

FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE BOARD

WORK SESSION

BLM REGIONAL OFFICE
DENALI CONFERENCE ROOM
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

January 28, 2020
9:00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Anthony Christianson, Chairman
Charles Brower, Public Member
Rhonda Pitka, Public Member
Don Striker, National Park Service
Chad Padgett, Bureau of Land Management
Eugene Peltola, Bureau of Indian Affairs
Greg Siekaniec, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
David Schmid, U.S. Forest Service

Ken Lord, Solicitor's Office

Recorded and transcribed by:
Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
135 Christensen Drive, Second Floor
Anchorage, AK 99501
907-243-0668; sahile@gci.net

1 P R O C E E D I N G S
2
3 (Anchorage, Alaska - 1/28/2020)
4
5 (On record)
6
7 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Good morning.
8 We'll go ahead and start this meeting off this morning.
9 I'm Anthony Christianson, Federal Board Chair. I'd
10 like to welcome everyone here to the work session,
11 January 28th.
12
13 With that, I'll turn it over to Tom for
14 a minute.
15
16 MR. DOOLITTLE: Alrighty. Good morning
17 everybody.
18
19 REPORTER: Wait. Tom, your microphone.
20
21 MR. DOOLITTLE: My name's Tom
22 Doolittle. I'm the.....
23
24 REPORTER: Tom, please, your
25 microphone.
26
27 MR. DOOLITTLE:Acting Assistant
28 Regional Director with the Federal Office of.....
29
30 REPORTER: Tom. Tom, do it again, your
31 microphone's not on.
32
33 MR. DOOLITTLE:Subsistence
34 Management and so I welcome everybody to this work
35 session here starting on January 28th here at the
36 Federal building in Anchorage, Alaska.
37
38 The first thing I'm going to do is a
39 roll call for those members present and once we're done
40 with roll call and establish whether we have a quorum
41 I'll just make sure that we got around and probably do
42 introductions of the Board. There are new people that
43 are on the Federal Board right now and so I think that
44 would be appropriate to do.
45
46 So with the roll call. We'll start
47 with the National Park Service, Donald Striker.
48
49 MR. STRIKER: I'm present.
50

1 MR. DOOLITTLE: Bureau of Land
2 Management, Chad Padgett.
3
4 MR. PADGETT: Present.
5
6 MR. DOOLITTLE: U.S. Fish and Wildlife
7 Service, Greg Siekaniec.
8
9 MR. SIEKANIEC: Here. Thank you, Tom.
10
11 MR. DOOLITTLE: You betcha, Greg.
12
13 U.S. Forest Service, David Schmid.
14
15 MR. SCHMID: Present, Tom.
16
17 MR. DOOLITTLE: Bureau of Indian
18 Affairs, Eugene Peltola.
19
20 MR. PELTOLA: Eee.
21
22 MR. DOOLITTLE: Eee. Public Member,
23 Rhonda Pitka.
24
25 MS. PITKA: Here.
26
27 MR. DOOLITTLE: Public Member, Charlie
28 Brower.
29
30 MR. BROWER: (In Inupiat)
31
32 MR. DOOLITTLE: Ohhh.
33
34 (Laughter)
35
36 MR. DOOLITTLE: And Chairman, Anthony
37 Christianson.
38
39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I'm here.
40
41 MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay, we do have a
42 quorum. And I guess starting over with you, Chad,
43 we'll do some introductions.
44
45 MR. PADGETT: Chad Padgett, State
46 Director for BLM, Alaska.
47
48 MR. PELTOLA: Good morning all. Gene
49 Peltola, Jr., Regional Director for Bureau of Indian
50

1 Affairs.

2

3 MR. SCHMID: Good morning all. I'm
4 Dave Schmid. I'm the Regional Forester with the USDA
5 Forest Service here in Alaska.

6

7 MR. STRIKER: Good morning. I'm the
8 acting Regional Director for Region 11, Park Service
9 here. I've spent the last seven years as the
10 superintendent in Denali. So I have some familiarity
11 but fish will be new.

12

13 MR. DOOLITTLE: And, again, as I
14 introduced myself at the beginning, my name is Tom
15 Doolittle, and I'm the Acting Assistant Regional
16 Director for the Federal Office of Subsistence
17 Management.

18

19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And I'm Anthony
20 Christianson, the Federal Board Chair. Good morning.

21

22 MR. LORD: Ken Lord with the
23 Solicitor's Office.

24

25 MR. BROWER: Charlie Brower from
26 Barrow. We must be getting short on our budget, our
27 meeting rooms are getting smaller and smaller.

28

29 (Laughter)

30

31 MR. BROWER: Good morning everyone.

32

33 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thanks for that
34 reminder, Charlie. Good morning. Greg Siekaniec,
35 Regional Director here in Alaska for the U.S. Fish and
36 Wildlife Service. And thank you all for attending.

37

38 MS. PITKA: Rhonda Pitka, Public Member
39 from the village of Beaver.

40

41 MR. DOOLITTLE: And also for some of
42 our other guests that are in the audience. Is there
43 anybody from the Senior Advisor's Office from the
44 Department of Interior, on the phone lines or here?

45

46 (No comment)

47

48 MR. DOOLITTLE: Hearing none, anybody
49 from the State of Alaska.

50

1 MR. BURCH: I'm Mark Burch with the
2 Department of Fish and Game.

3
4 MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Mark. And
5 is there any other -- any other folks that'd like to
6 introduce themselves, representing the agencies or the
7 -- or the liaisons to the agencies.

8
9 (No comment)

10
11 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right. The
12 first order of business here is to review and adopt the
13 agenda as presented.

14
15 MR. BROWER: So moved, Mr. Chair.

16
17 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair.

18
19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, yes.

20
21 MR. PELTOLA: Before we move to --
22 since Charlie made a motion to adopt I'd like you to
23 make a modification of that to modify the agenda, if I
24 could.

25
26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead.

27
28 MR. PELTOLA: And what I'd like to do,
29 with Charlie's concurrence, is the motion is if you
30 look at the executive session agenda, we have review
31 agenda, information exchange, the OSM Staffing update
32 budget discussion. If you look at the Federal
33 Subsistence Board's meeting guidelines regarding
34 executive sessions, it stipulates executive sessions
35 are held at the discretion of the Chair for the purpose
36 of reviewing propriety data or private information
37 engaging in attorney/client communications, making
38 decisions on personnel matters, and addressing other
39 issues determined by the Chair to be appropriate for a
40 closed session for which a public meeting is not
41 required by law.

42
43 The items on the executive session I
44 don't feel meet the requirements of the executive
45 agenda and there isn't a reason why they should not be
46 discussed in a public forum so I'd like to make the
47 motion to move the OSM Staffing update and budget
48 discussion to the public agenda. And then under
49 executive session I'd like to put under there a Board
50

1 concurrence with the selection committee for the ARD of
2 OSM. The 2010 Secretarial Review stipulated that the
3 selection of the ARD for OSM was a Board decision.
4 We've had a panel that was created, that conducted
5 interviews. My understanding is that the last
6 interview was completed at the end of December and
7 nothing has been presented to the Board yet for full
8 consideration.

9
10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any discussion
11 on that amendment.

12
13 MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair.

14
15 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Greg.

16
17 MR. SIEKANIEC: The budget discussion
18 I'm not sure was prepared for a public discussion or
19 presentation. I don't know if that makes any
20 difference. I would like to ask, you know, Mary, and I
21 don't know if Brian is here yet, and, Tom, did you --
22 do you have any thoughts on whether that's -- I don't
23 think the information is of any issue, but the
24 presentation was not designed to be presented that way.

