41 to provide for a subsistence priority and at the same  
42 time enable harvest when the weather is more suitable  
43 for preservation of the meat.

44

45 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

46

47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
48 Dave. The floor is open for discussion, comments.

49

50

0190

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the

4 question.

5

6 MS. CREACHBAUM: Question.

7

8 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

9 Question's been called. We'll go ahead and do roll  
10 call, again, on this Sue. Thank you.

11

12 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you. The  
13 motion is to adopt WP22-28 and 29 as modified by the  
14 Southcentral Regional Advisory Council. Start with the  
15 maker of the motion, Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

16

17 MR. SCHMID: Thank you. The Forest  
18 Service supports in deference to the RAC and with the  
19 justification I provided.

20

21 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

22

23 Thomas Heinlein, BLM.

24

25 MR. HEINLEIN: BLM supports as modified  
26 by and in deference to the RAC.

27

28 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. BIA, Glenn,  
29 on behalf of Gene.

30

31 MR. CHEN: Yes, the BIA votes to  
32 support as modified by the Regional Advisory Council  
33 and as articulated by Mr. Schmid from the Forest  
34 Service. Thank you.

35

36 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

37

38 Sara Boario.

39

40 MS. BOARIO: Fish and Wildlife Service  
41 supports.

42

43 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

44

45 Sarah Creachbaum.

46

47 MS. CREACHBAUM: National Park Service  
48 supports.

49

50

0191

1 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

2

3 Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

4

5 MS. PITKA: I support in deference to  
6 the Regional Advisory Council and as articulated by the  
7 Forest Service. Thank you.

8

9 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

10

11 Public Member Charlie Brower.

12

13 MR. BROWER: Support as stated.

14

15 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

16

17 Chair Christianson.

18

19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support, as  
20 stated.

21

22 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Motion  
23 passes unanimously.

24

25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue.  
26 And we'll go ahead and take a 10 minute break until  
27 3:00 o'clock. A 10 minute break. I thank everybody --  
28 so, yeah, we'll make it a brief one but 10 minute  
29 break. Thank you.

30

31 (Off record)

32

33 (On record)

34

35 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Welcome back.  
36 Sue, we'll go ahead and just make sure we have a quorum  
37 whenever you're ready. Thank you.

38

39 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you. I  
40 understand we have everybody in listening mode and in  
41 the speakers room on the line listening now so I just  
42 want to confirm with the court reporter that we're now  
43 on the record.

44

45 REPORTER: I am, go ahead.

46

47 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you. I'll  
48 do a quick roll call.

49

50

0192

1 Sarah Creachbaum, Park Service.

2

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

4

5 MS. DETWILER: Great.

6

7 Tom Heinlein, BLM.

8

9 MR. HEINLEIN: Present.

10

11 MS. DETWILER: Sara Boario, Fish and  
12 Wildlife Service.

13

14 MS. BOARIO: Present.

15

16 MS. DETWILER: Dave Schmid, Forest  
17 Service.

18

19 MR. SCHMID: I'm here, Sue.

20

21 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

22

23 BIA, Glenn or Gene.

24

25 MR. CHEN: Yes, so this is Glenn Chen.  
26 I'll continue to represent Gene this afternoon. Thank  
27 you.

28

29 MS. DETWILER: Okay. All right, thank  
30 you.

31

32 Public Member Pitka.

33

34 MS. PITKA: I am here.

35

36 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

37

38 Public Member Charlie Brower.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 MS. DETWILER: And Chair Anthony  
43 Christianson I heard you on, so it looks like you have  
44 seven of eight members online right now.

45

46 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue.  
47 We'll go ahead and get started with the next proposal.  
48 Thank you.

49

50

0193

1 MS. DETWILER: Okay. That will be  
2 Wildlife Proposal WP22-30 and 31 and that will be Brian  
3 Ubelaker.

4  
5 MR. UBELAKER: Thank you, Sue. Good  
6 afternoon, again, Mr. Chair and members of the Board.  
7 For the record, Brian Ubelaker, Wildlife Biologist with  
8 OSM. I'll be presenting you a summary of the analysis  
9 for Wildlife Proposal WP22-30 which was submitted by  
10 Michael Adams of Cooper Landing and WP22-31, which was  
11 submitted by Chugach Regional Resources Commission.  
12 This analysis begins on Page 994 in your meeting books.

13  
14 These proposals request to extend the  
15 length of the moose hunting season in Unit 15 from  
16 September 20th to September 25th. The proponents state  
17 the Federal subsistence season should not be more  
18 restrictive than the State hunting season which is  
19 currently open five days later than the Federal season  
20 and would allow for more opportunity for participation  
21 by Federally-qualified subsistence users.

22  
23 In 2014, establishment by the Federal  
24 Subsistence Board of a cow moose hunt in Unit 15C. In  
25 2015 the Board of Game aligned all Federal moose  
26 seasons in Unit 15 to September 1st through the 25th  
27 with the harvest limit of 50-inch plus or four or more  
28 brow tines. They also established a non-resident  
29 general season in Unit 15C at this time. Then in 2019  
30 the Board of Game changed harvest limits to 50-inch  
31 plus or three or more brow tines. They also  
32 established a general season hunt in 15B and a resident  
33 any bull draw permit at the same time.

34  
35 Federal management objectives for the  
36 moose population in Unit 15 include in sub-Unit 15A to  
37 maintain a post-hunting bull/cow ratio of 25 to 100.  
38 In sub-Unit 15B west to maintain a bull/cow ratio of 20  
39 to 25 to 100 for maximum hunting opportunity. In 15B  
40 east to maintain a bull to cow ratio of 40 to 100 for  
41 maximum harvest of large antlered bulls. And in 15C to  
42 maintain a bull to cow ratio of 20 to 25 to 100 for a  
43 healthy productive population.

44  
45 Units 15A and C were under intensive  
46 management from 2012 to 2017 when the population  
47 objective in Unit 15A at that time was 3,000 to 3,500  
48 with a sustainable harvest of 180 to 350 animals. Unit  
49 15C's population objective was the same at 3,500 but  
50

0194

1 with a harvest goal of 200 to 350. In Unit 15A bull to  
2 cow ratios have been above State management objectives  
3 since 2012 but for the same timeframe population  
4 estimates have been below management objectives. In  
5 Unit 15B there's been no population census since 2001  
6 but all metrics indicate the population is increasing.  
7 Unit 15C has a bull to cow ratio at or above the  
8 management objective and has been since 2002.

9  
10 Moose harvest in Unit 15 has been  
11 increasing since harvest restrictions were lifted for  
12 2013. Federal harvest has averaged 12 moose per year  
13 over the last five years which equates to 4.4 percent  
14 of the total harvest. Since the establishment of the  
15 cow hunt in 2014 cows have averaged 27.2 percent of the  
16 Federal harvest.

17  
18 Another alternative considered was the  
19 same as for the last proposal, WP22-28 and 29. It was  
20 put forth by the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge and  
21 they suggested to shift the start date from August 10th  
22 to August 20th but to maintain the proposed end date of  
23 September 25th which would shorten the season by five  
24 days but would move the hunt closer to the rut and  
25 Federally-qualified subsistence users would still have  
26 12 days at the beginning of the season to hunt without  
27 competition from sport hunters.

28  
29 If this proposal were to be adopted,  
30 the resulting extension of moose season would allow  
31 more Federally-qualified subsistence users greater  
32 access to the resource. It would also align Federal  
33 and State closing dates.

34  
35 Therefore, OSM's conclusion is to  
36 support Proposal WP22-30 and take no action on WP22-31.

37  
38 Thank you. And I would be happy to  
39 answer any questions anyone may have.

40  
41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
42 questions from the Board.

43  
44 (No comments)

45  
46 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for  
47 that. Now we'll take any public comment that you may  
48 have received. Thank you.

49  
50

0195

1 MR. UBELAKER: Yes, Mr. Chair. There  
2 was one letter submitted in opposition to this  
3 proposal, the same as for the last. It was from the  
4 Kenai Chapter of Safari Club International and they  
5 were opposed because they do not support any rural  
6 determinations or subsistence priorities for the road-  
7 connected Kenai Peninsula.

8  
9 Thank you.

10  
11 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, very  
12 much. And with that we'll open it up to the public  
13 online, Operator, if anybody online would like to be  
14 recognized at this time it's their time to speak.

15  
16 OPERATOR: Thank you. If you would  
17 like to make a public comment please press, star, one.  
18 One moment please.

19  
20 (Pause)

21  
22 OPERATOR: We do have a public comment  
23 from Darrel, your line is open.

24  
25 MR. WILLIAMS: Hi everyone. Mr.  
26 Chairman. Members of the Board. My name is Darrel  
27 Williams with Ninilchik Traditional Council. We oppose  
28 this proposal for a lot of the same reasons that we  
29 opposed Wildlife Proposal 22-20. And there's also a  
30 little bit of a problem because if we didn't approve  
31 the C&T for 15C for Cooper Landing, it would be really  
32 difficult to be able to approve a bag limit in 15C with  
33 Proposal 22-30. And our concerns are the same reasons  
34 I stated before and just for the sake of saving some  
35 time for everyone I'd just like to refer to the  
36 comments made earlier.

37  
38 I will say that the analysis in this  
39 proposal looks like it's aggregated. Where we're  
40 talking about Units 15A, B and C, other than just Unit  
41 15C, which is the large part of the discussion that we  
42 had on Wildlife Proposal WP22-20.

