

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE BOARD

VOLUME I
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

July 19, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Tim Towarak, Chairman
- Kristin K'eit, Bureau of Indian Affairs
- LaVerne Smith, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Wayne Owen, U.S. Forest Service
- Deb Cooper, National Park Service
- Bud Cribley, Bureau of Land Management
- Keith Goltz, Solicitor's Office

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

(Anchorage, Alaska - 7/19/2011)

(On record)

OPERATOR: Welcome and thank you for standing by. At this time all participants are on a listen only mode. This conference is being recorded, if you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. I would now like to turn the call over to Mr. Tim Towarak. You may begin.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you very much. I will call this emergency special action meeting to order. And before we get started I'd like everyone here in the room to introduce themselves and for those of you on the phone that have the ability to speak to introduce yourself.

My name is Tim Towarak, I'm the Chairman of the Federal Subsistence Board.

MR. CRIBLEY: Bud Cribley, Alaska State Director for BLM.

MR. SHARP: Dan Sharp for Bureau of Land Management.

MR. ELLIS: My name is Mitch Ellis. I'm the Chief of Refuges for the US Fish and Wildlife Service here in Alaska.

MR. ARDIZZONE: Chuck Ardizzone, Deputy ARD for Subsistence.

MS. BROWN: Cole Brown, wildlife biologist for OSM.

MR. RABINOWITCH: Sandy Rabinowitch, Staff Committee for the Board for the Park Service.

MR. LORD: Ken Lord, Solicitor's Office.

MR. GOLTZ: Keith Goltz, Solicitor's Office.

MS. COOPER: Deb Cooper, Associate Regional Director for the Park Service.

1 MS. SMITH: LaVerne Smith. I'm the
2 Deputy Regional Director for the Fish and Wildlife
3 Service.
4
5 MR. BERG: Jerry Berg, Staff Committee
6 member for Fish and Wildlife Service.
7
8 DR. WHEELER: Polly Wheeler, acting ARD
9 for OSM. And if you guys can stand up and make sure the
10 microphone can pick you up, please.
11
12 MS. MCDONALD: Tracy McDonald, Refuge
13 supervisor with the Fish and Wildlife Service.
14
15 MS. MEDEIROS: Andrea Medeiros,
16 subsistence outreach coordinator OSM.
17
18 MR. BELL: Larry Bell, Fish and Wildlife
19 Service, external affairs.
20
21 MR. STARKEY: John Sky Starkey, legal
22 counsel, Ninilchik Traditional Council.
23
24 MS. PETRIVELLI: Pat Petrivelli, BIA
25 subsistence anthropologist.
26
27 DR. WHEELER: And maybe have the people
28 on line too.
29
30 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Could we have the
31 people on line introduce themselves too.
32
33 (Mr. Owen and Mr. Burcham talking
34 simultaneously)
35
36 DR. WHEELER: Milo, I think you just
37 talked completely talked over Wayne. But I guess we've
38 got -- maybe it'd be easier if I just said it from here.
39 We have Milo Burcham, Wayne Owen, who's the Forest
40 Service Board member, Robert Stoval who's with the Forest
41 Service, Kristin K'eit, who's the BIA Board member, and
42 Andy Loranger, the Kenai Refuge manager. Anybody else on
43 line.
44
45 MR. LARSON: Robert Larson.
46
47 DR. WHEELER: Oh, I'm sorry, I thought I
48 said Robert. I had it written down.
49
50 MR. BERG: Robert Stoval and Robert

1 Larson.

2

3 DR. WHEELER: Robert Stoval and Robert
4 Larson. Anybody else?

5

6 (No comments)

7

8 DR. WHEELER: Okay.

9

10 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thanks Polly. Thank
11 you, Polly. I don't know if you want to take, right at
12 the beginning, kind of outline the process, it's a
13 restricted process so I think we should make that point
14 clear right at the beginning.

15

16 DR. WHEELER: Okay, I could do that. The
17 Board had wanted -- just to back up and Tim or any of the
18 other Board members can fill in. This emergency special
19 action -- this is an emergency special action, it was --
20 the reason -- it's called an emergency special action
21 because it's the duration is 60 days or less, a temporary
22 special action is longer than that. The InterAgency
23 Staff Committee addressed this analysis several weeks ago
24 but was not able to reach consensus that's why it went to
25 the Board. Often times the Board -- or the Board does
26 delegate the authority down to the InterAgency Staff
27 Committee to make a decision on an emergency special
28 action if it can, but the InterAgency Staff Committee
29 pushed this back to the Federal Subsistence Board at its
30 meeting last week here in Anchorage, the Board decided to
31 have a listen only teleconference so that the Board could
32 have a decision and the public could at least hear the
33 Board during its decisionmaking when they talked about
34 this special action. As it turns out the majority of the
35 Board members are actually in this room, we do have two
36 on line, one, is, again, from the BIA and one is from the
37 Forest Service but the remaining, including the Chair,
38 are here in the room.

39

40 So, Mr. Chair, I don't know how much
41 further you wanted me to go but.....

42

43 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I think that will
44 suffice for now. I'm going to read some comments that
45 will give further explanation.

46

47 I know that there has been increasing
48 interest in this emergency special action request in
49 recent days and I thought it might help to provide some
50 explanation for why the Board is approaching this special

1 action in this way.

2

3 Emergency special actions are meant to
4 address issues that cannot wait until the normal
5 regulatory process can take place. They are effective
6 for 60 days and then if further action is needed then a
7 proposal can address the issue for the long-term, which
8 includes public and Regional Council input.

9

10 This is different than a temporary
11 special action, which requires a public meeting in the
12 affected areas and is in place for the remainder of the
13 regulatory year.

14

15 Because of the interest in this issue the
16 Board agreed to allow for the public to listen in to our
17 discussions on this decision today but this is not
18 typically done. In fact, it is my understanding that the
19 Board has never taken public testimony on any emergency
20 special action in the 20 year history of the Federal
21 Subsistence Program.

22

23 Numerous special actions are taken every
24 year without public participation due to the emergency
25 nature of protecting the resource.

26

27 The Yukon chinook salmon returns this
28 year are a good example of where the in-season manager
29 has reduced fishing time throughout the river to address
30 the strength of the run. This was done through special
31 action.