25
26 MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, I think the
27 presentation does get into kind of the nuances and has
28 a bit of Federal speak to it, and so it was designed as
29 more of an internal budget discussion but also in that
30 I think that we're fully capable of being able to -- to
31 explain it fully, you know, to make this appropriate
32 and to maintain transparency in the -- in the public
33 sec -- section as well. So I don't, personally, have
34 an issue with it.

35
36 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

37
38 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question or
39 discussion on the recommendation to -- what was that,
40 move the budget.....

41
42 MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, move the two items
43 from executive session, being OSM Staffing and budget
44 discussion to the public agenda. And then under
45 executive session, add the Board concurrence for the
46 selection committee for the ARD of OSM.

47
48 MR. BROWER: And the budget.

49
50

1 MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, so it would be
2 taking number 3 and 4 off the executive session and
3 moving it to the public session and then adding a 3, so
4 to speak, which would be the Board concurrence for the
5 selection committee of ARD of OSM.

6
7 MS. PITKA: Does the amendment require a
8 second?

9
10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, I was
11 just going to say I would like a second to that because
12 it's an amendment.

13
14 MS. PITKA: Okay, I'll second.

15
16 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any further
17 discussion on the amendment to the agenda as discussed.

18
19 MR. BROWER: Question on the amendment.

20
21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been
22 called. All in favor say aye.

23
24 IN UNISON: Aye.

25
26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Opposed, same
27 sign.

28
29 (No opposing votes)

30
31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion carries
32 unanimously. So we'll go ahead and go back to the main
33 motion to accept the amended agenda.

34
35 Call for the question.

36
37 MR. BROWER: Question.

38
39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All in favor of
40 the amended agenda say aye.

41
42 IN UNISON: Aye.

43
44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion carries
45 unanimously. Thank you.

46
47 We'll move on to information exchange.

48
49 Anybody up here has anything they'd
50

1 like to share.

2

3 Greg.

4

5 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
6 So just a couple of items.

7

8 I think most Board members would know
9 that, Fred Bue, our Yukon River in-season manager, for
10 the past several seasons has retired, so we'll be
11 having a, you know, new in-season manager there, which
12 is very appropriate given that the delegation is
13 actually to the office in Fairbanks, not to an
14 individual itself, so that'll be a fairly easy
15 transition to make.

16

17 Another retirement of note is Refuge
18 Law Enforcement Officer, Jim Hjelmgren, who has worked
19 incredibly hard to bridge this sort of relationship
20 between, you know, law enforcement and subsistence
21 users, rural users themselves, in regards to, you know,
22 what the Board here sets forth by way of both in-season
23 management and regulations that carry through multiple
24 years. So anticipate us, you know, filling that
25 position at some point in the future here. You know,
26 Jim did a great job for us at just building
27 relationships so we will miss him.

28

29 I've had some questions on the
30 Veteran's allotment that came out of the Dingle Bill
31 that, you know, told us to, you know, sort of figure
32 out what lands should be made available for the Vietnam
33 era Veterans that are still in that allotment selection
34 process so we've been working diligently and have our
35 report ready to go to the Department, which ends up
36 going to Congress for the purposes of fulfilling that
37 obligation, as was dictated by the Act itself.

38

39 And new hires, other things of
40 particular interest, maybe. Yukon Delta Refuge
41 Manager, Izembek and, of course, was already noted, the
42 ARD for OSM, we're in the process of looking and
43 working to fill those positions.

44

45 And then the Mulchatna Caribou Herd, is
46 the Board took some action on, just a short update of,
47 you know, very little evidence of illegal harvest
48 happening, of course, an incident here or there, and
49 then -- but we've had a great discussion with the State

50

1 of Alaska at the Alaska Board of Game meetings and it
2 looks like there could be some activity or interest by
3 the Board to kind of come in alignment with, you know,
4 making sure that we're taking care of the caribou from
5 a resource standpoint and try and figure out and give
6 that herd an opportunity to rebound or, you know, be
7 able to meet subsistence needs in the future.

8
9 So I would just offer those as a few --
10 few updates. Looking at my -- oh, Kaktovik bull moose
11 hunt of which had also been of interest to the Board
12 here, 10 permits and, to date, no harvest has been
13 reported. So we'll still wait to see if the spring
14 brings any harvest opportunity there from the Kaktovik
15 residents.

16
17 Oh, same, Unimak Caribou hunt, again,
18 of Board interest, 10 permits, quota of four bulls, but
19 also no harvest has been reported at this point in time
20 so.....

21
22 And with that I would -- thank you, Mr.
23 Chair.

24
25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
26 Greg.

27
28 Gene.

29
30 MR. PELTOLA: If I may, I'd just like
31 to build upon something that Greg, you know,
32 identified, is that when Jim Hjelmgren first arrived in
33 the Alaska region with the Fish and Wildlife Service,
34 he came from Minnesota, and he happened to be my
35 supervisor when he first came on board, when I carried
36 a Fish and Wildlife Service law enforcement commission
37 with the Service, he did bring a totally different
38 approach to rural law enforcement and he put a lot of
39 time and effort into building relationships and a lot
40 of the success that the Federal program has benefited
41 from over the years, especially with regard to the
42 Yukon, is directly attributable to Jim's efforts on
43 that river.

44
45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Chad.

46
47 MR. PADGETT: Thank you. Sorry about
48 the phone drop -- I need a mic drop instead of a phone
49 drop.
50

1 (Laughter)

2

3 MR. PADGETT: So just a couple of quick
4 things.

5

6 As everybody knows Dan Sharp, who was
7 our Staff person has retired. We are hoping to have an
8 announcement on the street for his position here
9 shortly, with the hopes of having that hired before the
10 April Board meeting.

11

12 So just a quick update on that.

13

14 And I have Nichole Hayes, who's our
15 branch chief for renewable resources, who's here with
16 us today, at least for a little bit, filling in and
17 trying to help me through it, babysitting me a little
18 bit. So I just wanted to make that announcement.

19

20 Along the lines of what Greg said as
21 well, on the Dingle Act, we've been working with BIA --
22 everybody's got a finger in this it seems, so we're
23 hoping to get some draft rules out here in the next
24 couple of weeks, but we have a decision memo that's
25 going to be before the Secretary before we do the draft
26 rule. So just to update everybody a little bit, we
27 will be having the draft rules out in a couple of
28 weeks, we hope.

29

30 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Dave,

31

32 MR. SCHMID: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Just a
33 couple of highlights here that dominated the Forest
34 Service business over the last several months.

35

36 One of those is the Alaska Roadless
37 Rule. We did put out our draft -- working on our Draft
38 EIS, and throughout Southeast Alaska and we received, I
39 think it was almost 400,000 comments from across the
40 country. As part of that, though, that I did want to
41 share, we did conduct subsistence hearings, .810
42 hearings, in, I think, 19 rural communities in Alaska
43 and those are all part of the record and we will be
44 making a subsistence determination here at the end of
45 the process.

46

47 Then up north here on the Chugach,
48 after a seven year effort, we're at the finish line
49 here with the Chugach Forest Land Management Plan. I

50

1 hosted objection meetings here last week in Anchorage
2 or the week before, and we'll be moving forward with a
3 final decision that'll guide the Forest here for the
4 next couple of decades likely. So that's been a
5 herculean effort as well to get done.

6
7 And so two milestones here as we're
8 moving forward.

9
10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other Board
11 members.

12
13 (No comments)

14
15 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: State.

16
17 (No comments)

18
19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
20 thanks. I think that concludes our information
21 sharing. If we keep at this pace we'll be done before
22 lunch.

23
24 (Laughter)

25
26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, I'm just
27 teasing.

28
29 (Laughter)

30
31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll move on
32 to the recommendations of the 2020 Fisheries Resource
33 Monitoring Plan.