43  
44 So with that said we oppose the  
45 proposal. Thank you.

46  
47 OPERATOR: Once again.....

48  
49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

50

0196

1 OPERATOR: .....to make a public.....

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Anyone else

4 Operator.

5

6 OPERATOR: .....please press star, one.

7 I'm showing no further public comment.

8

9 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,  
10 thank you. We'll move on to the tribal consultation  
11 process.

12

13 MR. LIND: Mr. Chair, I think.....

14

15 MS. DETWILER: Actually.....

16

17 MR. LIND: .....it's Regional Advisory  
18 Council recommendations.

19

20 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, yes it is,  
21 thank you, Orville. Regional Advisory Council  
22 recommendation.

23

24 MS. STICKWAN: Council supported with  
25 modification of seasons as August 20 to September 25th.  
26 The Council voted to align the same season in -- to  
27 Unit 15 that it previously recommended for Unit 7 for  
28 the same reasons, to provide a preference to the  
29 subsistence user. Adding hunting opportunities during  
30 a time when temperatures are better for meat  
31 preservation. Climate change in recent years is a  
32 factor in considering extensions of seasons to  
33 accommodate users of the resource.

34

35 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
36 questions for the RAC.

37

38 (No comments)

39

40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,  
41 we'll move on. Orville, Tribal Native Liaison.

42

43 MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
44 Federal Subsistence Board members. Orville Lind,  
45 Native Liaison. During the consultation period we had  
46 no comments or recommendation on that proposal. Thank  
47 you, Mr. Chair.

48

49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,

50

0197

1 Orville. We'll move on to the State Liaison.

2

3 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
4 For the record, Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
5 opposes this proposal as Federal subsistence  
6 regulations already provide a significant advantage for  
7 Federally-qualified users over non-Federally-qualified  
8 users. Federal subsistence regulations for Federally-  
9 qualified users in GMU 15 are currently less  
10 restrictive than State hunting regulations. The  
11 hunting season for Federally-qualified users in GMU 15  
12 begin 22 days before the general State season and 12  
13 days before the bull only season for 15A and B.  
14 Additionally, Federally-qualified users have a late  
15 season that runs from October 20th to November 10th for  
16 an additional 22 days, which means that Federally-  
17 qualified users currently have over a month of  
18 additional time to hunt moose not available to non-  
19 Federally-qualified users under the State's hunting  
20 season. Federally-qualified users also have a more  
21 relaxed bag limit as they're able to harvest a fork  
22 antlered bull or a cow during the first portion of the  
23 season and a fork bull during the late season in  
24 addition animals available for harvest under State  
25 regulations.

26

27 Thank you, sir.

28

29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
30 questions for the State.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,  
35 InterAgency Staff Committee recommendation.

36

37 MS. LAVINE: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair.  
38 This is Robbin LaVine. For Wildlife Proposal 22-30/31  
39 the InterAgency Staff Committee provided the standard  
40 comment. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

41

42 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
43 Robbin. That opens up the floor for Board discussion  
44 or deliberation.

45

46 (No comments)

47

48 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,  
49 that opens the floor for Board action on this proposal.

50

0198

1 MS. BOARIO: Mr. Chair, Fish and  
2 Wildlife Service.

3  
4 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you.....

5  
6 MS. BOARIO: I move to adopt Wildlife  
7 Proposal 22-30 as modified by the Southcentral Alaska  
8 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council to shift the  
9 moose hunting season in Unit 15 to August 20th to  
10 September 25th to align with the Unit 7 season and to  
11 take no action on Wildlife Proposal 22-31. Following a  
12 second I will explain why I support my motion.

13  
14 MR. BROWER: Second.

15  
16 MS. BOARIO: My justification is based  
17 on the comments given by the Southcentral Alaska  
18 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council and the OSM  
19 analysis. Recently moose harvest in Unit 15 has  
20 decreased during the early part of the season because  
21 of warming climate conditions that makes meat spoilage  
22 more likely. Extending and shifting the moose hunting  
23 season in Unit 15 until later in the fall will continue  
24 to provide for a subsistence priority and at the same  
25 time enable harvest when the weather is more suitable  
26 for preservation of meat. In addition, aligning Unit  
27 15 moose season with the Unit 7 season will create less  
28 user confusion.

29  
30 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

31  
32 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
33 further Board discussion, deliberation.

34  
35 (No comments)

36  
37 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,  
38 we'll call for the question.

39  
40 MR. SCHMID: Question.

41  
42 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been  
43 called. Roll call, please, Sue.

44  
45 MS. DETWILER: Yes. The motion is to  
46 adopt WP22-30 and 31 as modified by the Southcentral  
47 Council. And I'll start with the maker of the motion.

48  
49 Sara Boario, Fish and Wildlife Service.

50

0199

1 MS. BOARIO: Fish and Wildlife Service  
2 supports.

3  
4 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

5  
6 Gene -- sorry, BIA, Glenn Chen.

7  
8 MR. CHEN: Yes, Sue, the BIA votes to  
9 support with the modification provided by the  
10 Southcentral Regional Advisory Council and for the  
11 reasons articulated by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

12  
13 Thank you.

14  
15 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

16  
17 BLM, Tom Heinlein.

18  
19 MR. HEINLEIN: BLM supports.

20  
21 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

22  
23 Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

24  
25 MR. SCHMID: Yeah, the Forest Service  
26 supports the proposal as modified by the Southeast --  
27 I'm sorry, Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional  
28 Advisory Council and with the justification provided by  
29 Fish and Wildlife Service.

30  
31 Thanks.

32  
33 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

34  
35 Park Service, Sarah Creachbaum.

36  
37 MS. CREACHBAUM: National Park Service  
38 supports as modified.

39  
40 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

41  
42 Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

43  
44 MS. PITKA: Hi. I support as modified  
45 and as articulated. Thank you.

46  
47 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

48  
49 Public Member Charlie Brower.

50

0200

1 MR. BROWER: I support.

2

3 MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Charlie.

4

5 Chair Christianson.

6

7 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support as  
8 specified.

9

10 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. And the  
11 motion passes unanimously, Mr. Chair.

12

13 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue.  
14 We'll go ahead and move on to the next wildlife  
15 proposal and the Staff. Thank you.

16

17 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. That would  
18 be WP22-35 and that would be Tom Plank presenting that  
19 one.

20

21 (Pause)

22

23 MS. KENNER: Hello, Sue, this is Pippa  
24 Kenner with OSM. I think we are on WP22-36, am I  
25 correct.

26

27 MS. DETWILER: I have 22-35.

28

29 MS. KENNER: Okay, great, thank you.  
30 When there was nobody coming on I thought maybe it was  
31 -- thank you very much.

32

33 MS. DETWILER: Yeah, I think the  
34 presenter for this one is Tom Plank and he may be  
35 having trouble getting on but maybe Lisa Grediagin  
36 knows what the situation is.

37

38 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, through the.....

39

40 MS. DETWILER: So maybe -- go ahead,  
41 Lisa.

42

43 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, through the  
44 Chair, this is Lisa Grediagin. And Tom is trying to  
45 unmute his phone. Yeah, I just got a message he's  
46 going to call back in. Yeah, and others are saying  
47 they're having -- and I think that happened to Pippa  
48 earlier too, where she had to call back in to get off  
49 of mute. So, Mr. Chair, if you're able to just give  
50

0201

1 him a couple minutes to call back in.

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You bet Lisa.  
4 I got stuck in another room too, thank everyone for  
5 their patience today. It's valuable that we get all  
6 the insight. Thank you.

7

8 (Pause)

9

10 OPERATOR: Mr. Plank, your line is  
11 open.

12

13 MR. PLANK: Thank you. Hi, this is Tom  
14 Plank, can you hear me now?

15

16 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Tom, we  
17 can hear you loud and clear, you have the floor.

18

19 MR. PLANK: I do apologize for that.  
20 So I'll go ahead and get started here. Hello, Mr.  
21 Chair, and members of the Board. My name is Tom Plank  
22 and I am a Wildlife Biologist in the Office of  
23 Subsistence Management. I will be presenting a summary  
24 of the analysis for Wildlife Proposal WP22-35 submitted  
25 by Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission requesting to  
26 establish a may be announced season in Unit 11 with a  
27 harvest limit of one bull by Federal permit in an .804  
28 analysis. And this begins on Page 1012 in your books.

29

30 The proponent states their  
31 understanding is that recent scientific research and  
32 assessment has determined that the Mentasta Caribou  
33 Herd population has stabilized at a lower level than  
34 that envisioned by the now outdated Mentasta Caribou  
35 Herd Management Plan as necessary in order to resume  
36 subsistence caribou hunting opportunities in Unit 11.  
37 The proponent further states that understanding --  
38 their understanding is that Nelchina bull caribou  
39 collared data demonstrates that the Nelchina bulls  
40 frequent the Mentasta Herd such that a bulls only  
41 caribou hunt during times that the Nelchina Herd is  
42 present in Unit 11 would not affect the biological  
43 status of the Mentasta Caribou Herd since a distinct  
44 Mentasta cow caribou would not be open to hunting.