32

33 We realize that the Alaska Board of Game
34 took action on this issue in March but it has taken some
35 time for Staff to conduct an independent review of the
36 biological information and assess the various options of
37 how best to address the issue prior to submitting the
38 special action request.

39

40 So while there will not be an opportunity
41 for public input today there is an urgent need to take
42 action because we are getting many requests for moose
43 permits at the Refuge daily for this season that opens in
44 a few weeks.

45

46 As a general comment it seems like we do
47 not want to raise expectations that the Board will seek
48 public on emergency actions as a normal part of doing
49 business. Doing so could bog down a process that
50 Congress intended to be expedient and responsive to the

1 needs of our constituency and the interest of the
2 conservation of the resource.

3

4 So the process will consist of the
5 following:

6

7 A brief presentation of the analysis by
8 Cole Brown, biologist for OSM. I would
9 note that the analysis was provided to
10 Board members late Friday afternoon and
11 it was made available to the public on
12 the OSM website yesterday afternoon.
13 Staff experienced some technical
14 difficulties loading the analysis to the
15 web and we apologize for any issues this
16 may have caused.

17

18 Board members can follow up with any
19 questions of either Cole or the managers
20 that are on line, Andy Loranger, manager
21 of the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge
22 and Milo Burcham, in-season manager for
23 Forest Service lands in Unit 7.

24

25 The Board can then discuss the special
26 action and make its decision.

27

28 The decision will be made in the form of
29 a motion which will need to be seconded
30 and then because we are on
31 teleconference we will have a roll call
32 vote. Board members or their designees
33 that are either here or on the line are
34 as follows: National Park Service, Deb
35 Cooper; Bureau of Land Management, Bud
36 Cribley; Fish and Wildlife Service,
37 LaVerne Smith; Bureau of Indian Affairs
38 on the phone, Kristin K'eit; USDA Forest
39 Service, Wayne Owen, also on the phone;
40 and, myself, Chairman of the Federal
41 Subsistence Board Tim Towarak. In
42 addition we have legal counsel available
43 if necessary.

44

45 So with that, and just a brief statement,
46 that we had received letters from organizations asking
47 about the process of -- that brought up by the Secretary
48 of the Interior on deference to Regional Advisory
49 Councils or the tribal consultation process, that since
50 inception since I've been on this, this whole process has

1 been -- is new to all of us, in fact, it's new on a
2 national scale and there's a lot of process planning that
3 we've been doing. We've had a committee putting together
4 a recommended plan for how we will address the --
5 especially the tribal consultation process. We have yet
6 to receive our final reports from them and they are
7 continuing to draft up a process that we hope to use in
8 future years in our meetings. So we hope that,
9 especially public organizations, will recognize that we
10 are in an interim stage, it's kind of awkward at this
11 point for us to meet some higher expectations, primarily
12 because of wanting to have a defined process that is
13 understandable to everyone.

14
15 With that then I think we will ask our
16 Staff to get us started on the special order -- emergency
17 special order action request.

18
19 MS. COLE: Good afternoon. My name is
20 Cole Brown, I'm the wildlife biologist for OSM. I'm
21 going to give a brief presentation on the special action
22 request WSA11-02.

23
24 This emergency special action, 11-02 was
25 submitted by the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge, and
26 requests that the moose harvest limits in Unit 7
27 remainder, 15A remainder, 15B and 15C be revised to remove
28 the spike-fork harvest option and change the brown
29 requirement from three or more to four or more brow tines
30 on either antler for the August 10th through September
31 20th season. Additionally the proponent requests the
32 antlers of a harvested moose be inspected and sealed
33 within 10 days of harvest by an authorized
34 representative. The proponent states that recent moose
35 composition surveys indicate that there are conservation
36 concerns for the moose population in Unit 15 since the
37 bull/cow ratios in portions of the area are very low and
38 declining in other subunits. These low bull/cow ratios,
39 if not corrected, could lead to low productivity and
40 potentially severe moose population declines on the Kenai
41 Peninsula in the future. Modifying the antler
42 restrictions should reduce the harvest of bulls in order
43 to address these conservation concerns while still
44 allowing a harvest opportunity. This change in antler
45 restrictions is meant to be a short-term solution of
46 approximately two years to allow the increase in bull/cow
47 ratios.

48
49 In March 2011, the Alaska Board of Game
50 adopted the same antler restrictions and without a

1 similar action in the Federal regulations any
2 conservation gain may be compromised as the majority of
3 land in Unit 7 and 15 are Federal public lands.

4
5 In addition sealing the antlers within 10
6 days of harvest will allow for more accurate tracking of
7 harvest of legal moose.

8
9 The biological background for Unit 15A.
10 The 2010/11 fall sex and age composition survey had a
11 bull/cow ratio of 20/100 which is lower than long-term
12 bull/cow ratio of 26 bulls to 100 cows and below the
13 established Refuge goal. Of greatest concern within Unit
14 15A are the large areas of land where sex ratios are as
15 low as five bulls to 100 cows.

16
17 Moose populations within 15A peaked in
18 1971 with approximately 6,000. In 1991 moose populations
19 estimate was approximately 3,000 to 4,000. 2001
20 population was 1,700 to 2,400 and the 2008 was 1,400 to
21 2,000 indicating a continued population decline in Unit
22 15A.

23
24 The habitat. Although biologist believe
25 that habitat is the driving factor to overall population
26 decline, due to the diminished amount and quality of
27 moose habitat, the current harvest regime has impacted
28 the population. Spike-fork harvest has impacted
29 recruitment of bulls into the population reducing the
30 overall bull/cow ratio. Additionally allowing the
31 harvest of three brow tine moose has impacted the number
32 of breeding bulls population. Because of this, there are
33 conservation concerns for this moose population.

34
35 For Unit 15B, the most up to date census
36 is from 2001 when the population was estimated at 958.
37 Composition surveys were completed in 2010 and '11 and
38 estimated 33 bulls to 100 cows. Cows were estimated to
39 comprise six percent of the population. The 2010 and '11
40 composition surveys were conducted within Unit 15B East
41 where the US Fish and Wildlife Service has a 40 to 60
42 bull to 100 cow management objective.