34
35 Pippa, welcome.

36
37 MR. RISDAHL: Mr. Chairman. Members of
38 the Board. My name is Greg Risdahl. I'm the Acting
39 Deputy Assistant Regional Director for OSM, and also
40 the Fisheries Division leader.

41
42 First, I'm going to apologize, you're
43 all going to have to turn around.

44
45 (Laughter)

46
47 MR. RISDAHL: First let me allow my
48 colleague here to introduce herself as well for the
49 record.

50

1 MS. KENNER: Thank you, Greg. My name
2 is Pippa Kenner, and I'm an anthropologist at the
3 Office of Subsistence Management.
4

5 MR. RISDAHL: We do have a PowerPoint
6 presentation here to share with you today. The primary
7 goal here will be to give you a little.....
8

9 MS. KENNER: There's chairs in the
10 front here.
11

12 MR. RISDAHL: Thank you, Chris.
13

14 MS. KENNER: Should we do some lights.
15

16 MR. RISDAHL: I think it's all right.
17

18 (Pause)
19

20 MR. RISDAHL: All right, everybody
21 comfortable. Charlie, where'd Charlie go. Good.
22

23 MR. BROWER: Yep.
24

25 MR. RISDAHL: Okay. Again, my name is
26 Greg Risdahl, the Subsistence Division Leader for
27 Fisheries. The following presentation is an overview
28 of the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program or FRMP.
29 We're going to give you a little bit of information
30 about the process that we use to develop the draft 2020
31 Monitoring Plan during the second part of this
32 presentation.
33

34 Are you clicking for me, Chris.
35

36 CHRIS: I mean I can if you want.
37

38 MR. RISDAHL: Is it just the arrows,
39 oh, there we go, technologically challenged here, too.
40 Showing my age.
41

42 (Laughter)
43

44 MR. RISDAHL: Thank you. When the
45 Federal government assumed responsibility for
46 subsistence management on Federal public lands, the
47 Departments of Interior and Agriculture made a
48 commitment to increase the quantity and quality of
49 information available for management of subsistence
50

1 fisheries on Federal public lands and waters.

2

3 The FRMP was created in 2000,
4 specifically for this purpose.

5

6 The mission of the program is to
7 identify and provide information needed to sustain
8 subsistence fisheries on Federal public lands and
9 waters for all Alaskans through a multi-disciplinary
10 process.

11

12

13 The Fisheries Resource Monitoring
14 Program is organized around six regions that correspond
15 to fish stocks, harvest and community issues held in
16 common within specific geographic areas.

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

40 The final determination about which
41 projects to fund is made by the OSM Assistant Regional
42 Director, based on the availability of funding,
43 comments provided by the Councils, the ISC, the Board,
44 and the public, as well as a geographical regional
45 guidelines and TRC ranking.

47 The Technical Review Committee is
48 foundational to the development of the Draft Monitoring
49 Plan. It ensures the credibility and scientific

1 integrity of the proposal evaluation process. The TRC
2 is composed of senior technical experts from Federal
3 agencies and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.
4 The Office of Subsistence Management, Assistant
5 Regional Director approves nominations for the TRC.
6 Current members come from the Bureau of Indian Affairs,
7 the Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service,
8 Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Forest Service,
9 and, again, Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Two
10 OSM Staff members act as co-Chairs to facilitate the
11 project review process. For the 2020 Draft Monitoring
12 Plan that was Ms. Kenner and myself. The TRC reviews
13 and scores every project proposal submitted and the TRC
14 Is composed of a balance of fisheries biologists and
15 cultural anthropologists.
16

17 Some of the FRMP program's major policy
18 and funding guidelines are outlined on this slide. We
19 consider projects of up to four year in duration,
20 studies should not duplicate existing projects,
21 monitoring program funding is prioritized for non-
22 Federal agencies, strategies for long-term projects are
23 considered on a case by case basis, and it is
24 imperative to make sure we are funding the very best
25 projects and those that are ready for implementation
26 immediately.
27

28 There are some activities not eligible
29 for funding in the Monitoring Program. These include
30 such things as habitat protection, mitigation,
31 restoration and enhancement, hatchery propagation,
32 restoration, enhancement and supplementation,
33 contaminant assessment, evaluation and monitoring, and
34 projects where the primary objective is outreach and
35 education. Examples of these would be science camps,
36 technician training, or intern programs.
37

38 A question we're often asked is why are
39 these types of activities not also funded by the FRMP
40 Program. Simple answer is, there are other agency
41 programs that specifically address these kind of
42 issues.
43

44 There are five specific objective
45 criteria used by the TRC to select proposals for
46 funding. That's what you see up here on the screen.
47 These criteria are summarized in this slide. Studies
48 must have a Federal nexus and be responsive to issues
49 identified through the priority information needs
50

1 process, or we call it the PINS process. The technical
2 quality of the study design must meet accepted
3 standards for information collection, compilation,
4 analysis and reporting. Investigators must show they
5 are capable of successfully completing the proposed
6 study by providing information on the ability and
7 resources they possess to conduct the work.
8 Collaborative partnerships and capacity building are
9 priorities for the FRMP as well. In ANILCA, Title VIII
10 it mandates that rural residents be afforded a
11 meaningful role in the management of subsistence
12 fisheries. The Monitoring Program offers opportunities
13 for partnership and local resident participation in
14 monitoring and research for subsistence fisheries.
15 Finally, each project's cost is also evaluated for
16 reasonableness.

17
18 General budget guidelines are also
19 established by geographic region. These are displayed
20 on the slide. And this is in an effort to see that
21 some of the research and monitoring that takes place is
22 spread throughout the state of Alaska. The geographic
23 guidelines provide an initial target for planning,
24 however, they do not determine final allocations and
25 may be adjusted each cycle as needed to ensure the best
26 quality projects are funded. This process takes place
27 after the TRC has reviewed and ranked projects and the
28 Councils and ISC have had the opportunity to comment on
29 project summaries.

30
31 Yes.

32
33 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you. Could you
34 go back to the other slide.

35
36 MR. RISDAHL: You bet.

37
38 MR. SIEKANIEC: That Department of
39 Interior funds represents, is that this year that
40 you've put up there?

41
42 MR. RISDAHL: No, this is actually the
43 guidelines for the program as whole, and there will be
44 a slide.....

45
46 MR. SIEKANIEC: Okay.

47
48 MR. RISDAHL:I think it's the
49 second to the last slide in the program that shows.....
50

1 MR. SIEKANIEC: What it looks like this
2 year?
3
4 MR. RISDAHL:what the guideline
5 is as well as what this year's.....
6
7 MR. SIEKANIEC: Okay.
8
9 MR. RISDAHL:funding spread would
10 be.
11
12 MR. SIEKANIEC: Okay.
13
14 MR. RISDAHL: The total amount of
15 funding used for subsistence fisheries monitoring
16 through the FRMP program since its inception in 2000
17 through 2019 is an -- oh, for heaven's sake we didn't
18 change this one.....
19
20 MS. KENNER: We updated it.
21
22 MR. RISDAHL: We updated it, yes, we
23 did.
24
25 MS. KENNER: So we have better
26 information.
27
28 MR. RISDAHL: We went back through our
29 files, we -- basically what we found is the information
30 from 2000 to 2004 seemed a little odd, but we
31 discovered that there was a lot more money being spent
32 and actually this number should be \$117 million.....
33
34 MS. KENNER: From 2000.
35
36 MR. RISDAHL:since 2000 through
37 2019.
38
39 As a result the average cost per year
40 has changed as well to actually 6.2 million, and the
41 total number of projects that we have been able to
42 tally up through 2019 is 480. I apologize for that not
43 getting updated as well. It's updated in my slides.
44
45 This brings the average to about 25 new
46 projects per year.
47
48 So in 2019 OSM did spend about 3.5
49 million on the FRMP program. This included 29 projects
50

1 from the 2016 and 2018 cycles as well. OSM recommends
2 in -- today -- today, funding 21 projects out of 28,
3 that were reviewed by the TRC for the Draft 2020
4 Monitoring Plan.