45

46 The proponent would like to resume the  
47 continued subsistence use of caribou in Unit 11 within  
48 the Ahtna Traditional Use Territory. Note that this  
49 analysis only considers the establishment of a season

50

1 and a harvest limit. The .804 analysis may be  
2 conducted at a later time if a caribou hunt is open in  
3 Unit 11.

4  
5                   There has not been a Federal season for  
6 caribou hunting in Unit 11 for most of the last three  
7 decades and have been few proposals to establish one.  
8 In 1993 a proposal was adopted by the Federal  
9 Subsistence Board to close Federal public lands to  
10 caribou hunting in Unit 11. The combination of low  
11 caribou numbers and low recruitments were direct  
12 indicators of a continuing conservation concern which  
13 warranted protection of the small Mentasta Caribou Herd  
14 population under ANILCA, Section .815, Section (3). In  
15 1996 the Federal Subsistence Board adopted a proposal  
16 with modification to reopen the caribou season with a  
17 total quota of 15 bulls only to residents of the seven  
18 communities identified consistent with the requirements  
19 of ANILCA Section .804. Based on the objectives of the  
20 Mentasta Caribou Herd Cooperative Management Plan being  
21 met for calf production and recruitment of the Mentasta  
22 Caribou Herd despite a declining population. In 1998  
23 the Federal Subsistence Board adopted a proposal  
24 requesting to close all caribou hunting within Unit 11  
25 due to the calf recruitment being below the management  
26 objective.

27  
28                   Caribou in Unit 11 have been part of  
29 the Nelchina Caribou Herd or Mentasta Caribou Herd as  
30 these ranges of these herds overlap as you can see on  
31 Map 2 on Page 1018. These two herds are considered  
32 distinct herds because females calve in separate areas  
33 although the herds mix during some breeding seasons.  
34 The Nelchina Caribou Herd calving grounds and summer  
35 range lie within Unit 13, the Mentasta Caribou Herd and  
36 the primary herd within Unit 11 calves and summers  
37 within the Upper Copper River Basin and the northern  
38 and western flanks of the Wrangell Mountains within the  
39 Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve. The  
40 Mentasta Caribou Herd declined from an estimated around  
41 3,200 caribou in 1987 to an estimated 495 caribou in  
42 2021 as you can see on Table 2 on Page 1022. The fall  
43 population estimate in 2020 was almost 1,200 caribou,  
44 however, the increase from 2019 is not explained by  
45 calf production the previous year but may be due, in  
46 part, to the Nelchina Caribou returning late from the  
47 winter grounds or may have failed to migrate back to  
48 the traditional calving grounds. The number of caribou  
49 observed during the 2021 Mentasta Caribou Herd survey  
50

1 dropped back down to levels observed in 2019. The  
2 Mentasta Caribou Herd population has remained stable at  
3 relatively low levels since 2004 as evidenced by low  
4 calf survival. The bull/cow ratio, total bulls  
5 observed as fluctuated between 1987 and 2021 which is  
6 also on Table 2 on Page 1022. While Nelchina bulls  
7 have wintered within the range of the Mentasta Herd  
8 there is limited ability to predict the extent or  
9 frequency of mixing between the Nelchina and Mentasta  
10 bulls and is impossible to discern whether the harvest  
11 of a bull would be from either herd.

12

13                   The Nelchina Herd is a popular herd to  
14 hunt and experiences heavy harvest pressure due to its  
15 road accessibility and proximity to Fairbanks and  
16 Anchorage. Over 95 percent of the Nelchina Caribou  
17 Herd harvest occurs in Unit 13, and between 2001 and  
18 2019 harvest from the Nelchina Caribou Herd under State  
19 regulations has averaged around ,2300 caribou a year.  
20 Federal regulations for Units 12 and 13 combined  
21 averages 421 caribou per year. Harvest for the  
22 Mentasta Caribou Herd in the 1996 and '97 season was  
23 one caribou with 15 permits issued and in the 1997 and  
24 '98 season 12 permits were issued by not harvest was  
25 reported for caribou.

26

27                   There has been no reported harvest for  
28 the Mentasta Caribou Herd since 1998 as there has been  
29 no State or Federal season for caribou in Unit 11,  
30 however, some incidental harvest of Mentasta caribou  
31 may take place during winter hunts targeting the  
32 Nelchina Caribou Herd and areas of herd overlap in the  
33 adjacent units.

34

35                   If this proposal is adopted the  
36 additional harvest is unlikely to have a biological  
37 affect on the Nelchina Caribou Herd, however, impacts  
38 to the Mentasta Caribou Herd are a conservation concern  
39 and deters from the principles in the Mentasta Caribou  
40 Herd Management Plan. The Mentasta Caribou Herd has  
41 fallen short of any metric that would support opening a  
42 season for the past 25 years. Current low population  
43 numbers are indicative of poor recruitment and low  
44 survival rates among cohorts within the population and  
45 an increased opportunity for incidental harvest could  
46 further exacerbate a decline of population as currently  
47 of conservation concern. If this proposal is adopted  
48 it would allow a harvest of caribou when the Nelchina  
49 Caribou Herd migrates through Unit 11 providing  
50

50

0204

1 increased subsistence hunting opportunities. Based on  
2 participation and harvest of Federally-qualified  
3 subsistence users from 1996 to 1998 when a very limited  
4 open Federal caribou season occurred in Unit 11,  
5 harvest from a Unit 11 caribou hunt may be expected to  
6 be very low, however, if the Nelchina caribou are  
7 easily accessible along the Nabesna Road hunting  
8 efforts and harvest could be higher than was  
9 experienced in 1996 and 1998.

10

11 The OSM's conclusion is to support  
12 Proposal WP22-35 with modification to delegate  
13 authority to the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and  
14 Preserve Superintendent to announce season dates,  
15 harvest quotas, and number of permits to be issued, to  
16 define harvest areas and to open and close a season via  
17 delegation of authority letter only. Timing of this  
18 migration differs from year to year and the number of  
19 Nelchina bulls that mix with the Mentasta Caribou Herd  
20 within Unit 11 also varies year to year. The Wrangell-  
21 St.Elias National Park and Preserve superintendent  
22 would have the needed data to make these announcements  
23 year to year as timing and numbers vary.

24

25 Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the  
26 Board. I'd be happy to field any questions.

27

28 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
29 questions from the Board.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,  
34 hearing none, moving on to any public comment received.

35

36 MR. PLANK: This is Tom Plank with OSM.  
37 And there were no written public comments received.

38

39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Tom.  
40 We'll go ahead and move on, Operator, if anybody online  
41 that wants to be recognized at this time, it's their  
42 opportunity for the public comment period for this  
43 agenda item.

44

45 OPERATOR: Thank you. If you would  
46 like to make a public comment please press, star, one.  
47 One moment please.

48

49 (Pause)

50

0205

1 OPERATOR: We do have a public comment.

2

3 (Pause)

4

5 OPERATOR: Our comment comes from Karen  
6 Linnell, your line is open.

7

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

9 For the record my name is Karen Linnell, Executive  
10 Director for the Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission,  
11 which represents eight tribes and two ANCSA  
12 Corporations located within the Ahtna Traditional Use  
13 Territory.

14

15 AITRC submitted WP22-35 to restore at  
16 least some of the Federal subsistence hunting  
17 opportunity for caribou on Federal public lands in Game  
18 Management Unit 11. We've been unable to hunt caribou  
19 in Unit 11 since the '90s because of the Mentasta  
20 Caribou Herd size was in decline. The Mentasta Herd  
21 continues to be in a predator pit, such that the herd  
22 has stabilized at a much smaller size than originally  
23 desired within the management plan. AITRC requests  
24 involvement in a new planning process to revise this  
25 plan but in the meantime requests that limited Federal  
26 subsistence caribou hunting be allowed for bull caribou  
27 during times when the Nelchina Herd is present in Unit  
28 11.

29

30 Allowing a limited Federal hunt for  
31 those Federally-qualified users who are customarily and  
32 traditionally most dependent on resources in GMU 11 and  
33 the caribou there can sustainably be provided when  
34 Nelchina caribou are present in Unit 11 with bulls only  
35 limited hunt. We ask for a bulls only hunt as the  
36 Mentasta Herd is only genetically distinct through the  
37 mitochondri -- contrieal -- excuse me, let me say that  
38 again, mitochondrial DNA, which is passed from mother  
39 to offspring. Such take would be sustainable due to  
40 the high bull/cow ratio with a 10 year average of 82 to  
41 100 bulls observed in the Mentasta Herd.

42

43 AITRC has heard some concerns from the  
44 Alaska Department of Fish and Game about allowing take  
45 of Nelchina caribou in Unit 11 and given their stated  
46 desires to take the allowable harvest prior to the herd  
47 crossing the Richardson Highway and entering into GMU  
48 11 is no wonder they are opposed to this proposal.  
49 Alaska residents and Federally-qualified subsistence  
50

0206

1 users should not be prevented from opportunity to hunt  
2 Nelchina caribou in Unit 11 when they are present, in  
3 fact, ADF&G should not be attempting to take all of the  
4 harvestable surplus prior to the herd migrating into  
5 GMU 11. Allocation determinations among Alaska  
6 residents living within the range of the Nelchina Herd  
7 may need to be taken to the Board of Game to ensure  
8 reasonable opportunities for State subsistence uses are  
9 being provided to all Alaskan residents, however, that  
10 is a State of Alaska concern. The Federal Subsistence  
11 Board, the concern before the Federal Subsistence Board  
12 is whether Federal subsistence uses by Federally-  
13 qualified users of caribou in Units 11 and 12 are being  
14 provided for, if they're being provided a Federal  
15 priority by existing caribou allocations to the Federal  
16 Subsistence Management Program.