43
44 For Unit 15C, the 2010/11 fall sex and
45 age composition revealed an extremely low bull/cow ratio
46 of nine bulls to 100 cows which was much lower than the
47 long-term bull/cow ratio of 29 bulls to 100 cows and well
48 below the established Refuge goal. Based upon ADF&G's
49 2010 population estimate of 2,200 animals, the moose
50 population in Unit 15C has decreased from 2001 when the

1 population was estimated to be around 3,000 animals.

2

3 Without action to address the imbalance
4 in sex ratios, the moose population within Unit 15C will
5 likely continue to decline.

6

7 The harvest history. The impact of
8 various harvest scenarios on bull/cow ratios within 15C
9 specifically was analyzed by ADF&G and the harvest
10 restrictions implemented by the Board of Game in 2011
11 including requiring four brow tine antlers for harvest
12 have the highest probability of achieving management
13 objectives short of a total season closure during the two
14 year management period. Comparable results could be
15 expected in the remainder of Unit 15 and Unit 7
16 remainder.

17

18 On the Kenai Peninsula from 2004 to 2009
19 approximately one-third of the harvest has been spike-
20 fork bulls in Unit 7 and the majority of the harvest, 59
21 percent, within Unit 15 has been spike-fork bulls.

22

23 Other alternatives were considered and
24 rejected for various reasons.

25

26 OSM preliminary conclusion is to support
27 Special Action WSA11-02.

28

29 The justification. While the current
30 levels of moose harvest under Federal subsistence
31 regulations are low within Unit 7 remainder and Unit 15,
32 the percentage of spike-fork bulls that make up the total
33 harvest by users within those units is significant. If
34 Federal subsistence regulations continue to allow spike-
35 fork and three brow tine options, current and additional
36 Federally-qualified subsistence users may choose to hunt
37 with a Federal permit and adversely impact the
38 productivity of the moose population. At present most of
39 these individuals choose to harvest with a State permit.

40

41 This change in antler restrictions is
42 meant to be a short-term solution of approximately two
43 years to allow the increase in bull/cow ratios. Aligning
44 the State and Federal regulations for this timeframe by
45 eliminating the spike-fork option will allow bull/cow
46 ratios to recover to management objectives more quickly
47 addressing conservation concerns.

48

49 In addition, increasing the brow tine
50 requirement to four brow tines will limit the number of

1 large bulls harvested in the area while still allowing
2 for a harvest opportunity of bulls with 50-inch antlers
3 regardless of the number of brow tines. The Federal
4 season from August 10th through September 20th is 10 days
5 longer than the State season and provides a subsistence
6 priority. Additionally there is a Federal season in
7 Units 15B and C not found under State regulations from
8 October 20th through November 10th providing an
9 additional 20 days of harvest for Federally-qualified
10 subsistence users. Requiring the sealing of antlers will
11 allow for more accurate tracking of legal harvest to
12 effectively manage the moose population on the Kenai
13 Peninsula.

14

15 Thank you.

16

17 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any questions of the
18 Board from -- no, I meant to the Staff.

19

20 MS. K'EIT: Mr. Chair, this is Kristin
21 K'eit.

22

23 DR. WHEELER: Kristin.

24

25 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Oh, go ahead, Kristin.

26

27 MS. K'EIT: Thank you. I do have a
28 question. I don't have all my materials in front of me
29 so I apologize if you've provided this already. I
30 remember clearly the comment or the information that
31 other options were considered but that this is considered
32 as like an option preferred by the Refuge. What were
33 those other options and what were some of the criteria
34 used to eliminate them?

35

36 MS. BROWN: The first alternative that
37 was considered was maintaining the current Federal
38 regulations regarding antler restrictions despite the
39 changes that occurred in the State antler restriction --
40 regulations.

41

42 The proposed changes in antler
43 restrictions are designed to be a short-term two year
44 management strategy to increase the bull/cow ratios. If
45 the Federal subsistence regulations continue to allow the
46 spike-fork and three brow tine moose to be harvested,
47 many Federal users who have been harvesting under State
48 regulations may choose to hunt under the less restrictive
49 Federal moose regulations, which would therefore minimize
50 expected conservation gains from this new harvest

1 strategy. Then maintaining the current Federal
2 regulations to determine whether there will be an
3 increase in the number of Federal permits used for the
4 first year could delay the benefits of the new harvest
5 strategy and negatively impact Federally-qualified users
6 in the future.

7
8 The second was establishing a quota for
9 spike-fork bulls or bulls with 50-inches or three brow
10 tines for the Federal season. Quotas have been
11 established for moose in other units throughout Alaska.
12 Typically if the herd's growth rate is approximately 10
13 percent in a given year, the harvest objective for that
14 hunting season is two to three percent of the herd.
15 Although a quota system could be used it would be
16 difficult to manage the hunt in-season as the quota
17 numbers would be relatively low. If there were a large
18 number of hunters in the field it would be very difficult
19 to close the hunt in a timely manner and avoid over
20 harvest which could adversely impact the productivity.
21 Harvest reporting would be very important as would the
22 number of days in which an individual has to report.

23
24 The third was maintain the current
25 Federal antler restriction in Unit 7 and change the
26 Federal season in Unit 15 to align with the State season.
27 While reported harvest by Federally-qualified subsistence
28 users has been small, approximately one-third, 32 percent
29 of the harvest from 2004 to 2009 has been spike-fork
30 bulls in Unit 7 and 62 percent were bulls with antlers
31 that were 50-inches or three or more brow tines. The
32 proposed regulation would allow the maximum increase of
33 bull/cow ratios without closing the season. Similarly if
34 Federal subsistence regulations continued to allow the
35 harvest of spike-fork and three brow tine many Federal
36 users who have been harvesting under the State
37 regulations may choose to hunt under the less restrictive
38 Federal moose regulations minimizing any conservation
39 gains through this two year harvest strategy.