5

6

Let's see here.

7

8

9 During the 2020 notice of funding
10 opportunity, 28 project proposals, as I mentioned, were
11 submitted by principal investigators that totaled about
12 \$10.4 million or about \$2.5 per year over a four year
13 funding cycle. It's important to note that the TRC
14 consider all 2020 project proposals worthy of funding,
15 so this year compared to the previous cycle, all the
16 projects that were submitted were considered high
17 quality projects and if we had enough funding we would
18 have funded all of them.

18

19

The remainder of my slides are now a
20 summary of the overview of the Draft 2020 FRMP
21 Monitoring Plan.

22

23

24

You'll recall that executive summaries
25 have been reviewed by the Regional Subsistence Advisory
26 Councils and the InterAgency Staff Committee. Both
27 have offered comments on the Draft 2020 Monitoring
28 Plan. Therefore, I'm not going to actually discuss
29 individual project proposals unless there are very
30 specific questions in which that case at the end of the
31 presentation OSM Staff would all be available to answer
32 questions.

32

33

34

Now, if you'd turn to Page 39 of your
35 book in the Draft 2020 FRMP Monitoring Plan you'll see
36 these numbers. The DOI average estimated allocation
37 for the 2020 FRMP projects is \$1.875 million per year
38 over a four year period. The USDA will contribute an
39 estimated \$277,000 in 2020. There is no estimate for
40 2021 through 2023 from the USDA at this time. The
41 estimated total cost of the Draft 2020 FRMP Program for
42 each of the four year funding cycle is also displayed
43 on this slide. So that's 2020 through 2023. Note, that
44 not all projects are four year projects, some are only
45 for three years. Years 2020 and through 2022 also
46 include some of the projects still being funded from
47 the 2016 and 2018 cycles. One more important thing to
48 notice is that the total estimated cost for each of the
49 four years of the 2020 cycle presented in this slide
50 are now considerably below the long-term average of

1 \$6.2 million. As the availability of funding continues
2 to decrease this level of funding is not sustainable.
3 It's especially important to understand this because a
4 new FRMP cycle will be coming again in 2022.

5
6 The reason why those numbers decrease
7 is in 2022 and 2023 the number of 2016 and 2018
8 projects are basically finished.

9
10 The 2020 FRMP projects that are being
11 considered for funding are listed in chronological
12 order in the table on Page 39 of your book. That's the
13 large table on the upper half of the page.

14
15 And for your information, this morning
16 we handed out two additional tables for you that
17 display the actual project rankings as done by the TRC.
18 This first table, with no white breaks between projects
19 is the entire list of the 28 projects listed in ranked
20 order versus the table on Page 39, it shows them in
21 chronological order. The second table that I've passed
22 out, it separates the projects by region so they're
23 ranked within each region on this second table. So you
24 can see actually how the TRC ranked them.

25
26 Again, the average estimated cost to
27 fund the 2020 FRMP projects is \$2.152 million, this
28 includes both USDA and the Fish and Wildlife Service,
29 or DOI funds.

30
31 For each of the projects listed on the
32 table in Page 39, you can see the proposal number, each
33 project's working title, the organization or
34 organizations that submitted the research or monitoring
35 project, the total cost of each project and the average
36 estimated annual cost.

37
38 This first slide shows the Draft 2020
39 Monitoring Plan projects that are being considered for
40 the northern region. They include a Bering LandBridge
41 National Park genetic stock determination study. A
42 Noatak River Dolly Varden project and a Dolly Varden
43 and whitefish traditional ecological knowledge project.

44
45 This slide shows the projects being
46 considered for funding in the Yukon region. They
47 include a Yukon River coho salmon telemetry project.
48 Yukon River chum salmon project. An Arctic lamprey
49 project. The Henshaw Creek weir. A Yukon River
50

1 subsistence salmon survey. A lower and middle Yukon
2 River customary trade project. And the Yukon River in-
3 season salmon management teleconferences. Some of
4 these you may recognize, they are projects that have
5 been continued from a previous cycle.
6

7 These are the Draft 2020 Monitoring
8 Projects being considered for funding in the Kuskokwim
9 region. They include a Kuskokwim River coho and
10 whitefish sonar project. The Pitka Fork weir. A
11 Kuskokwim River salmon assessment project. The
12 Kwethluk River weir. And a Kuskokwim River food
13 knowledge and place names traditional ecological
14 knowledge project.
15

16 For the Southwest region we have two
17 projects. The McLees Lake sockeye salmon escapement
18 monitoring project and a Kodiak road system subsistence
19 salmon and non-salmon project.
20

21 For the Southcentral region there are
22 two projects. The Klutina River sonar and the Tanada
23 Creek weir.
24

25 And last, but not least, these are the
26 projects being considered for funding in the Southeast
27 region. They include the Eek and Kasook Lake sockeye
28 salmon escapement project. And a Southeast eulachon
29 population dynamics monitoring project.
30

31 Greg, here's the question you had asked
32 earlier, it shows both the guideline and the current
33 proposed funding by region from both DOI and the UDSA.
34 And, of course, a lot of this depends on the kind of
35 projects you receive. For instance, you may not
36 receive any project for one region and you may receive
37 a lot from another, and what we have done here is, for
38 instance, if you look at the rankings of the two
39 additional tables that I handed out you'll see that if
40 you look carefully that there are some projects in
41 there that were ranked lower, but because those were
42 the only projects for that particularly region they
43 also are being considered for funding.
44

45 As I said before, all the projects were
46 ranked as good enough to fund by the TRC and based on
47 the amount of funding we have available this is how we
48 ended up.
49

50

1 This slide displays the amount of
2 funding that would go toward harvest monitoring and
3 traditional ecological knowledge as compared to stock,
4 status and trend monitoring by region. I guess,
5 historically, this was before my time with this
6 program, they used to shoot for about 30 percent HMTEK
7 and 70 percent SST and it looks like we're close to
8 that anyway. But honestly, today, many of the projects
9 have both elements of HMTEK and SST.

10

11 MS. PITKA: Can you please explain
12 those acronyms.

13

14 MR. RISDAHL: Harvest monitoring and
15 traditional ecological knowledge, that's what HMTEK
16 means; Harvest Monitoring and Traditional Ecological
17 Knowledge. So it's counting the number of fish that
18 are harvested and doing cultural anthropological
19 studies versus the science of counting fish migrating
20 up stream and trends from year to year.

21

22 Finally, this is an action item for the
23 Board as I mentioned. We're asking the Board to
24 comment on the Draft 2020 FRMP Monitoring Plan and to
25 make comments and recommendations to support or approve
26 the plan.

27

28 If there's any questions, we'll be
29 happy to take those now.

30

31 MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chair.

32

33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Dave.

34

35 MR. SCHMID: Yeah, a question, Greg.
36 So I know Staff has made me aware, I looked at the USDA
37 Forest Service funding and while we are funding a
38 couple hundred thousand this year, we have ongoing
39 projects as well, and so the magnitude, at least the
40 numbers they gave me, we have ongoing projects in 2020
41 that we're funding for about -- well, \$506,000 and then
42 with the two new projects here, you know, the total is
43 about \$784,000. That's, I think within the agency --
44 my question, are there other ongoing project -- what's
45 the total magnitude of the funding in 2020 across the
46 board relative to projects versus just the 2020, new
47 projects coming on board, do you have an idea.