17  
18 AITRC supports the amendment proposed  
19 by OSM. And we look forward to the passage of this  
20 proposal and working with the in-season manager,  
21 Wrangell-St. Elias SRC, the RACs, OSM, and the Alaska  
22 Department of Fish and Game in partnership to restore  
23 some customary and traditional harvest, opportunities  
24 and to develop a revised Mentasta Caribou Management  
25 Plan to better restore the herd to abundance and ensure  
26 continuation of priority State subsistence uses and  
27 reasonable opportunities for State subsistence uses and  
28 other uses of caribou in Unit 11.

29  
30 Thank you, Mr. Chair. And I'll take  
31 any questions if you have any.

32  
33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
34 Karen. Any questions from the Board.

35  
36 (No comments)

37  
38 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Appreciate you  
39 taking the time to call in today, Karen.

40  
41 MS. LINNELL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

42  
43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Operator, is  
44 there anybody else online who would like to be  
45 recognized at this time.

46  
47 OPERATOR: I'm showing no further  
48 public comment.

49  
50

0207

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
2 Operator. We'll move on to Regional Advisory Council  
3 recommendations.

4  
5 MS. STICKWAN: Council supported with  
6 OSM modification to delegate authority to Wrangell-  
7 St.Elias Subsistence -- Wrangell-St. Elias  
8 superintendent to announce season dates, harvest  
9 quotas, number of permits, define harvest areas and  
10 open or close seasons via a delegation of authority  
11 letter only. The Council supported this proposal which  
12 would allow a may be announced season. This would have  
13 an opportunity for local people to get caribou and  
14 spread the hunt into Unit 11 which could possibly  
15 alleviate some of the hunting pressure in Unit 13.  
16 Delegation of authority to open and close the hunt  
17 helps conservation of Mentasta bulls because Mentasta  
18 and Nelchina Herds will be monitored and the in-season  
19 monitor open -- manager open or close the harvest based  
20 on when the Nelchina Herd is in the area. The  
21 opportunity benefits Federally-qualified subsistence  
22 users.

23  
24 (Pause)

25  
26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. Is there  
27 any other Regional Advisory Council members who would  
28 like to make a comment at this time.

29  
30 OPERATOR: This is the Operator, we did  
31 have another comment come in.

32  
33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. At this  
34 time we'll entertain the public comment, we'll  
35 recognize you, you have the floor.

36  
37 OPERATOR: Barbara Cellarius your line  
38 is open.

39  
40 MS. CELLARIUS: Thank you. Can you  
41 hear me?

42  
43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Barbara,  
44 you have the floor.

45  
46 MS. CELLARIUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
47 My name is Barbara Cellarius and I'm the Cultural  
48 Anthropologist for Wrangell-St.Elias National Park and  
49 Preserve but what I want to present to you is the  
50

0208

1 comments from the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence  
2 Resource Commission. And so the Wrangell-St.Elias  
3 National Park -- sorry, I'm sort of rushing here. The  
4 Commission advised -- the National -- Wrangell-St.Elias  
5 National Park on subsistence issues, it's a citizen's  
6 advisory committee.

7

8 And so the Wrangell-St.Elias National  
9 Park Subsistence Resource Commission supported WP22-36  
10 with the OSM modification plus an additional  
11 modification to establish a working group on the  
12 Mentasta Caribou Herd Management Plan with tribal  
13 involvement in the plan. The proposal would provide  
14 for subsistence opportunity when Nelchina are present  
15 in Unit 11. Considerable concern was expressed about  
16 potential harvest of Mentasta caribou and the  
17 delegation of authority to the superintendent would  
18 provide important tools for managing a hunt. Updating  
19 the management plan is similarly important for ensuring  
20 agreement on the consistent cooperative approach for  
21 management.

22

23 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

24

25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
26 questions from the Board for the public.

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for  
31 taking the time to call in today, Barbara. Any other  
32 Regional Advisory Councils wish to speak to this  
33 proposal.

34

35 MS. GREDIAGIN: Mr. Chair, this is Lisa  
36 Grediagin. The Eastern Interior Council also had a  
37 recommendation on this proposal and I think Sue  
38 Entsminger is on the call but is having trouble being  
39 heard.

40

41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, I'm not  
42 hearing her come through there Lisa. And if.....

43

44 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, perhaps the  
45 Council Coordinator could provide that recommendation  
46 then for the Eastern Interior Council.

47

48 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for  
49 that, yes, we'll hear from that Council Coordinator at

50

0209

1 this time. Thank you, Lisa.

2

3

(Pause)

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

MS. DETWILER: So this is Sue Detwiler. So that would be either Sue Entsminger, and if she can't join then Brooke McDavid, the Council Coordinator would have those comments.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, I think they're calling on Council Coordinator now, Sue, so thank you.

MS. MCDAVID: Mr. Chair, this is Brooke McDavid, Council Coordinator for the Eastern Interior RAC. I'm sorry, it appears that both myself and Sue Entsminger, the Chair, are having issues with our phone lines. I'll just give a shout out to Sue, Sue Entsminger, are you on the line.

MS. ENTSMINGER: I am on the line, can anyone hear me.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Sue, you have the floor, go ahead.

MS. ENTSMINGER: Okay, thank you. Yeah, Sue Entsminger, Eastern Interior RAC Chair. Our Council supports WP22-35 with the OSM modification, with additional modification to reinstate and update the Mentasta Caribou Management Plan.

The Council stated that passage of this proposal, as modified by OSM would be beneficial to subsistence users and additional modification recognizes the importance of updated caribou herd management plans for current and future subsistence needs.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue. Any questions from the Board for Sue.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, thank you Regional Advisory Council Chairs for sharing the position of your Board. We'll go ahead and move on to tribal liaison. Orville.

0210

1 MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
2 Again, Native Liaison for OSM. The consultations,  
3 there were no comments or recommendations made on WP22-  
4 35.

5  
6 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

7  
8 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
9 Orville. We'll go ahead and move on to the State  
10 liaison, Mr. Mulligan.

11  
12 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, sir. For the  
13 record, ADF&G opposes to what could amount to the  
14 harvest of animals from the Mentasta Herd at this time.  
15 Any additional Federal harvest from the Nelchina Herd  
16 should only be done by cooperative inter-agency  
17 agreements to ensure the sustainable harvest of  
18 Nelchina caribou is maintained. Unrestricted State  
19 harvest for two existing Federal hunts account for five  
20 to 34 percent of Nelchina harvest annually with a most  
21 recent annual five year average of 10 percent of total  
22 harvest. Federal harvest varies widely due to changes  
23 in migratory patterns, weather conditions, and hunter  
24 effort from year to year. Federal harvest for the  
25 existing two hunts is impossible to predict which makes  
26 Nelchina management and the goal of achieving, but not  
27 exceeding, harvestable surplus annually incredibly  
28 difficult. There are already existing hunts in place  
29 that allow for the take of any harvestable surplus  
30 associated with the Nelchina Herd and there's no  
31 harvestable surplus available for the Mentasta Herd.  
32 This hunt would unnecessarily complicate hunt  
33 administration, adding in an additional highly variable  
34 Federal harvest opportunity with no restrictions or  
35 framework for inter-agency coordination, would only add  
36 to the complexity and difficulty currently associated  
37 with co-management of this important subsistence  
38 resource.

39  
40 Harvest when Nelchina caribou are  
41 present in GMU 11 will require constant monitoring of  
42 the two herds to ensure Mentasta Herd collars are not  
43 present in the hunt area and may not be feasible in  
44 years when GMU 13 State and Federal subsistence  
45 opportunities have achieved available harvest before  
46 the herd migrates into GMU 11.

47  
48 Thank you, sir. Appreciate it.

49  
50

0211

1                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
2 questions for the State.

3  
4                   (No comments)

5  
6                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,  
7 thank you. We'll move on to the InterAgency Staff  
8 Committee recommendations.

9  
10                  MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair, this  
11 is Robbin LaVine. For this proposal the InterAgency  
12 Staff Committee provided the standard comment. Thank  
13 you.

14  
15                  CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
16 Robbin. We'll go ahead and move on to Board  
17 deliberation and discussion.

18  
19                  (No comments)

20  
21                  CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,  
22 the floor is open for Board action.

23  
24                  MS. CREACHBAUM: National Park Service.

25  
26                  CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Park  
27 Service you have the floor.

28  
29                  MS. CREACHBAUM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
30 I move to approve Wildlife Proposal 22-35 to establish  
31 a may be announced caribou season in Unit 11 with the  
32 OSM modification. And if I get a second, I'll explain  
33 why I intend to vote in support of my motion.

34  
35                  MR. PELTOLA: BIA seconds.

36  
37                  MR. BROWER: Second.

38  
39                  MS. CREACHBAUM: Thank you. Approval  
40 of Wildlife Proposal 22-35 would increase hunting  
41 opportunities for Federally-qualified subsistence users  
42 when the Nelchina Caribou Herd migrates through Unit  
43 11. My support for the proposal as modified by OSM is  
44 consistent with recommendations of the Southcentral and  
45 Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council and the  
46 Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission.  
47 Delegation of authority to the Wrangell-St. Elias  
48 superintendent to announce season dates, harvest  
49 quotas, and the number of permits to be issued, to  
50

0212

1 define harvest areas and to open and close the season  
2 would facilitate timely in-season management and ensure  
3 the long-term conservation of the Mentasta and Nelchina  
4 Caribou Herd.