40
41 The next was closure of the Federal
42 public lands to non-Federally-qualified users completely
43 or by subunit. Federal public lands within Unit 7 are
44 managed by the Chugach National Forest. The Chugach
45 National Forest Plan lists moose as a management
46 indicator species and has a goal of maintaining habitat
47 to produce viable and sustainable wildlife populations
48 that support the use of fish and wildlife resources for
49 subsistence and sporthunting and fishing, watching
50 wildlife conservation and other values. Federal public

1 lands within Unit 15 are managed by the Kenai National
2 Wildlife Refuge which has a mandate for recreation uses
3 including recreational hunting. If all Federal lands
4 were closed to non-Federally-qualified subsistence uses
5 or if just one subunit were to be closed it would put
6 additional hunting pressure on State managed lands or the
7 remaining subunits thereby negating conservation benefits
8 for those areas. Federally-qualified subsistence users
9 have an extended early season and a late season that
10 season that is not available to non-Federally-qualified
11 subsistence users.

12
13 The next option was to eliminate the
14 spike-fork antler restriction but maintain the 50-inch or
15 three brow tine antler restriction, the State maintain
16 the drawing hunt for Unit 15B East but still have 50-
17 inches or three brow tines but change all other hunts to
18 four brow tine.

19
20 This is a two year short-term management
21 strategy to increase bull/cow ratios as much as possible
22 during this timeframe.

23
24 ADF&G has a drawing hunt for Unit 15B and
25 has maintained 50-inches or three brow tine antler
26 restriction for 50 drawing permits from September 1st to
27 September 30th. These drawing permits are available to
28 both Federally-qualified users and non-Federally-
29 qualified users.

30
31 And that was it.

32
33 MS. K'EIT: Okay, thank you.

34
35 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Further questions.

36
37 MR. CRIBLEY: I guess I -- and this is
38 probably more of a procedural question than a resource
39 question. The action that we're taking here is emergency
40 action and it's only good for 60 days, so it'll only be
41 effective for this hunting period.

42
43 MS. COLE: Correct.

44
45 MR. CRIBLEY: We're talking about actions
46 for -- or Alaska Fish and Game's action is a two year
47 restriction or adjustment, what -- what, from the
48 standpoint of subsistence, what's the next step, or what
49 takes -- what happens next from the standpoint of the
50 remainder of the two years, or what's the plan?

1 MS. COLE: There are two proposals that
2 have been submitted, currently in our proposal cycle,
3 addressing those very same issues, and because of the
4 emergency nature and our proposal cycle is two years.....

5
6 MR. CRIBLEY: Right.

7
8 MS. COLE:taking this special
9 action will then be translated over to the proposals.....

10
11 MR. CRIBLEY: Okay.

12
13 MS. COLE:and that will be a two
14 year regulatory cycle, so it'd be in effect starting this
15 next year.

16
17 MR. CRIBLEY: So essentially what.....

18
19 MS. COLE: If the Board approves it.

20
21 MR. CRIBLEY: Yeah. What would happen
22 then -- well, regardless of what happens here it's still
23 the intent to try to -- or bring before the Board through
24 the normal process, the restriction in harvest.....

25
26 MS. COLE: That's correct.

27
28 MR. CRIBLEY:to help deal with the
29 conservation issues of the herd -- okay.

30
31 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Could you review our
32 communications with the Regional Advisory Councils on
33 this issue.

34
35 DR. WHEELER: Certainly. This is Polly
36 Wheeler. Just for those of you that are on line the
37 Chairman asked me to review the communications with the
38 Regional Advisory Councils.

39
40 At the spring meeting of the Southcentral
41 Regional Advisory Council, the Kenai National Wildlife
42 Refuge manager came and spoke to the RAC about proposed
43 changes before the Board of Game. The Board of Game
44 hadn't taken action yet but he was giving the
45 Southcentral Council a head's up on what actions might be
46 considered by the Board of Game. Subsequent to that --
47 and the Refuge manager did tell the Council that
48 depending on what the Board did, that proposals would
49 likely be submitted through the regular process. To be
50 honest I don't think anybody expected this Board of Game

1 to do the regulatory changes that they did -- that they
2 took at that time, but nonetheless they did that.
3 Subsequent to that when the Board mentioned this last
4 week -- well, I don't want to speak for you Andy, so you
5 can certainly jump in, but I know Andy Loranger, the
6 Refuge manager had contacted several of the RAC members
7 living in the affected area to discuss this special
8 action with them, the Board also heard last week at its
9 meeting from Judy Caminer, who spoke, representing some
10 of the perspectives that were discussed by the Regional
11 Advisory Council at their spring meeting with regard to
12 some proposed regulatory changes, the transcript from
13 that discussion, the Regional Advisory Council discussion
14 last spring, was included as an appendix to the analysis
15 to ensure that the Board saw the full discussion that the
16 Regional Advisory Council had. You all received an email
17 from Judy Caminer on Sunday evening, which I made sure
18 was forwarded to everybody -- or select Board members got
19 it on Sunday evening and I forwarded it to everybody and
20 the InterAgency Staff Committee on Monday morning, and
21 then we received these four letters, which I've also
22 forwarded to the Federal Subsistence Board and the
23 InterAgency Staff Committee members as soon as I got
24 them. And I've had discussions with four attorneys
25 yesterday, one of whom was Sky Starkey who called me.

26
27 MR. CRIBLEY: I guess one other --
28 another question I've got, my understanding is is that
29 there is a second season, a winter hunt kind of we would
30 term it, that it's just a subsistence hunt, it's not a
31 State hunt also, so the only hunters are those who
32 qualified for subsistence permits, I guess my
33 understanding is, is that the Refuge manager has
34 discretion on that hunt if they choose and if I could get
35 a clarification on do they, do they -- has there been any
36 discussion of limiting that hunt or affecting that hunt,
37 based on what happens here today?

38
39 DR. WHEELER: Andy, did you want to take
40 that?

41
42 MR. LORANGER: Yes, it is correct, that
43 we are the in-season manager and by regulation we have
44 authority relative to opening or closing that season and
45 there have been discussions in regards to what steps need
46 to be considered moving forward depending on Board action
47 today.

48
49 MR. CRIBLEY: Because, I guess, my
50 understanding also is, is this action, whatever this

1 action is, does not affect that hunt so even if we do
2 restrict the harvest or what animals qualify for harvest,
3 either we'd have to readdress it again or it would come
4 back to what the current definition of what is
5 harvestable?

6

7 DR. WHEELER: Correct.

8

9 MR. CRIBLEY: Would it be the intent of
10 Fish and Wildlife Service to come back and ask for
11 another emergency adjustment on that or what -- is there
12 a plan there as to how they are planning on dealing with
13 that or do they know yet?