48

49 MR. RISDAHL: Mr. Schmid, through the

50

1 Chair. So for 2019 there were 29 projects that are
2 still being funded from 2016 and 2018, and that -- the
3 cost of that is shown in -- well, it was shown on Slide
4 12, which basically says that in 2019 OSM is spending
5 approximately \$3.5 million on 29 projects and that
6 would include the USDA contribution as well.

7
8 REPORTER: Greg, lower that microphone
9 a little, it's still bouncing off the ceiling and
10 getting some feedback -- sorry.

11
12 MR. RISDAHL: Okay.

13
14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Tom.

15
16 MR. DOOLITTLE: Tom Doolittle, Acting
17 Assistant Regional Director. One thing that I did do
18 was do a budget exercise, if we were fully Staffed, and
19 that we could -- and whether we could handle the full
20 load of, you know, the Fishery Resources Monitoring
21 Projects and essentially for 2020 is that we could,
22 just barely at this particular funding level. And then
23 also -- but then in 2021, then that amount it -- then
24 we'd be a bit over, if we were at full Staffing levels,
25 and then in '22 and '23, we would be fine.

26
27 However, as you can see if we're adding
28 new projects in 2022, is that, the funding levels for
29 future resource monitoring projects will be
30 considerably less.

31
32 One thing that happened, going back to
33 2016, and Mr. Peltola may remember that from his tenure
34 at OSM, was at that time, we were in the situation
35 where we funded all the projects and at that time in
36 2016, we funded \$4.6 million worth of resource
37 monitoring projects. And when we did that, in those
38 subsequent years, we were paying back that larger load,
39 so that's one of the reasons I am reluctant to go
40 anywhere near the averages, and you'll see in our
41 budget presentation, toward the end of our open session
42 here, on kind of why we want to even fund this one at a
43 lower level. And, specific to -- and so I don't want
44 to see the program constantly catching up.

45
46 Last year, also, I forward funded about
47 \$1.8 million to take care of projects that were in
48 FY'16, 17, '18, and forward funded some, you know, that
49 we could take care of some of the burdens that we'd
50

1 experienced in 2020 and '21. So really our outlay in
2 2020, due to forward funding, is a lot less.

3
4 The same in 2021, is that I actually
5 grabbed some of those projects for 2021 to forward
6 fund, those previous or existing projects, so that
7 financial burden to the program would be less.

8
9 However, in a climate of forward
10 funding, we can do this kind of project level funding
11 that we're presenting today but in the next cycle
12 without that level of forward funding, and the reason
13 for that forward funding was obviously the Staff
14 shortage that we'll be discussing later, at OSM, those
15 FTE costs were moved into, you know, paying, you know,
16 forward funding those resource monitoring projects.

17
18 So it's not -- forward funding
19 processes are not sustainable, period.

20
21 It just happens to be a luxury at this
22 moment and at this time.

23
24 And then more specifically, to Dave's
25 question, is that the Forest Service is maintaining
26 their responsibilities through their USDA budget to pay
27 for existing projects in Southeast and in partly in
28 Southcentral. And also there is a larger, you know, a
29 first time contribution for taking on Southcentral and
30 Southeast projects at an estimated cost of \$277,000 for
31 FY'20. One of the goals that we've had and Dave might
32 be able to speak to it more specifically, or one of his
33 Staff, is that the goals are eventually to decrease the
34 amount of existing burden that the Forest Service has
35 relative to the existing projects and trying to pool or
36 funding together as one whole project, so we don't see
37 that fragmentation and I think, you know, part of
38 Dave's, you know, concern is like are we including the
39 \$500,000 in existing projects that the Forest Service
40 is paying for. And the answer to that at this moment,
41 Dave, is no, you're still paying for those existing
42 projects. So, yes, the cost of the FMRP [sic] in total
43 is -- is greater than what we've -- than what we're
44 depicting, if you look at those existing project costs
45 that the Forest Service is -- is also paying for at
46 this particular time.

47
48 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

49
50

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Tom.

2

3 Dave, questions.

4

5 MR. SCHMID: No, thank you. That helped
6 me considerably. And, yes, we are, Tom, working, you
7 know, with appropriated dollars as well to fund this
8 and I agree, I think long-term, as what you've
9 indicated, is where we want to end up as well.

10

11 MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

12

13 MS. PITKA: Mr. Chair.

14

15 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Rhonda.

16

17 MS. PITKA: So I noticed in your
18 presentation you indicated that these -- was it the
19 rankings are prioritized for non-Federal agencies; do
20 they get further points, is that what I heard you say?

21

22 MS. KENNER: Thank you for the
23 question, Mr. Christianson -- Ms. Pitka.

24

25 So the prioritization of money for non-
26 Federal agencies occurs primarily through the ranking
27 pro -- through the scoring process with the TRC so one
28 way that the prioritization occurs is that if -- we
29 receive proposals from any entity, any government
30 entity, university, and the more a project is partnered
31 with a rural organization, a non-government, a rural
32 organization, the higher points they get in partnership
33 and capacity building.

34

35 MS. PITKA: Thank you. So on Page 39,
36 it indicates that pretty much 40 percent of the funding
37 goes to non-Federal agencies, that doesn't include the
38 State funding because 38 percent of that funding goes
39 to the State of Alaska, with 22 percent going back to
40 the Federal government. I want to point this out just
41 so that it's transparent and very clear, that a
42 majority of this funding goes towards funding State and
43 Federal agencies, and less goes to those other
44 organizations. So it's been a concern of mine for a
45 long time, that very important monitoring projects that
46 are critical for management, for in-season managers, go
47 into a competitive process instead of being funded by
48 their particular agency as a core function. And I
49 think this process sort of really illustrates that for
50

1 me.

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

I understand that all of the agencies have had tremendous budget cuts, but it's very bothersome to me that it gets put into this competitive process for such important and crucial projects for management.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Rhonda, that's a great point and I had noticed that and had asked a similar question when I was talking with our ISC team member. And I want to point to the line that says Kuskokwim under the Federal agency of 181,583 when in actuality, we pass through 119,000 of that amount to the Native Village of Kwethluk for them to do the weir work. So these numbers are a little bit off in what they're actually presenting.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, Greg, and we had that discussion yesterday about, you know, maybe taking it one more level because there's -- like you said, some of these, that they are subcontracted out to, and there was a few examples yesterday that we discussed that, even though the Federal agency or the State agency is the lead and gets the grant, that there is subcontract work and some of those larger ones were to Native or rural organizations and so we kind of tasked maybe that we can take a look at other subset so that it maybe gives a clearer picture of who the partners are and where the money actually ends up.

So I mean we did have that in our briefing.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah. Charlie.

MR. BROWER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to echo some of the -- on the northern region, that the Advisory Councils from the Northwest, their concern about the beaver activity and is not a priority, I think the communities within that Northwest

1 area, that lives around the river, knows what's
2 happening and how it can be detrimental to their
3 subsistence activities and it's not a priority, and it
4 was a concern, I guess, brought out by that Advisory
5 Council -- why it wasn't pointed as a priority list,
6 when the migration of more beavers coming in affecting
7 their areas -- I'm just curious on that.

8
9 MR. RISDAHL: Mr. Brower, through the
10 Chair. Actually that project was on the PINS, or
11 priority information needs list of that region,
12 however, when the TRC scored the projects it did not
13 score in the upper part of the scoring and as a result,
14 with the amount of funding we have available it did not
15 quite make the cut. Like I said, we all agreed that it
16 was still a worthy project, but we only had X amount of
17 funding and we couldn't quite reach down as far as we
18 would have needed to in order to pick that project up
19 as well.