5

6 Although updating the Mentasta Caribou  
7 Herd Management Plan is outside the scope of the  
8 proposal, Park Staff are aware of the need and the  
9 Eastern Interior RAC's request for updating the plan.  
10 Regional Office Staff will be available to support that  
11 effort when ongoing analysis, long-term monitoring data  
12 are complete and results can be used to inform the plan  
13 development.

14

15 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16

17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
18 Board discussion, questions, comments.

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the  
23 question.

24

25 MR. PELTOLA: BIA. Question.

26

27 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
28 We'll do roll call again on this, Sue, thank you.

29

30 MS. DETWILER: Okay. The motion is to  
31 adopt WP22-35 with the OSM modification. And I'll  
32 start with Sarah Creachbaum, National Park Service for  
33 her vote.

34

35 MS. CREACHBAUM: Thank you. The  
36 National Park Service supports Wildlife Proposal 22-35  
37 to establish a may be announced caribou season in Unit  
38 11 with the OSM modification.

39

40 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

41

42 Sara Boario, Fish and Wildlife Service.

43

44 MS. BOARIO: Fish and Wildlife Service  
45 supports.

46

47 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

48

49 Gene Peltola, BIA.

50

0213

1 MR. PELTOLA: BIA supports in deference  
2 to the Regional Advisory Councils and in addition to  
3 for the reasons articulated by National Park Service in  
4 their motion.

5  
6 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

7  
8 BLM, Tom Heinlein.

9  
10 MR. HEINLEIN: BLM supports.

11  
12 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

13  
14 Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

15  
16 MR. SCHMID: Yeah, the Forest Service  
17 supports in deference to the Southcentral and Eastern  
18 Interior RACs and as justified by the Park Service.  
19 Thank you.

20  
21 MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Dave.

22  
23 Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

24  
25 (No comments)

26  
27 MS. DETWILER: Rhonda may be having  
28 trouble getting into the speaking line.

29  
30 I'll move to Charlie Brower, Public  
31 Member.

32  
33 (Telephone interference)

34  
35 MR. BROWER: Support.

36  
37 MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Charlie.

38  
39 Rhonda, was that you?

40  
41 (No comments)

42  
43 MS. DETWILER: Chair Anthony.....

44  
45 MS. PITKA: Hi, can you hear me.

46  
47 MS. DETWILER: Yes. Yes, Rhonda.

48  
49 MS. PITKA: Oh, great. Okay, I support  
50

0214

1 in deference to the Regional Advisory Councils as  
2 modified by OSM. Thank you.

3

4 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you, Rhonda.

5

6 Finally, Chair Christianson.

7

8 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, I support.

9 Thank you.

10

11 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Motion  
12 passes unanimously.

13

14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, Sue.  
15 Thank you everyone for that one. We'll go ahead and  
16 move on to one more WP proposal today and I'll call on  
17 Sue to call on the next order and Staff. Thank you.

18

19 MS. DETWILER: Okay. This will be the  
20 last wildlife proposal for the Southcentral region,  
21 that is WP22-36 and that will be presented by Pippa.

22

23 MS. KENNER: Thanks, Sue. Now can you  
24 hear me?

25

26 MS. DETWILER: Yes.

27

28 MS. KENNER: Wonderful. Good  
29 afternoon, Mr. Chair, and members of the Federal  
30 Subsistence Board and Regional Advisory Council Chairs.  
31 The analysis for Wildlife Proposal WP22-36 is part of  
32 your supplemental meeting materials. I'll just stop a  
33 beat here and make sure you have that in front of you.

34

35 (Pause)

36

37 MS. KENNER: So my name is Pippa Kenner  
38 and I'm an Anthropologist at the Office of Subsistence  
39 Management in Anchorage. The topic of community  
40 harvest systems and alternative permitting systems in  
41 Federal regulations are the focus of this proposal.  
42 These systems are intended to provide some flexibility  
43 in harvest regulations to make legal the activities of  
44 super harvesters in rural communities. You're going to  
45 hear more about this during this short presentation.

46

47 Proposal WP22-36 was submitted by the  
48 Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission also known as  
49 AITRC and requests to codify temporary special actions

50

0215

1 that expire June 30th, 2022. These proposed changes  
2 are necessary to fully implement the AITRC community  
3 harvest system for caribou and moose in Units 11, 12,  
4 and 13. The regulations in this proposal are the  
5 result of extensive work by people at AITRC working  
6 with a group of people at Federal agencies.  
7 Specifically Proposal WP22-36 would codify existing  
8 temporary regulations by:

- 9
- 10 1. Allowing community members to opt  
11 out of this community harvest system thereby retaining  
12 their individual harvest limits.
- 13
- 14 2. Allowing designated hunters as part  
15 of the community harvest system.
- 16
- 17 3. Defining the geographic boundaries  
18 of eligible communities as the most recent census  
19 designated places established by the U.S. Census  
20 Bureau.
- 21
- 22 4. Specifying that harvest reporting  
23 will take the form of reports collected from hunters by  
24 AITRC and submitted directly to the land managers and  
25 the Office of Subsistence Management, which replaces  
26 the need for Federal registration permits, joint  
27 State/Federal registration permits or State harvest  
28 tickets.
- 29
- 30 5. Setting the harvest quota for the  
31 species in units authorized in the community harvest  
32 system as the sum of individual harvest limits for  
33 those opting to participate in the system and, finally:
- 34
- 35 6. Adding moose and caribou in Unit 12  
36 to the community harvest system.

37

38 The OSM preliminary conclusion that was  
39 presented to the Southcentral and Eastern Interior  
40 Alaska Councils was to support Proposal WP22-36 with  
41 modification to just clarify the regulatory language.  
42 However, at its fall 2022 meeting the Southcentral  
43 Alaska Council, at the request of AITRC, recommended a  
44 further modification which was to restrict the  
45 community harvest system in Unit 12 to that portion  
46 that lies within the Ahtna Traditional Use Territory  
47 instead of all Federal public lands in Unit 12.

48

49 Additionally, at its fall 2021 meeting,  
50

0216

1 the Eastern Interior Alaska Council tabled this  
2 proposal until its winter meeting that occurred last  
3 month in March 2022. The Eastern Interior Alaska  
4 Council requested OSM and AITRC develop language to  
5 further modify the proposal before the Council would  
6 make a recommendation. Specifically, the Council  
7 wanted a description of what lands in Unit 12 would be  
8 included in the Ahtna community harvest system and a  
9 description of any changes to the framework describing  
10 how the hunt is administered. In response, OSM added  
11 an addendum and presented it to the Eastern Interior  
12 Alaska Council at its winter meeting last month in  
13 March 2022. OSM writes an addendum when an OSM  
14 conclusion changes from the OSM preliminary conclusion  
15 that we presented to the Councils, and our conclusion  
16 has changed and I'll describe it to you now.

17

18 The addendum begins on Page 16 of the  
19 analysis.

20

21 So in response to recommendations made  
22 by the Councils at their fall 2021 meetings, the  
23 addendum recommends the Federal Subsistence Board  
24 support this proposal, WP22-36 with two additional  
25 substantial modifications.

26

27 1. Is to modify a provision in Units  
28 11, 12 and 13 so that participants in the community  
29 harvest system may not designate another individual to  
30 harvest on their behalf any species for which they have  
31 registered within the community harvest system but may  
32 serve as designated hunters as the proponent, AITRC,  
33 clarified was their intent at the Eastern Interior  
34 Alaska Council's meeting in fall 2021.

35

36 And, 2. To specify that the community  
37 harvest system in Unit 12 will be implemented only on  
38 Ahtna Traditional Use Territory in Unit 12, instead of  
39 all Federal public lands in Unit 12.

40

41 This modification was recommended by  
42 the Southcentral Alaska Council in response to AITRC's  
43 request at its fall 2021 meeting.

44

45 However, we have learned that area  
46 descriptors in codified Federal regulations should be  
47 geographic features identifiable on the landscape. And  
48 thus, the language in this addendum is OSM's best  
49 reflection of AITRC's intent. So this map is Figure 2  
50

0217

1 on Page 20 of the analysis. The map shows the Ahtna  
2 Traditional Use Territory in Unit 12 overlaid with the  
3 regulatory area described in the addendum. The Ahtna  
4 Traditional Use Territory is west of the thick blue  
5 line, the OSM proposed area is in diagonal striping or  
6 cross-hatching. So AITRC Staff reviewed this addendum  
7 with OSM Staff after the fall 2021 Council meeting  
8 cycle concluded and indicated that they concurred with  
9 this modification but that the Ahtna Traditional Use  
10 Territory could be better described.

11

12 Continuing with Council actions on this  
13 proposal, at its  
14 winter meeting last month, the Eastern Interior Alaska  
15 Council recommended a further modification. The  
16 Council recommended that the Tok River Bridge on the  
17 Tok Cutoff Road better reflects the northern boundary  
18 of the Ahtna Traditional Use Territory than what OSM  
19 proposed. So this is Figure 3 on Page 24 is a map  
20 showing this area in Unit 12 in green diagonal striping  
21 or cross-hatching, and it was recommended by the  
22 Eastern Interior Alaska Council. The Eastern Interior  
23 Alaska Council Chair will be presenting its  
24 recommendation to you after we hear public comments on  
25 this proposal.