14

15 MR. BERG: This is Jerry Berg. We
16 actually did submit two special actions to OSM. One to
17 deal with this season and one with the late season. So
18 I guess depending on what happens here today, whether
19 that -- we may withdraw and change that special action to
20 mirror kind of what the Board does today or we may just
21 let that one go through, it kind of depends on what --
22 but, you know, we do intend to address it in some form.

23

24 MS. COOPER: But, Mr. Chair, can I.....

25

26 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

27

28 MS. COOPER: Mr. Chair. But regardless
29 of what this Board decides that October 20th to November
30 10th late hunt could be closed at any time for
31 conservation concerns by Andy. And this -- but it's
32 currently open to both spike fork and four brow tines or
33 three?

34

35 MR. BERG: Three.

36

37 MS. COLE: Three.

38

39 MS. COOPER: Three. So it couldn't
40 necessarily be modified like elimination of spike it just
41 could be closed?

42

43 MS. BERG: Correct.

44

45 MS. COOPER: Mr. Chair, can I ask a
46 question.

47

48 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

49

50 MS. COOPER: I've heard it bandied about

1 that there were only four moose taken by subsistence
2 users, was that for 15A or 15B or 15C or all of 15, do we
3 -- and I realize that number would grow significantly if
4 there was more opportunity for subsistence -- Federally-
5 qualified subsistence users than for sport users, but as
6 it stood last year, do we know if that four was as low as
7 it sounds?

8

9 MS. COLE: I do know from the table that
10 was included in the analysis that it is low. The actual
11 harvest under Federal regulations for Federally-qualified
12 users is low. For Unit 7 remainder, Unit 15A, Unit 15 B,
13 but -- I don't know how to qualify but there is more use,
14 more harvest within Unit 15C of spike-fork. And the
15 percentage of the actual harvest isn't included in that
16 table of what consists of spike-fork within those.

17

18 MS. COOPER: Thank you.

19

20 MS. COLE: And Table 7, basically shows
21 the number of permits that were requested or issues,
22 those individuals that hunted and those individuals that
23 were successful within those communities that have
24 customary and traditional use determination within 15.
25 Part of the argument from the concern of being Federal
26 users who are harvesting under State regulations
27 currently could then, under Federal regulation, harvest
28 without that competition because it would be closed under
29 State regulations, would see an increase, so looking
30 at.....

31

32 MS. COOPER: In success rate.

33

34 MS. COLE: Correct, yeah. So
35 individuals, for example, Unit 15, say Ninilchik, 153
36 were issued, 153 hunted but only 30 were successful. So
37 if you're looking at that 153 to 30 being successful
38 without that competition, could it be argued that that
39 may increase.

40

41 MS. COOPER: Or that the number of issued
42 permitted would go up anyway.

43

44 MS. COLE: Right.

45

46 MS. COOPER: Because we don't
47 (indiscernible - simultaneous speech).....

48

49 MS. COLE: Yeah.

50

1 MR. CRIBLEY: I guess, another question,
2 Mr. Chairman, is then if the Board decided not to take
3 action and they're -- I mean right now the assumption is,
4 is that there'll be a shift if we don't take action and
5 there'll be more subsistence permits issued, so that may
6 cause an increase in -- or we may not meet our objective
7 from the standpoint of reducing the bull harvest, if, in
8 fact, that did become apparent, Fish and Wildlife Service
9 or the Refuge manager would still have the option of
10 shutting down, too.....

11
12 MR. ARDIZZONE: You'd have to do a
13 special action, he doesn't have the in-season management
14 authority for the early season.

15
16 MR. CRIBLEY: No, I'm saying the late
17 season.

18
19 MR. ARDIZZONE: Thee late season.

20
21 MR. CRIBLEY: He could then defer or
22 decide not to have the late season hunt to try to offset
23 the -- or to try to balance out the harvest, but that's
24 another way it could go, I guess, that tool, if, in fact,
25 he did see either the -- or I guess the overall harvest
26 did not go down based on the decision or lack of decision
27 on the part of the Board, or final action on the part of
28 the Board.

29
30 MS. COOPER: I have another question.
31 Let me explain my thought process before I ask a
32 question. Just looking at the chart for 15A, 15B and 15C
33 where harvest is segregated by age class, it looks like
34 there are very, very few taken that are over 50-inches
35 and have more than four brow tines, and given that you
36 might consider that a trophy animal, I understand that
37 the responsibility of this Board is more to provide for
38 subsistence rather than manage for trophy; I'm a little
39 concerned that the subsistence opportunity is more
40 focused toward the spike-fork than those that are eating
41 animals in a lot of cases and that we would eliminate any
42 opportunity for subsistence users.

43
44 (Indiscernible - Beeping interruption)

45
46 MS. COOPER: So I guess one question that
47 comes to mind is -- and this is for either OSM or the
48 Refuge manager is, have we explored fully the option of
49 a quota of spike-fork take?

50

1 MS. COLE: Just in -- not at any length
2 other than saying what is under the alternatives
3 considered section that we have that it is possible. The
4 challenges that that would raise, in terms of executing
5 that quota, were really what was focused on, considering
6 the in-season manager, the timeframe of having a lot of
7 hunters in that area, how do you get word to them that
8 it's been -- the quota has been reached and you can no
9 longer harvest. And then harvest reporting within that,
10 obviously, is very, very critical. It's always a
11 difficult thing to get to begin with and then having it
12 to be such an expedited process, that's why it was
13 disregarded.

14
15 In addition, just to bring you back to
16 Table 4, this is just for spike-fork. Maybe this should
17 be a table that I have -- more harvest was actually done
18 by subsistence users for 50-inch or three brow tine than
19 there were for spike-fork.

20
21 MS. COOPER: Oh, is that right?

22
23 MS. COLE: Yeah. And that's in the
24 language, in the paragraph, but I didn't make a table
25 about it, but let me see if I can find -- yeah, so I can
26 see that -- if I had a calculator I could do it right
27 now.