20
21 MR. BROWER: Thank you. But at the
22 long run, you know, when people live in these
23 communities know and see it first-hand, it's bothersome
24 that, you know, their proposals or their requests are
25 not approved to what they want.

26
27
28 Then another concern I have is what's
29 this Arctic lamprey thing in the Yukon project, is it a
30 -- they don't use that fish anymore, it's so muddy,
31 there's no more dog teams to feed them with -- what's
32 the -- I mean just to put transmitters to see where
33 they're going; is that right?

34
35 MS. KENNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr.
36 Brower. Thanks for the question. So as matter of fact
37 through the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program, and
38 the investigation into non-salmon fish uses on the
39 Yukon River, particularly in the GASH area, there's a
40 substantial number of Arctic lamprey that are taken
41 each year, there's an active subsistence fishery. I
42 think one of the reasons why there's -- there's
43 probably two reasons why this is shown up as a PIN, as
44 a priority information needs several times, and as you
45 know the priority information needs are developed by
46 our Regional Advisory Councils. One is that we don't
47 know a lot about the migration of lamprey, and however
48 people do rely on it. And the second is that they're
49 either -- there has been small commercial utilization
50

1 of lamprey in that area and there may be more in the
2 future, and I think that's a couple of the reasons why
3 it has come up on our priority information needs.
4

5 We tend to be very -- we have been very
6 salmon centric on the Yukon and the Kuskokwim because
7 of the issues, and that's appropriate, but there are
8 other species used for subsistence.
9

10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Rhonda.
11

12 MS. PITKA: So last night Pippa gave me
13 a presentation on eel harvesting and lamprey harvesting
14 because I had honestly never seen one and then I texted
15 back and forth with a couple of friends of mine from,
16 you know, who have experience in lower river with the
17 lamprey and it's really a very fascinating harvest
18 method. They take a stick with a couple of nails and
19 then they swirl it around in an ice hole and then they
20 pull it up, it's really fascinating. I spent a lot of
21 time on this last night and I really appreciated it.
22

23 Thank you.
24

25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other
26 questions in regards to the Fisheries Monitoring Plan
27 presented by the Staff.
28

29 MR. SIEKANIEC: Please.
30

31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg.
32

33 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
34 Thanks Greg and Pippa. A couple of questions.
35

36 One, so there's nothing under multi-
37 regional, is that just there's never been any projects
38 submitted under multi-regional?
39

40 MR. RISDAHL: Yeah, Mr. Siekaniec,
41 through the Chair. This cycle there were no multi-
42 regional projects.....
43

44 MR. SIEKANIEC: And so there's also no
45 carryover.....
46

47 MR. RISDAHL:submitted.
48

49 MR. SIEKANIEC:so is that --
50

1 because it was zero in both columns. So I was just
2 wondering if it's.....

3

4 MR. RISDAHL: That's a good question.

5

6 MS. KENNER: Well, what does he mean by
7 carryover?

8

9 MR. RISDAHL: From 2016/2018.

10

11 MR. SIEKANIEC: Yeah. I thought that's
12 what I saw in the one slide.

13

14 MS. KENNER: Oh.

15

16 MR. SIEKANIEC: And you don't have to
17 -- I just noticed that and thought, well, is that a
18 remnant of this that we'd no longer need to consider
19 because we don't ever get multi-regional or -- so.....

20

21 MS. KENNER: Thank you for pointing
22 that out, and it should be fixed. We have one
23 carryover project from 2018 that's multi-regional.

24

25 MR. SIEKANIEC: Okay. And then, Greg,
26 you had indicated, I think you called them worthy, so
27 is that -- and I think I asked this same thing last
28 year, I apologize, so is that the TRC that is
29 responsible for making the determination as to whether
30 or not the project itself, as submitted by the
31 principal investigator, meets the intent of this
32 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program?

33

34 MR. RISDAHL: Okay, Mr. Siekaniec,
35 through the Chair. two things come to my mind.

36

37 As I mentioned, in the past cycles, the
38 TRC, when they ranked projects, they did have projects
39 that they did not consider were fundable, that were
40 just not up to par, and they color-coded the projects
41 green, yellow and red. And the red projects were
42 essentially those projects that just were not good
43 enough to fund; yellow projects were projects that they
44 felt were fundable, they may need some additional help
45 to bring them up to the technical standards required
46 for a study, and of course the green projects were the
47 ones that were basically ready to go.

48

49 So this cycle the TRC, they didn't have

50

1 any red color-coded projects, they were mostly green
2 and there were a few yellow projects. And in the case
3 of a yellow color-coded project, the process has been
4 to go back to those principal investigators and say
5 these are some of the additional things that might be
6 needed to bring your project up standard to be
7 technically sound and get the results that we need to
8 have to be really useful for the Program.

9
10 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you. And we had
11 some yellow from this year that we had to go back to
12 the principal investigators on?

13
14 MS. KENNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair and
15 Mr. Siekaniec. This is Pippa Kenner.

16
17 What had been done in previous years is
18 they picked a cut off line, and I thin it was around
19 60, that anything under 60 was in that 60 point
20 score.....

21
22 MR. SIEKANIEC: Okay.

23
24 MS. KENNER:was in that yellow
25 range unless it was unfundable; there's something wrong
26 with the principal investigator, the organization, or
27 something about it that we could not go back and work
28 on with them to fund it.

29
30 This year the scores were low. The
31 scoring was a little bit low and the TRC thought that
32 all the projects that had been submitted could be
33 brought up to the -- that all of those investigators
34 could respond to the TRC comments in a way that would
35 have made that project higher ranking and more in line
36 with our program. And so if the -- if funding -- if we
37 were able to reach them with funding, those lower
38 scoring ones that had a lot of comments from the TRC
39 could not go in the water as written. An attempt would
40 be made to work with those investigators to bring those
41 projects up to a better level.

42
43 But this is not -- this is after this
44 process. The scoring of the proposals is only made on
45 the proposals that we receive.

46
47 MR. SIEKANIEC: So the scoring of the
48 proposals and then hence the recommended funding column
49 does represent projects then that you have to go back
50

1 to and work -- I'm trying to make sure I followed that
2 train there -- so you have to go back on some of them
3 and work the principal investigator to make sure they
4 meet the intent.

5

6 MS. KENNER: What I'm concerned -- this
7 is Pippa again. What I'm concerned about is that you
8 think that all these projects were of such high quality
9 they could all be funded right now.

10

11 MR. SIEKANIEC: Yep.

12

13 MS. KENNER: The process is before we
14 write the cooperative agreement, we always go back to
15 the investigator and we look at the TRC's comments. We
16 have to do a budget analysis, make sure the budget
17 matches the project. There's always some correcting
18 that goes on before we write the cooperative agreement.
19 With projects that were lower scoring, that we -- that
20 possibly the funding could reach, the TRC has a lot of
21 comments of things that should be fixed before funding,
22 we will go to the investigator and request those fixes,
23 and work with them to make that, if the investigator
24 isn't able to, then we'll move on to the next project.

25

26 MR. SIEKANIEC: Okay, thank you, Pippa.
27 So I'm just -- so you're asking, I guess -- you're
28 asking the Board to approve this without having a clear
29 understanding that the project's actually reachable, so
30 I'm just trying to figure out how we should be thinking
31 about that.

32

33 MS. KENNER: I'm not quite sure what
34 you mean by reachable.

35

36 MR. SIEKANIEC: Well, you said if you
37 go back and the principal investigator can't do what
38 was recommended by the TRC they get bumped off and then
39 you go to a lower funded project and that's not
40 reflected in here.