26

27 So thank you, Mr. Chair. This is the  
28 end of my presentation and I will try to answer your  
29 questions.

30

31 (Pause)

32

33 MS. DETWILER: Mr. Chair, did you drop  
34 off the line?

35

36 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No, I'm on  
37 here. I was calling for the next agenda -- maybe I'm  
38 not getting picked up, or broken up here.

39

40 MS. DETWILER: Yeah, we're having  
41 troubles with the phone today. Pippa just finished  
42 giving the analysis and it was the time for any Board  
43 questions and if not then she could also give the  
44 summary of written public comments.

45

46 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, I was  
47 calling for public comment, thank you Sue.

48

49 MS. DETWILER: Okay.

50

0218

1 MS. KENNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For  
2 the record this is Pippa Kenner. No public -- written  
3 public comments were received for this proposal.

4  
5 Thank you.

6  
7 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

8  
9 (Teleconference interference -  
10 participants not muted)

11  
12 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. And  
13 now we'll go ahead and open up the line, Operator. If  
14 there's anyone, now is the time for public comment on  
15 this agenda item.

16  
17 Thank you.

18  
19 (Pause)

20  
21 OPERATOR: If you would like to make a  
22 public comment please press, star, one. One moment.

23  
24 (Pause)

25  
26 OPERATOR: Our first public comment  
27 comes from Barbara Cellarius, your line is open.

28  
29 MS. CELLARIUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
30 Again, it's Barbara Cellarius. I'm with Wrangell-  
31 St.Elias National Park and Preserve but presenting  
32 comments on behalf of the Wrangell-St.Elias National  
33 Park Subsistence Resource Commission.

34  
35 The Wrangell-St. Elias National Park  
36 Subsistence Resource Commission supported WP22-36 with  
37 the OSM modification plus an additional modification to  
38 limit the land in Unit 12 to that portion of Unit 12  
39 within the Ahtna Traditional Use Territory. The  
40 additional modification was represented by  
41 representatives of the Ahtna InterTribal Resource  
42 Commission.

43  
44 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

45  
46 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
47 Thank you for calling. Any other public online  
48 Operator.

49  
50

0219

1 OPERATOR: Yes, we do have another  
2 public comment from Karen Linnell, your line is open.

3  
4 MS. LINNELL: Thank you, Mr. Chair and  
5 members of the Board. In regards to the proposed  
6 changes made by Eastern Interior RAC, I think there was  
7 some misunderstanding. While we had agreed to the --  
8 the ending point ending at the Little Tok River where  
9 it meets the Tok Cutoff and the farthest north point in  
10 -- and then going to Noise Mountain, from there the  
11 rest of Unit 12 got left out and that includes all the  
12 hunting off of the Nabesna Road, and so we have a  
13 different descriptor that we would like to suggest, or  
14 include. It includes the recommendation from the  
15 Eastern Interior RAC for the lands along the Tok  
16 Cutoff, Federal public lands in Unit 12 within the Tok  
17 and Little Tok River drainages, south of the Tok River  
18 Bridge and east of the Tok Cutoff Road, and then from  
19 there where it intersects with the Wrangell-St.Elias  
20 boundary within the Ahtna Traditional Territory east of  
21 this boundary would extend based on existing Unit 12  
22 moose harvest area in Federal regulations -- currently  
23 in Federal regulations, specifically, following the  
24 lands -- the following lands would be included:

25  
26 That portion of Unit 12 within the  
27 Nabesna River drainage west of the east banks of the  
28 Nabesna River up stream from the southern boundary of  
29 the Tetlin National Wildlife Refuge, i.e., the Unit 12  
30 portion of the RM291 hunt area, and that portion of  
31 Unit 12 that is east of the Nabesna River and south of  
32 the Pickeral Lake Winter Trail running southeast from  
33 Pickeral Lake to the Canadian Border.

34  
35 I do want to stress and state that we  
36 have conducted weekly harvest reports although for this  
37 community harvest, however, since late October, early  
38 November there has not been any caribou within GMU 13  
39 or on Federal lands for any allowable harvest. This  
40 year as in several of the past years the caribou have  
41 not returned to Federal lands in Unit 13 for quite some  
42 time, and actually the snow this year is so deep that  
43 they haven't returned at all. They're still way back  
44 in the mountains from what I saw this last weekend and  
45 I was out on that Unit 12 section at the end of Nabesna  
46 Road this weekend. So I just want to stress that we --  
47 AITRC places great importance on Western science in  
48 addition to indigenous knowledge, and this includes  
49 accurate and timely harvest reporting.

50

0220

1                   But I have the language here and I  
2 worked with Barbara Cellarius with the Sub -- the  
3 Subsistence Coordinator at Wrangell-St.Elias to come up  
4 with this language to include those portions that were  
5 mistakenly left out at the Eastern Interior RAC  
6 meeting.

7  
8                   It's hard to see and make decisions on  
9 the maps that are provided by OSM when there are no  
10 landmarks on there, including the road or any of the  
11 river systems so that we can see it. All we have is a  
12 color swatch and it's very difficult to make decisions  
13 on that type of data. Had the Chair, Sue Entsminger,  
14 seen the Nabesna Road she would have known that people  
15 hunt in that area and it's just difficult to do and I  
16 would encourage OSM to provide better quality maps on  
17 this. And I would have hoped that OSM would have  
18 contacted AITRC with this modification that Eastern  
19 Interior RAC proposed, it would have been really  
20 helpful.

21  
22                   And, again, this is -- I'm listening to  
23 you folks, and the inability to connect and the -- and  
24 be on this meeting, you can see the frustration -- or  
25 feel the frustration that we've been experiencing over  
26 the last two years in not being able to meet in-person  
27 and/or look at the same map at the same time. With  
28 technology and things and Teams, and Zoom, and all of  
29 this, it seems like there would be a better way to  
30 share information with folks. I know some communities  
31 don't have the bandwidth but it would be nice to be  
32 able to look at the same maps because how I describe  
33 something may not be the same way that the Federal  
34 Agency Staff would describe those areas.

35  
36                   I can email this to you or Barbara  
37 Cellarius can email it to you. She has it. We worked  
38 on it together today. So thank you, Mr. Chair and  
39 members of the Board.

40  
41                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
42 Karen.

43  
44                   MS. GREDIAGIN: Mr. Chair. This is  
45 Lisa, I'd like to respond to Karen if that's okay.

46  
47                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the  
48 floor, Lisa.

49  
50

0221

1 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, thank you, Karen.  
2 This is Lisa Grediagin for the record. I'd just like  
3 to say on behalf of OSM, as far as that Unit 12  
4 boundary goes for the community harvest system, we  
5 support AITRC, whatever boundary they would like for  
6 that area as long as, you know, you use the geographic  
7 features. So if you're able to, yeah, send that to us  
8 to make sure and I actually agree, I think there was a  
9 little confusion and misunderstanding at the Eastern  
10 Interior Council meeting, a lot of it due to  
11 teleconference issues, and also that OSM is short on  
12 map-making capacity right now, but that's something we  
13 would agree could be improved on in the future.

14

15 So, again, yeah, I'd thank the Chair  
16 and Ms. Linnell for the comments, on behalf of OSM.  
17 Thank you.

18

19 MS. LINNELL: Thank you, Ms. Grediagin.  
20 I will get you that description in an email right now.

21

22 MS. GREDIAGIN: Thank you.

23

24 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for  
25 that.

26

27 (Teleconference interference -  
28 participants not muted)

29

30 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Is there  
31 anybody else online that would like to be recognized at  
32 this time, Operator. Thank you.

33

34 (Pause)

35

36 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

37

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

40

41 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I  
42 was wondering if we can request the National Park  
43 Service to send each of the Board members a map so we  
44 could briefly see what was explained by Karen from  
45 AITRC. And, in addition to, if they could  
46 differentiate between what was agreed upon yesterday in  
47 that forthcoming map, hopefully, and what is  
48 recommended by OSM, I would appreciate that, before we  
49 take an action on this proposal.

50

0222

1 Thank you.

2

3

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. Gene,  
4 thank you for that. Sue, is that something we can take  
5 care of through the Park Service. Thank you.

6

7

MS. DETWILER: Yes, we can delay action  
8 on this proposal while we try to get those maps and  
9 get them out to the Board members.

10

11

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. With no  
12 objection from the Board, can we just move this order  
13 of business and this proposal to later in this, maybe  
14 tomorrow, come back and revisit this, or to another  
15 meeting time that we determine the situation.

16

17

MS. ENTSMINGER: Mr. Chair, this is Sue  
18 Entsminger, Eastern Interior RAC. Could I just add a  
19 little bit here.