28
29 MR. ARDIZZONE: I just want to make a
30 point, too, you got to remember, kind of focus in on brow
31 tines -- I'm sorry, Chuck Ardizzone, OSM. We're focusing
32 on brow tines here, but 50-inches is 50-inches, if you
33 have 50-inch antlers, you're legal, I don't care if you
34 have one brow tines, two brow tines, three brow tines or
35 four, we're kind of getting off on a little tangent on
36 the different brow tines, it makes a difference but there
37 are quite a few 50-inch bulls out there.

38
39 MS. COOPER: Uh-huh, you need to say or
40 instead of and.

41
42 MS. COLE: Yeah.

43
44 MS. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, if there are no
45 more questions.....

46
47 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Sure.

48
49 MS. SMITH:I would like to make a
50 motion. This is LaVerne Smith with the Fish and Wildlife

1 Service, and my motion would be that we adopt the special
2 action request 11-02 with one modification. And that
3 modification would be that we allow hunters to fill the
4 antlers at either the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge or
5 at the Forest Service office in Moose Pass, and this
6 would be in addition to being able to fill antlers at the
7 Fish and Game offices identified in the SAR. And I'd be
8 glad to provide my rationale and support for this motion
9 if I get a second.

10

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay.

11

12

MR. OWEN: Second.

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

I think that, you know, the biological
information clearly identifies that there's a
conservation concern in Unit 7 and 15. We're concerned
about the declining population numbers but I think even
more importantly we're concerned about the low bull/cow
ratios. We believe that if we take action now, hopefully
within a couple of years we could see good results and we
could see the population improving and the bull/cow
ratios improving.

We believe without similar action to what
the Board of Game has already done, it's likely that many
Federally-qualified users would shift their effort over
to a Federal permit and that would negate the
conservation gains that we're looking for.

Unfortunately I think we're in a
situation where the substantial harvest restrictions are
needed. This does just apply to the 60 day period and
more consideration of this will be ongoing through other
action.

A special action request to extend these
protections for the late season is still further action
as we just talked about earlier.

And we believe that if we don't take
action now that it could result in restrictions that
would be needed for a longer period of time as the

1 population would get to a lower level and it would be
2 harder for it to rebound.

3
4 This action should help us get the
5 population back to being a healthy and stable population
6 so we can return to a more liberal hunting regulations in
7 place for future years.

8
9 And we believe that subsistence users
10 will continue to be provided a priority with the
11 additional 10 days prior to the State season and 20 days
12 late season hunt.

13
14 We also believe that there will be long-
15 term subsistence users will benefit from the conservation
16 actions that we're taking because the population will be
17 healthier in the long-term.

18
19 We realize that putting all the hunting
20 pressure on the larger bulls is not sustainable for a
21 long-term strategy but the intent is for this to be a
22 short-term restriction that will, again, hopefully get
23 the population to respond fairly quickly.

24
25 Finally, the motion will allow hunters to
26 fill their antlers where it is more convenient for them
27 and this will provide us with more data for using in
28 managing the population.

29
30 I also just wanted to note that we do
31 realize that the Alaska Board of Game took their action
32 in March and it's taken us some time to complete our
33 independent review, we got all the data, we did an
34 independent review of all of the data and analysis and I
35 don't think we've done this, you know, lightly, I think
36 we've went into a lot of discussion, a lot of the review
37 of the data, and it was a very tough call but it's one
38 that we believe is in the best interest of managing the
39 population so that it's healthy for the long-term which
40 will benefit subsistence users.

41
42 And I think, myself, Jerry and Andy, we'd
43 all be glad to answer any questions during the discussion
44 period.

45
46 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any further
47 discussions.

48
49 MS. K'EIT: This is Kristin K'eit.
50

1 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Kristin.

2

3 MS. K'EIT: Thank you, Tim. I do have a
4 question, I don't want to lose the opportunity for
5 questions, it might take me a second here to kind of
6 formulate it. I'm trying to better understand what the
7 special -- emergency special action, what the effect will
8 be on our subsistence users, especially in the four
9 villages that are a part of that Southcentral RAC in
10 relation -- and understanding this effect in relation to
11 some of the points that were brought up by the
12 Southcentral RAC and Greg Encelewski's letter.

13

14 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Does anyone have
15 answers to her question?

16

17 DR. WHEELER: This is Polly Wheeler, Mr.
18 Chair. I don't want to speak out of turn here, and I
19 also don't want to speak for subsistence users, but I
20 think that Mr. Encelewski, in his letter, which I got at
21 2:24, so I probably sent it out to people at about 2:30
22 or quarter of 3:00, and he lays out what he sees as being
23 the impacts, he says this isn't an emergency, he
24 addresses some of the issues, LaVerne, that you've just
25 addressed, he says there's several options for addressing
26 conservation concerns that don't eliminate subsistence
27 opportunity, he makes the point that an extra 10 day
28 season is meaningless if the moose the hunter is allowed
29 to take are not available, he says that the RAC members
30 discussed this issue at the March meeting, that the Fish
31 and Wildlife Service can exercise expedited reporting and
32 emergency closure authority to control the Federal
33 subsistence harvest. They could -- Federal lands in Unit
34 15C could be closed which would reduce impacts. Only
35 residents of Ninilchik, Seldovia, Port Graham and
36 Nanwalek have C&T for moose in 15C so if those Federal
37 public lands were closed then that would provide
38 opportunity.

39

40 And I'm summarizing this as best I can,
41 Mr. Chair, and I don't know for those of you that have
42 had a quick opportunity to look at it, if you want I can
43 read it into the record if that would be better. I don't
44 know what the Board wants to do. I guess I'll take
45 direction from the Board, Mr. Chair.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 DR. WHEELER: Hearing none, I'll
50 continue.

1 He also says that if the Board is
2 concerned that there are too many potential subsistence
3 hunters for a limited number of moose that can be
4 harvested, the Federal Board should and must implement
5 .804, Section .804 of ANILCA analysis, meaning picking
6 from amongst those that are most dependent upon the
7 resource, similar to the State's Tier II system.

8
9 It says there's a number of spike-fork
10 moose that can be taken from 15C without causing an
11 emergency conservation concern, particularly since the
12 emergency is not so dire as to require the closing of
13 Federal lands to all those except rural subsistence -- or
14 rural residents, sorry, with C&T use, which is four
15 villages, and particularly since the State is allowing a
16 drawing hunt for 15B for moose outside the 50-inch four
17 brow tine restriction. He said if there is some number
18 of spike-fork moose available in 15C and he claims that
19 there is, then the Federal Board should issue permits for
20 the taking of this number of animals through the criteria
21 in Section .804 amongst those rural residents that live
22 in the four villages with C&T use.