41

42 MS. KENNER: That's.....

43

44 MR. SIEKANIEC: You're kind of asking
45 the Board to just approve a lump sum without a real
46 understanding of what projects will actually represent
47 the list for this year to a point. That's all I'm
48 trying to figure out.

49

50

1 MS. KENNER: Okay, thank you. This is
2 Pippa again. I might be being a little bit too
3 transparent.

4
5 MR. SIEKANIEC: Yeah, okay.

6
7 MS. KENNER: This is the process we go
8 through every year and it's required for cooperative
9 agreement funding.

10
11 MR. SIEKANIEC: Okay. So maybe the --
12 I think what I heard Greg say, the TRC has decided that
13 these are all worthy of funding, so they're in
14 agreement then with the list that you had put forward,
15 the way that it looks right now?

16
17 MR. RISDAHL: Mr. Siekaniec, through
18 the Chair. Basically, as I said, when the TRC scored
19 the projects we unanimously -- we were the
20 facilitators.

21
22 MR. SIEKANIEC: Yep.

23
24 MR. RISDAHL: But the unanimous
25 conclusion was that all the projects were good
26 projects. Some were just -- looked like they were
27 ready to go right out of the box, others said, oh,
28 there were a few tweaks and things that probably should
29 be made to be able to bring forth the technical results
30 that we need to find out. Some of them there were some
31 questions about how they had done their budget
32 calculations, or, you know, various, it could be any
33 number of things, but in the end there was nothing so
34 egregious or poor in any of the projects proposed for
35 this funding cycle that would make them unfundable.
36 And we basically reached down the list as far as we
37 could go, to pick up as many projects as we possibly
38 could.

39
40 And as Pippa is saying, I mean if
41 something comes up and one of the project investigators
42 says, yeah, I really can't do that, then we would
43 probably drop that project and move down the list to
44 pick up the next one based on the availability of
45 funding, if we could afford it.

46
47 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you. So I think
48 what I heard out of there is, yes, you Chaired that,
49 and the TRC and you're in agreement that this list
50

1 represents their work?
2

3 MR. RISDAHL: Yes. Mr. Siekaniec,
4 through the Chair. This is the work of the TRC.
5

6 MR. SIEKANIEC: Yeah, okay.
7

8 MR. RISDAHL: And we're all in
9 agreement with that.
10

11 MR. SIEKANIEC: Okay.
12

13 MR. RISDAHL: And then on Page 39, the
14 way those projects are -- they're listed there in
15 chronological order so they're not listed by ranked
16 order on Page 39, we did that specifically -- we didn't
17 want the Councils or the ISC or anybody to look at
18 these projects and start comparing, well, this one
19 should be higher than that one, we gave the projects in
20 chronological to everybody at the start just to say
21 these are the projects, to get their comments on the
22 projects, we didn't want to have people comparing one
23 over another. So that was the original purpose there.
24

25 But in the end the projects as they
26 come out -- well, here's an example.
27

28 You don't see the -- you don't actually
29 see the scores on these projects on either of these
30 tables, but there are, for instance, a couple of
31 projects for one of the regions, and we can talk about
32 this later in more detail, that actually were lower
33 down the ranking scale, but because they were the only
34 projects for that region we have opted to suggest
35 funding those projects as well so that we can spread
36 out the research across the state.
37

38 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Greg. And I
39 think maybe a couple of more questions if you don't
40 mind.
41

42 So on this draft funding
43 recommendations that came out earlier, as an example,
44 20-351 was identified at \$400,000 and then in a table
45 that was provided this morning it's at \$858,000. I'm
46 not sure if -- was that just an error in the draft that
47 was put out a little while ago, and the project
48 submitted actually was for the 858?
49
50

1 MS. KENNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Mr.
2 Siekaniec. This is Pippa Kenner.

3
4 So the way the funding calculations are
5 done is you fund projects in a region until if you
6 funded one more project, your funding guideline would
7 be reached. Then you go to the next region and you
8 fund projects in ranked order until funding another
9 project would exceed the guideline. Then you can go
10 back and you can look at ties and you can look at the
11 next highest scoring project statewide and continue to
12 fund that way.

13
14 The project that you're referring to
15 was the last project to be considered for funding
16 through this ranking and regional funding process. And
17 the TRC and the ISC had said that this project could
18 not be funded at that level of funding, that it wasn't
19 appropriate and so when we are suggesting to you, in
20 this draft, our draft funding recommendation, we
21 reduced that by half to make it more in line with the
22 TRC's recommendation.

23
24 Now, we haven't gone back to the
25 investigator, we've just said -- this is next on the --
26 if this project were to be funded, it would only be
27 funded at this level. But we still have to work that
28 out.

29
30 MR. DOOLITTLE: Through the Chair.

31
32 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep.

33
34 MR. DOOLITTLE: Tom Doolittle, Acting
35 Assistant Regional Director.

36
37 I think the answer, Greg, is that when
38 you're down at the bottom of the list, you're trying to
39 get to the next project in line and sometimes there
40 might be a point spread or in lots of different
41 circumstances, and when you look at that as a group and
42 from the final decision, when the Assistant Regional
43 Director for OSM, you know, allocates that funding, is
44 that we will see, you know, whether we can fit in that
45 project or not at the discretion of the proponent.
46 And, in fact, I think I know of most, you know, area
47 regional directors for OSM in the past have done that,
48 and I remember in the last cycle there was a Federal
49 agency that was, again, the last one on the list and we
50

1 asked them, hey, would you take a -- you know, this
2 kind of a cut so we could fit you in because that's the
3 only way we can get to you with the amount of available
4 funding that we had in our budget at that time. So
5 this -- that process -- if I'm reading, A, the
6 question; and, B, the answers from Staff, correctly, is
7 essentially for that last type project type to be
8 funded and whether we can stretch out those last
9 dollars.

10

11 Is that correct, Pippa?

12

13 MS. KENNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr.
14 Doolittle. Yes, that's correct.

15

16 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Tom. Yeah, I
17 think that does answer it because I think in the
18 earlier draft you had made that cut with a \$400,000
19 availability instead of the 858 and that's what I was
20 trying to figure out, the difference between those two,
21 so if that's that.

22

23 The only other comment I would make is
24 that, you know, I've -- for 35 years I've not been a
25 proponent of dividing up regions and just providing a
26 certain percentage of money to regions, and, rather, I
27 much prefer the idea that you look at, well, what are
28 the needs that are from a conservation standpoint
29 and/or anthropological standpoint that really rise to
30 that priority level without just saying we're going to
31 go reach lower scoring quality type projects just to
32 push some money in that direction.

33

34 So that's just a comment, I think the
35 Board needs -- should struggle with that at some point
36 in time.

37

38 So, thank you, Mr. Chair.

39

40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Gene.

41

42 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. A
43 couple comments.

44

45 One is specific to 20-351 and I also
46 noted and it was brought to my attention about Staff
47 had concerns about it. If you look at Page 19 the
48 total project cost is 858, annual 214; but if you look
49 at Page 39 the same project is 400,000 total, 100,000

50

1 annual. So my exposure to FRMP has been that we have
2 never really provided an opportunity for the principal
3 investigator, going through the point where you get to
4 the TRC ranking, to modify the proposal and it seems
5 like there has been a benefit attributed to this
6 program that has not been attributed to other proposals
7 in the past.

8

9

That's one comment.

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

2. That's a lot different than the
funding decision made by the ARD. And it has been
commonplace within the program, example, you're in
Region X and you're trying to decide whether you could
get between Project 6 and 7 on that list, and the ARD's
over the history of the program, have looked at each
individual and said, okay, you stipulate, the PI, if
you could do this project for \$80, by going through the
budget it has been commonplace, I did learn as ARD, I
know my predecessor did, calling the PI, we could get
to you and fund this if you're able to accept \$60,000
and it does not take away from the primary benefit of
the proposal itself. A lot of times the PI will say
yes. That is different than within the TRC process,
with regard -- within the FRMP process of modifying a
proposal in process.