20

21

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

23

24

MS. ENTSMINGER: Yeah, thank you, very  
25 much. I have to share and agree with Karen about  
26 several points and the maps is one because the Nabesna  
27 Road was left off the map, which is a very important  
28 part of seeing what's in Unit 12 because it doesn't  
29 really show in these maps, it's very, very tiny and  
30 very hard to discern. And I will say that Karen  
31 attended our Eastern Interior RAC meeting and agreed  
32 with us when she testified about the Unit 12, that Tok  
33 River Bridge -- she said Little Tok but it's not the  
34 Little Tok, it's the Tok -- the -- Big Tok we call it,  
35 the Big Tok River Bridge on the Tok Cutoff. So that's  
36 a very discernible place to put on a map and actually  
37 their -- their -- boundary of the AITRC -- or I mean  
38 the Ahtna Traditional area is very similar there.

39

40

And I just wanted to say that -- just  
41 wanted to reiterate the whole problem with  
42 teleconferencing and all of this has been very  
43 difficult to really do a good job but -- and I also  
44 wanted to mention how frustrating and how confusing  
45 things get. The Subsistence Resource Commission took  
46 this up and both myself and Gloria are on that and it  
47 got so confusing that there were four in favor, one no  
48 and three abstentions during that meeting. So I think  
49 that's important for the Board to know that. And

50

0223

1 tomorrow whenever you guys get all your maps, if I can  
2 give our position that would be great.

3

4 Thank you.

5

6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for  
7 that Sue. Any further discussion, any other RACs or  
8 comments from the Board.

9

10 MS. CREACHBAUM: Mr. Chair.

11

12 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have  
13 the floor.

14

15 MS. CREACHBAUM: Sarah Creachbaum,  
16 National Park Service. We are prepared to produce a  
17 map that we could get to all members by tomorrow and  
18 also wanted the Board to know that we do have Karen's  
19 specific language within our motion ready to go today  
20 so we should be ready to act by tomorrow if everybody  
21 has an opportunity to look at the map for their comfort  
22 level.

23

24 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

25

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

28

29 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I  
30 just wanted to clarify something. It's not necessarily  
31 a comfort level but I think it's unreasonable to expect  
32 the Federal Subsistence Board to act upon something if  
33 we have not seen it or not had time to digest it yet at  
34 all. So I would agree to act upon this at a later date  
35 during this meeting, or tomorrow morning or such, but I  
36 think we have to have ample time to be exposed to what  
37 is being proposed.

38

39 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

40

41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right. So  
42 at this time what I'll do is maybe we can table this to  
43 a time to be determined tomorrow. How about time to be  
44 determined tomorrow, after lunch.

45

46 MS. PITKA: So that would be a deferral  
47 until tomorrow after lunch.

48

49 MS. ENTSMINGER: Mr. Chair, this is Sue

50

0224

1 Entsminger again.

2

3

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

4

5

MS. ENTSMINGER: I have a question.

6

7

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Sue.

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

MS. ENTSMINGER: I still have more information that I would like to provide from the Eastern Interior, can I do it when you guys take this up again.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, we'll pick up this conversation right here at public testimony and Regional Advisory Council conversation so we can continue to deliberate as we get new information. We'll pick this up with that understanding, if we get a second to the motion.

MS. ENTSMINGER: Okay, thank you. I appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So I'm seeking a second for the deferral until tomorrow after lunch.

MR. SCHMID: The Forest Service would second if that was a motion but as I understood it BIA moved to defer until we've had an opportunity to digest the maps and have all the information in front of us and would take this up tomorrow afternoon. That would be my second.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Dave.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. So we'll go ahead and just -- without opposition to the motion.

(No opposition)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing no opposition we'll just defer this until tomorrow after lunch until a time to be determined, 1:30-ish. And so we'll go ahead at this time, Rhonda -- it looks like Rhonda has to go. So Rhonda, appreciated you today and good luck on your flight -- have a safe flight.

Sue, so that moves us on to the next agenda item.

0225

1 MS. DETWILER: Yes. So that, for today  
2 anyway, concludes the Southcentral Region 2 proposals.  
3 The next one would be the Kodiak/Aleutian proposals but  
4 all of their proposals are on the consensus agenda so  
5 that would then bring us to the Bristol Bay proposals  
6 and that -- the first one would be WP22-39, which would  
7 be Tom Plank presenting.

8  
9 MR. PLANK: Hello, Mr. Chair. Members  
10 of the Board. My name is Tom Plank, and I'm a Wildlife  
11 Biologist in the Office of Subsistence Management. I  
12 will be presenting a summary of the analysis for  
13 Wildlife Proposal WP22-39 submitted by ADF&G starting  
14 on Page 1035 in your meeting books.

15  
16 The proponent requests to create  
17 specific harvest regulations for Alaska hare in Units 9  
18 and 17 stating that the once abundant Alaska hare in  
19 Units 9 and 17 are now at a very low density and has a  
20 patchy distribution throughout Bristol Bay and the  
21 Alaska Peninsula. The Alaska hare is sometimes called  
22 jackrabbits, Tundra hare, or Arctic hare but the Alaska  
23 hare is called the Tundra hare in Federal regulations,  
24 but Alaska hare appears to be the dominant term in  
25 contemporary usage including in State regulations. The  
26 Alaska hare is a different species than the snowshoe  
27 hare despite being lumped together in Federal  
28 regulations and to help kind of alleviate some of that  
29 confusion, please see the comparison table on Page 1040  
30 for the two hares.

31  
32 The Board of Game adopted a proposal in  
33 2019 establishing a specific State harvest regulation  
34 for Alaska hare in Unit 9 for November 1st through  
35 January 31st and a limited harvest of one hare per day  
36 with a maximum of four per season. ADF&G adopted  
37 Proposal 24 when the Board of Game during their January  
38 2022 meeting to include Unit 17 with identical Alaska  
39 hare management structure as Unit 9. ADF&G has also  
40 submitted Wildlife Proposal 22-45 to create specific  
41 harvest regulations for Alaska hare in Units 18, 22 and  
42 23.

43  
44 Alaska hares are among the most poorly  
45 understood game species in Alaska. Anecdotally,  
46 abundance is well below historical levels throughout  
47 the range of the species. The last known erupted  
48 population on the Peninsula occurred in the winter of  
49 1953 to '54 and the Alaska Peninsula and Becharof  
50

0226

1 Wildlife National Wildlife Refuge ranks the Alaska hare  
2 as the Refuge's No. 3 prioritized resource of concern  
3 as an ecologically significant endemic species  
4 vulnerable to the influence of climate change. In 2018  
5 ADF&G initiated a multi-year study to evaluate movement  
6 and mortality as well as long-term capture techniques.

7  
8 Little is known about the harvest of  
9 Alaska hare. Household harvest surveys indicate that  
10 it is harvested throughout the communities of western  
11 and southwestern Alaska.

12  
13 If this proposal is adopted the Alaska  
14 hare season will be reduced, although hunters will  
15 still have the opportunity to harvest hares during  
16 winter when they are out engaging in other subsistence  
17 or recreational activities. The change in daily and  
18 overall harvest limits may be effective in reducing  
19 harvest, which could translate into an improvement in  
20 the conservation status of these populations.

21  
22 Any positive effects these changes have  
23 on the Alaska hare populations will benefit subsistence  
24 users in the long-term despite the immediate reduction  
25 in subsistence opportunity.

26  
27 The OSM conclusion is to support  
28 Proposal WP22-39 with a modification to modify the  
29 definition of hare in Federal regulations to include  
30 Alaska hare.

31  
32 Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the  
33 Board. I'd be happy to field any questions.

34  
35 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
36 Does that conclude the Staff analysis?

37  
38 MR. PLANK: It does.

39  
40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
41 questions from the Board.

42  
43 (No comments)

44  
45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,  
46 hearing none we'll go ahead and take any public  
47 comments received.

48  
49 MR. PLANK: And, again, this is Tom  
50

0227

1 Plank with OSM and there were no written public  
2 comments for this proposal.

3  
4 (Pause)

5  
6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any -- anybody  
7 can hear me?

8  
9 MS. DETWILER: Yes, Tony, you're on.

10  
11 MR. PELTOLA: Yes.

12  
13 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, sorry, I  
14 got cut off there I guess. Operator, anybody online  
15 for public comment, this is their time.

16  
17 OPERATOR: Yes, if you'd like to make a  
18 public comment please press, star, one.

19  
20 (Pause)

21  
22 (Teleconference interference -  
23 participants not muted)

24  
25 OPERATOR: I am showing no public  
26 comments at this time.

27  
28 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
29 Operator, we'll go to the RAC. Thank you.

30  
31 (Teleconference interference -  
32 participants not muted)

33  
34 REPORTER: I think somebody needs to  
35 mute their phone, please. Not you Tony.

36  
37 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, we were  
38 calling for the RAC Chair.

39  
40 MS. MORRIS LYON: This is Nanci Morris  
41 Lyon with the Bristol Bay RAC.

42  
43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the  
44 floor.

45  
46 MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you, Chairman  
47 Christianson. Bristol Bay Subsistence Regional  
48 Advisory Council supported WP22-39 with modification to  
49 change the season closing date to March 31. The  
50

0228

1 Council notes that the number of Alaska hares being  
2 seen in recent years has decreased and they appreciate  
3 the effort to be attentive to the population. The  
4 Council stated that Alaska hare is a winter resource  
5 and that as winters are starting later in the years, an  
6 extension of the proposed season is reasonable. And  
7 I'm not sure why it's in this justification but also we  
8 have other closures that would align with March 31st  
9 typically our caribou hunters are out and also hunt  
10 hare if the opportunity arises, and that's the closure  
11 for our caribou so that's why that date was chosen over  
12 the one that had been previously offered. And I  
13 believe that concludes the just -- the Bristol Bay  
14 Subsistence Council's recommendation.