23
24 MS. K'EIT: Thank you, Polly.

25
26 DR. WHEELER: I hope that's what you
27 wanted, Kristin, I'm sorry if it was sort of a rough
28 summary.

29
30 MS. K'EIT: I think it was adequate,
31 yeah, I think that works.

32
33 So are there any responses to that from
34 the Staff members or OSM Staff or the Refuge manager?

35
36 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

37
38 MS. COLE: Hi, this is Cole Brown with
39 OSM. We might want to defer to Andy but I got this from
40 him regarding the bull/cow ratio in Unit 15C, you want to
41 clarify that Andy.

42
43 MR. LORANGER: The bull/cow ratio in
44 Federal lands within the Refuge within 15C the Caribou
45 Hills area, primarily, Southshore, Tustumena Lake, et
46 cetera, is an area that traditionally has had high
47 bull/cow ratios. The moose composition surveys which
48 first indicated an issue with -- a potential issues with
49 bull/cow ratios in 15C occurred in 2007/2008 season. A
50 pretty drastic decline was indicated. In the following

1 years a more intensive survey of those traditional count
2 areas was conducted by the Department, which, once,
3 again, determined that the bull/cow ratio had fallen into
4 the low double digits, somewhere in the 10 to 12 range.
5 And in the most recent season, snow conditions allowed
6 for a much more comprehensive larger scale moose
7 composition survey by the Department in 15C so they did
8 addition -- in addition to those traditional count areas
9 where the problem was first detected they did some
10 adjacent survey areas in the vicinity of 700 to 800
11 square miles and classified over 700 moose and basically
12 confirmed the concerns about low bull/cow ratios, again,
13 being in the nine to 10 range per 100 cows, which is a
14 very -- very, very significant conservation concern from
15 any perspective.

16

17 MS. K'EIT: Okay. Okay. How about a
18 response to Mr. Encelewski's reference to .804 priority?

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 DR. WHEELER: I think that the defining
23 silence that you're hearing, Kristin, is that that wasn't
24 addressed -- it wasn't addressed in the analysis.

25

26 MS. K'EIT: Okay. So is it an option, is
27 it not an option because it's too precedent setting, is
28 it -- are we not at an extreme enough conservation issue
29 to look at something like that, what would be any
30 discussion on that area?

31

32 DR. WHEELER: Typically it goes -- you
33 know, typically they would go through a stepwise process,
34 where you would close Federal public lands, and then the
35 next step would be to do an .804, that's oftentimes how
36 it's done, although sometimes they are done in
37 conjunction with each other; in Unit 19A for moose, for
38 example. But the step hasn't been taken to close Federal
39 public lands to all but Federally-qualified users. I
40 think in this case, you know, since there are just the
41 four communities, going on Mr. Encelewski's letter, then
42 if Federal public lands were closed, maybe an .804 would
43 not need to be done, I don't know. But I think that the
44 first step of closing Federal public lands was rejected
45 as not -- as an alternative considered but that wasn't
46 the alternative that was put forward. So think that's
47 where it stopped.

48

49 MS. K'EIT: Okay.

50

1 MR. BERG: Well, and, Kristin, this is
2 Jerry Berg. You know, I think if you went to .804, that
3 would mean that, you know, you would be issuing some
4 permits for spike-fork and I don't know if you had a
5 chance to look at Figure 10 in the analysis, but you kind
6 of look at those different projected lines of where the
7 bull/cow ratios might end up and if, you know, once you
8 start harvesting some of those bulls you're just
9 reducing, you know, the impact that you're going to gain
10 from the restriction, so, you know, so like -- you know,
11 like LaVerne was saying you're just going to -- you could
12 end up with restrictions that would be in place for
13 longer if you were to allow some of those bulls to be
14 taken.

15
16 MS. K'EIT: Right.

17
18 MS. SMITH: This is LaVerne. Just to
19 build on what Polly and Jerry just said. I mean I think
20 as we started trying to evaluate this issue and looking
21 at the conservation concerns and the low bull/cow ratios
22 and some of the habitat changes and things that are going
23 on on the Peninsula, I mean we sort of summarized the
24 options, sort of four options, and this is in a very
25 broad and general way, but, you know, the most
26 restrictive, the most protected, where you would get the,
27 you know, the most conservation gains most quickly would
28 be to do some sort of closure.

29
30 The second option would be, sort of what
31 we're recommending, is to restrict it to the four brow
32 tines or 50-inches throughout. We sort of felt like that
33 that would make good progress towards the conservation
34 goal but it also still allows some -- it still allows a
35 subsistence harvest opportunity and it still allows some
36 recreational harvest opportunities as well and we felt
37 like that that was consistent with the recreational
38 purpose in ANILCA for the Kenai Refuge, which that's the
39 only Refuge we have that for, as well as with the
40 subsistence Title VIII requirement. So that's sort of
41 why we went with that sort of second option, we feel like
42 it makes good progress to the conservation goal, but it
43 still allows, you know, subsistence opportunity.

44
45 The third option is sort of where the
46 State is, which is the four brow tines and the 50-inches
47 except in 15B east where the State is allowing three
48 brown tines and 50 inches and so they're sort of a
49 different option than us at this point.

50

1 And then one of the other main options
2 that I think was looked at, when Cole went through the
3 different alternatives that were considered, was the idea
4 of going three brown tines and 50-inches throughout Units
5 15 and 7.

6
7 And we were sort of just trying to look
8 at those and choose the one that we thought would help us
9 make adequate progress on the conservation gain and still
10 allow some level of harvest and that's sort of how we
11 came in at that second option, which is short of
12 closures.

13
14 MS. K'EIT: Okay.

15
16 MS. SMITH: So that's why we didn't go to
17 .804 because we didn't choose the closure option.

18
19 MS. K'EIT: Okay. Thank you, LaVerne,
20 for that summary, I really appreciate that.

21
22 MR. OWEN: Question, Mr. Chair.