15

16 Thank you.

17

18 MS. DETWILER: Mr. Chair, this is Sue  
19 Detwiler. In addition to Bristol Bay region, the other  
20 Regional Advisory Councils who may wish to weigh in may  
21 be YKDelta region, Western Interior, and Seward  
22 Peninsula if any of them are online.

23

24 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue.

25

26 (No comments)

27

28 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So any other  
29 Regional Advisory Councils, if they want to speak at  
30 this time.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,  
35 Sue, at this time we'll just go ahead and move on to  
36 Orville, Tribal Liaison.

37

38 MR. LIND: Thank.....

39

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

41

42 MR. LIND: .....you.

43

44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Robbin, go  
45 ahead.

46

47 MS. LAVINE: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, we  
48 are also looking to hear from Kodiak/Aleutian Chair,  
49 Della, and then Western Interior Chair Jack Reakoff.

50

0229

1 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2

3

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank  
4 you. I just wasn't hearing anything on my end, it  
5 keeps sounding like I'm dropping the call there or  
6 something when I talk. So thank you, Robbin, we'll  
7 wait for the other Chairs at this time.

8

9

Thank you.

10

11

MS. LAVINE: Thank you.

12

13

MR. REAKOFF: So, Mr. Chair, this is  
14 Jack Reakoff, Western Interior Regional Council.

15

16

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

27

28

29

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
Jack. Next Chair.

30

31

(No comments)

32

33

34

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Sue, can you  
call on the next Chair, please.

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

MS. DETWILER: Yes, sorry, Mr. Chair.  
I was actually looking at the wrong proposal line when  
I went through the list of potential Council Chairs  
that would speak. So for this proposal, WP22-39, it --  
I think -- let's see you've heard from Bristol Bay and  
Western Interior and the only one left would be  
Kodiak/Aleutians. And that would be Della Trumble, I'm  
not sure if she is still on or not.

45

46

47

MS. HONIG: Mr. Chair. This is Leigh  
Honig, Council Coordinator.

48

49

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have  
the floor.

50

0230

1 MS. HONIG: Della may have had to have  
2 stepped away this afternoon so I am prepared to read  
3 their recommendation if you would like.

4  
5 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So does that  
6 conclude the Regional Advisory Councils?

7  
8 MS. HONIG: Mr. Chair, can you hear me?

9  
10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have  
11 the floor.

12  
13 MS. HONIG: Okay. For WP22-39 the  
14 Kodiak/Aleutian recommended they were opposed to this  
15 proposal due to a lack of biological data and  
16 population estimates. No new information has been  
17 presented since last Board cycle. Sporthunters should  
18 be limited first before subsistence users. Hares are  
19 an important subsistence resource in the region.

20  
21 Thank you.

22  
23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
24 other Regional Advisory Councils.

25  
26 MS. LAVINE: Mr. Chair, this is Robbin  
27 LaVine. I -- we are having a hard time hearing you,  
28 you're sounding a bit muffled, but I do -- I did hear  
29 that you are asking if there are any other Chairs on  
30 the line and I do believe that Western Interior Chair  
31 Jack Reakoff may have something to add. Thank you,  
32 Jack, you have the floor.

33  
34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, I can hear  
35 you, so Jack you have the floor. Thank you, Robbin.

36  
37 MR. REAKOFF: I don't have my notes  
38 before me on that one, Robbin, if you can clue me in on  
39 that. I'm going through my recollection, I didn't get  
40 our justification on that proposal.

41  
42 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I do  
43 understand that the Western Interior deferred Wildlife  
44 Proposal 22-39 to the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory  
45 Council. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

46  
47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
48 Robbin.

49  
50

0231

1 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chair.

2

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

5

6 MR. REAKOFF: Yeah, we did deliberate  
7 the proposal, we discussed the proposal, we almost took  
8 action on it. It was my recollection that we were  
9 going to take action but I see that we deferred. But I  
10 do not have my notes before me on that proposal.

11

12 Thank you.

13

14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank  
15 you, Jack. Any questions from the Board for Regional  
16 Advisory Councils -- any other questions, comments,  
17 deliberation.

18

19 (No comments)

20

21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,  
22 thank you. Hearing none we'll go ahead and move on to  
23 Orville. Tribal Native Liaison.

24

25 MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
26 Orville Lind, Native Liaison for OSM. During the  
27 consultation session August 19th there were no comments  
28 or recommendations on Wildlife Proposal 22-39.

29

30 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

31

32 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
33 Orville. We'll go ahead and ask the State Liaison.

34

35 MR. BURCH: Mr. Chair, this is -- for  
36 the record this is Mark Burch with the Department of  
37 Fish and Game. Ben Mulligan, our Deputy Commissioner  
38 had to step away for a moment and I'll provide the  
39 position of the Department of Fish and Game.

40

41 The Department of Fish and Game  
42 supports the proposal. As the population of Alaska  
43 hares is being investigated it has been found that the  
44 population is such that -- is at such a level that  
45 these restrictions are warranted.

46

47 Thank you.

48

49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,

50

0232

1 Mark. Any questions for the State.

2

3

(No comments)

4

5

6

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

7

8

9

10

11

MS. LAVINE: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair.  
Members of the Board. This is Robbin LaVine. The ISC  
submitted the standard comment for Wildlife Proposal  
22-39. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

12

13

14

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,  
Robbin. Any questions for ISC.

15

16

17

(No comments)

18

19

20

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none  
I'll open the floor for Board deliberation or  
questions, comments.

21

22

23

(No comments)

24

25

26

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

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

MS. BOARIO: Mr. Chair, the U.S. Fish  
and Wildlife Service moves to adopt Wildlife Proposal  
22-39 as modified by the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory  
Council to establish specific seasons and harvest  
limits for Alaska hare in Units 9 and 17 with the  
season end date of March 31. Following a second I will  
explain why I intend to support my motion.

35

36

MR. PELTOLA: BIA seconds.

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MS. BOARIO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I  
intend to support my motion to establish specific  
seasons and harvest limits for Alaska hare in Units 9  
and 17. The analysis presents sufficient evidence for  
the need to establish specific regulations for Alaska  
hare in these units distinct from those for snowshoe  
hare. Recent observations and local knowledge indicate  
a reduction in the amount of Alaska hares seen over  
recent years. Reducing the amount of harvest is a  
biologically appropriate means of aiding population  
recovery while we await the results of the study from  
the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

0233

1                   The longer season proposed by the  
2 Bristol Bay Subsistence Regional Advisory Council  
3 accommodates winters starting later in their region but  
4 still maintains the annual harvest limit of four hare  
5 per year which will help achieve the desired management  
6 and biological impact for the species which is to  
7 reduce overall harvest while still providing  
8 subsistence opportunity, and at the same time it should  
9 not disturb them during their late spring mating  
10 season.

11  
12                   Thank you, Mr. Chair.

13  
14                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any  
15 Board discussion, comments, questions.

16  
17                   MS. GREDIAGIN: Mr. Chair, this is Lisa  
18 Grediagin.

19  
20                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Lisa, go  
21 ahead.

22  
23                   MS. GREDIAGIN: I would just like to  
24 clarify for the record whether or not the Board is  
25 including the OSM modification for the definition  
26 change. My understanding is this is a somewhat  
27 necessary housekeeping administrative change since  
28 we're creating a season for a species that currently  
29 isn't defined in Federal regulation so I'm -- I'm -- I  
30 recognize this also could be addressed under WP22-45,  
31 which also addresses Alaska hare for different units  
32 but I wanted to just clarify that for the record.

33  
34                   Thank you, Mr. Chair.

35  
36                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for  
37 that, Lisa. Any clarification for Lisa by the maker of  
38 the motion.

39  
40                   MS. BOARIO: Mr. Chair, Fish and  
41 Wildlife Service. Yes, that was the intent to include  
42 the OSM definition and season and bag limit  
43 information.

44  
45                   CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for  
46 that clarification.

47  
48                   MS. GREDIAGIN: Thank you.

49  
50

0234

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other Board  
2 comments, questions or clarification.

3  
4 (No comments)

5  
6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the  
7 question.

8  
9 MR. PELTOLA: Question, BIA.

10  
11 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been  
12 called. All in favor of this motion say aye.

13  
14 IN UNISON: Aye.

15  
16 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Opposed, same  
17 sign.

18  
19 (No opposing votes)

20  
21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.  
22 Motion carries unanimously. That's how the Chairman  
23 goes when he starts getting tired and so I think what  
24 I'm going to do, guys, I know it's only a quarter to  
25 5:00 here but I think I'm going to call it for the day  
26 so we could start fresh in the morning on non-agenda  
27 items and then we could get on a fresh proposal. That  
28 way we're not starting off the morning in the middle of  
29 the business.

30  
31 MR. BROWER: Sounds good.

32  
33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So I'm going to  
34 go ahead and adjourn this meeting until tomorrow at  
35 9:00 a.m., and everybody have a good evening. We'll  
36 come back and reconvene starting with where we just  
37 left off.

38  
39 Thank you.

40  
41 MR. SCHMID: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

42  
43 MR. PELTOLA: Good night.

44  
45 MR. BROWER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

46  
47 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

48  
49 (Off record)

50

0235

(PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

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