23
24 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

25
26 MR. OWEN: This is Wayne Owen for the US
27 Forest Service. LaVerne, on your motion you mentioned
28 the possibility of tagging at Moose Pass, however, I know
29 that our in-service [sic] manager Mr. Burcham, has been
30 speaking with ADF&G and it's my understanding that they
31 are open to sort of broader assistance in the antler
32 sealing. Maybe it would be -- maybe there's an
33 opportunity for other places, other than Moose Pass, you
34 know, for example, we have the Seward Office and we have
35 law enforcement officers that are sort of, you know,
36 cruising around that area, you know, and are familiar to
37 the people in those communities, just in terms of making
38 that service more convenient and the hunters that are
39 still out there more compliant to get their antlers
40 sealed.

41
42 MS. SMITH: That would be great, I mean
43 that's the goal, is to, you know, make it easy for
44 people.

45
46 MR. BURCHAM: This is Milo, can I make a
47 suggestion?

48
49 MS. SMITH: Yes, I -- well, I.....

50

1 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Yes, this is the
2 Chairman, go ahead.
3
4 MR. BURCHAM: Yeah. Along those lines,
5 rather than specify a location, maybe just specify
6 getting antlers sealed by Forest Service personnel or
7 Refuge personnel.
8
9 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Is that agreeable with
10 the maker of the motion, and the second?
11
12 MS. SMITH: It is.
13
14 MR. OWEN: It is with the second.
15
16 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay. Then we will
17 reword the motion. Are there further questions or
18 discussions.
19
20 MS. COOPER: Yeah, Mr. Chair.
21
22 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.
23
24 MS. COOPER: I would just like to ask the
25 Refuge manager if there are plans to go back to the RAC,
26 particularly at the end of the fall hunt, with kind of
27 the details of how it went, what the harvest looked like,
28 whether this is going in the direction we want it to go
29 in and then come back to -- so that the RAC has that
30 information to consider, particularly on a future
31 proposal that we might be considering, and bring that
32 information back to the Board as well?
33
34 MR. LORANGER: This is Andy Loranger, the
35 Refuge manager. Certainly our intention is to provide
36 the RAC with as much information as we have. The RAC
37 meeting may be prior to the fall moose composition
38 surveys so we may not have that information available but
39 we would certainly have harvest information from the
40 early season.
41
42 MS. COOPER: Thank you.
43
44 DR. WHEELER: And if I could add to that,
45 Mr. Chair, and for the other Board members, the Board
46 will be considering those two proposals at its January
47 2012 meeting and that kind of information will be
48 provided to the Board at that time, and the Regional
49 Council Chair can also weigh in too so there'll be
50 additional opportunities down the road given the

1 scheduling that we're dealing with.

2

3 MS. COOPER: Thank you.

4

5 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: And also to the fact
6 that since there's a lot of interest from the Traditional
7 Councils, I think if there's a way to do it conveniently
8 without creating a communications problem, you know, I
9 would like to -- I would personally like to see the
10 tribal councils get the information as soon as possible
11 also.

12

13 Further discussion.

14

15 (No comments)

16

17 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Is there a call for
18 the question.

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: If there isn't any
23 further discussion, I see that as the only.....

24

25 MS. SMITH: Can I call for the question
26 even though I did the motion?

27

28 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Yes, any Board member
29 could call for the question.

30

31 MS. SMITH: Okay, I would call for the
32 question.

33

34 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Question's been called
35 for, and there was a request that we vote individually.

36

37 DR. WHEELER: A roll call vote.

38

39 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: A roll call vote.

40

41 DR. WHEELER: I can do that, Mr. Chair,
42 if you'd like.

43

44 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Sure.

45

46 DR. WHEELER: Kristin K'eit with BIA.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50 DR. WHEELER: Kristin.

1 (No comments)
2
3 DR. WHEELER: That's weird. Is everybody
4 on line or is anybody on line?
5
6 MR. OWEN: yes, I'm still here, maybe
7 Kristin has her mute button pushed.
8
9 DR. WHEELER: Maybe she doesn't want to
10 vote.
11
12 (Laughter)
13
14 DR. WHEELER: Okay. Then I'll move up
15 the list. Wayne Owen with the Forest Service.
16
17 MR. OWEN: Aye.
18
19 DR. WHEELER: Deb Cooper with the
20 National Park Service.
21
22 MS. COOPER: Yes.
23
24 DR. WHEELER: Bud Cribley with the Bureau
25 of Land Management.
26
27 MR. CRIBLEY: Yes.
28
29 DR. WHEELER: LaVerne Smith with Fish and
30 Wildlife Service.
31
32 MS. SMITH: Yes.
33
34 DR. WHEELER: Tim Towarak, Chair of the
35 Federal Subsistence Board.
36
37 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Yes.
38
39 DR. WHEELER: And one more chance for
40 Kristin K'eit, BIA.
41
42 (No comments)
43
44 DR. WHEELER: Maybe she had to step away,
45 Mr. Chair. But there were five in favor and one didn't
46 vote, so, Mr. Chair, the motion would pass.
47
48 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay. That takes care
49 of the action today. And for those listening, too, I
50 would like to really reiterate that this is an emergency

1 situation and that we are open for any discussions on the
2 long-term solution to this temporary -- our current
3 situation. I think there's an overabiding concern for
4 conservation and if I remember right, part of our charge
5 as the Board for the subsistence -- Federal Subsistence
6 Board is to base our actions on long-term protection for
7 subsistence users on Federal land, and I personally try
8 to use that as a mantra in making my decisions. But if
9 there are opposing views to that -- to the current
10 action, we'd like to hear some of those while we're doing
11 our long-term solutions.

12

13 Any other actions at this meeting.

14

15 (No comments)

16

17 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Not hearing any, is
18 there a motion to adjourn.

19

20 MR. CRIBLEY: Motion to adjourn.

21

22 MS. SMITH: Second.

23

24 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: There's a motion and
25 a second to adjourn, any objections to the motion.

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Motion passes
30 unanimously.

31

32 Thank you all to those that are on line.

33

34 (Off record)

35

36 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska and Owner of Computer Matrix, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 2 through 30 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the Meeting recorded electronically on the 19th day of July 2011, Anchorage, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed under my direction;

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 27th day of July 2011.

Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 9/16/14