There's two different things we're
talking about. The ARD making the funding decision and
then the proposal changing as it goes through the FRMP.
That's the one thing I'd like to point out.

The second point I'd like to make
before we get to you, Pippa, is that, and that's the
Chair's prerogative, but is if you look at the.....

(Laughter)

MR. PELTOLA:intent of the
program, and you might correct me on this, Pippa, is
the blue book, was it titled, which is the guiding
principles for FRMP, when the FRMP process was
established, I have no problem with the regional
percentages, I have no problem with the split between
TEK and, you know, monitoring, enumeration projects,
the blue book stipulated those percentages between
regions such that -- and if you read through the blue
book it's specific, such that, no one agency or program
and no drainage, i.e., the Kusko or Yukon, would

1 dominate the funding cycle because we have 10
2 established regions under Title VIII of ANILCA. There
3 was proposed 12 to 14 but it was cut back to 10 such
4 that those regions are reflective of subsistence
5 harvest practices within the best fit for the state of
6 Alaska and the rural residents who we provide for.
7 There's a particular reason, purpose behind those
8 percentages, behind the split between enumeration and
9 TEK, in addition to, if we minimize the TEK, which I
10 know some advocate for and some do not advocate for,
11 that could potentially remove the rural organizations
12 who are engaged in the Federal program, we may not have
13 otherwise, if we start toying with the percentages and
14 that's split between TEK and enumeration.

15
16 MS. KENNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair and
17 Mr. Peltola. I just wanted to point out that all of
18 these projects were scored based on the applications
19 that we received. So none of these have -- those
20 applications haven't changed. We haven't gone back and
21 asked anybody to change it.

22
23 In the past what we would have done, is
24 we would have stopped funding before we reached our
25 limit and so some of these bottom projects would not
26 even be here. For the sake of transparency, because we
27 were under our cap, we suggested that if we were to
28 continue funding, and if we were to find the extra
29 money this project could not be funded at that larger
30 level and that it just happened to be one of the end
31 projects, the last projects that we recommended for
32 funding. So the proponent, the applicant was not given
33 any advantage and this is a draft funding plan and we
34 appreciate your comments.

35
36 Thank you.

37
38 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
39 Board Member Peltola. Help me understand what you
40 said, I don't think I followed you. That there was a
41 project that was given some consideration within the
42 either ranking or the TRC's review, or what was.....

43
44 MR. PELTOLA: Here's an example that I
45 was involved in when I was ARD of OSM.

46
47 So we had a particular region. A
48 project came in funded, say, at the \$80,000 level. And
49 so we had \$62,000 available that we could continue to
50

1 fund. So within that, and within the regional
2 hierarchy, in addition to the overall TRC ranking, the
3 next project we would have been able to get to was this
4 \$80,000 project. We didn't have -- we were \$18,000
5 short. So I made the phone call to the principal
6 investigator, by looking at your project, here's one
7 line item, so which I identified, because I had some
8 personal exposure to that, I said, I know that you have
9 addressed that particular line item last year and may
10 not necessarily be a big as need as when you wrote this
11 proposal, if you were to accept \$60,000 as opposed to
12 80, would you consider that because then we could fund
13 you. The PI said, yes, you are correct, we did that
14 fund that line item so, yes, we can continue with the
15 project with the original goals and objectives without
16 losing anything if we were to be funded at the \$60,000
17 level. It was a boat.

18

19 (Laughter)

20

21 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you. But you
22 said there was a project in this list that was given
23 not that level of consideration, it was done
24 without.....

25

26 MR. PELTOLA: Oh, no, what I said
27 was.....

28

29 MR. SIEKANIEC: I'm sorry.

30

31 MR. PELTOLA: My view of the list that
32 came about, which 20-351 kind of flagged it for me, is
33 that if you look at the other projects, we don't have a
34 50 percent reduction in the budget for any other
35 projects, so what I'm saying is that, by the TRC going
36 through this process, some how the \$858,000 overall
37 budget has been reduced down to 400,000, and so that
38 one particular project may have been afforded attention
39 and consideration that the other projects may not have
40 been given. And no other budget has been modified to
41 try to fit into a position so where it could
42 potentially be funded.

43

44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Tom.

45

46 MR. DOOLITTLE: Through the Chair.
47 Yeah, and Gene that's very well taken, because I don't
48 think that -- you know, I don't think that was intent,
49 but, again, it can be perceived as being pre-

50

1 decisional, and I do not want to do that and so I'll
2 take -- again, as the responsibilities of -- that I
3 call the five-legged stool, as the decisionmaker, both
4 in the TRC's rankings and their notes about how they
5 went through the process, the Board and RAC comments,
6 as well as the geographic distribution, and the final
7 leg of the stool being the ARD as the decisionmaker
8 would look at that, and if there looks like there's any
9 aspects of pre-decisional aspects, then those projects
10 can be affected by that as well. So that, we'll take a
11 look at, and you're absolutely correct, is that, that
12 should be post a decision, and it should have been
13 reflected at the full \$800,000 level.

14

15 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. If
16 this process was to the reduction of the budgets, per
17 se, if that occurred at the ARD level, once the TRC has
18 finalized their aspect of their engagement with the
19 FRMP, then it would not be of a challenge, but since it
20 occurred during the ranking process, so to speak, then,
21 yeah, I have some concerns.

22

23 I'd like to also mention one other
24 concern.

25

26 Is that I'm not talking about anybody
27 in particular, but the members of the TRC are required
28 to sign a confidentiality agreement. It has been
29 brought to my attention from Staff and others that
30 there's been information that was only presented to the
31 TRC that filtered out to individuals who have not
32 signed that confidentiality agreement, which means that
33 some members have not taken as seriously as they should
34 have. When my briefing occurred with my Staff, we were
35 talking about the projects and I was not exposed, nor
36 did I ask to be exposed -- actually I chose not to be
37 exposed to the point scoring system, because that is
38 something that is only contained and should be held
39 with the individual that signs that confidentiality
40 agreement, and so somewhere along the lines the system
41 is not being executed the way it was intended to
42 because information is filtering out.

43

44 And if you look at the structure with
45 regard to FRMP today it had a big evolution, so to
46 speak, three to four years ago. The reason the FRMP
47 had that quote/unquote "evolution", is that the way the
48 program had been executed, it wasn't -- decisions were
49 made not based on the merits of a principal

50

1 investigator, the priority information needs, or the
2 merits of a program, a lot of decisionmaking was based
3 on a PI or advocate of the PI's ability to lobby the
4 Board, the RAC, and that's how we -- that's one reason
5 why the program modified the program to the way it is
6 today.

7
8 I think we need to continue down this
9 road, without modification, such that we get a true
10 aspect of having the system work. I'm a strong
11 advocate and was adamantly and vehemently argue about
12 leaving the percentages in place, leaving TEK in place,
13 because it addresses and assures that one, one agency,
14 one program does not dominate and one region does not
15 dominate and we have subsistence requirements and needs
16 throughout the state.

17
18 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
19 So, Gene, again, I'm just trying to figure out, then on
20 the 20-351, do you feel that that should be retained
21 within this list for this year or should that be
22 recommended to be held off until it gets resolved?

23
24 MR. PELTOLA: Based on the role that
25 the TRC has played within the program, we have come out
26 with a ranking, Staff has flagged that particular
27 project with some concerns. So what we have asked the
28 Board to do, the RACs to do and such, is that, I don't
29 think it would be appropriate for the Board to change
30 this list we've been given by OSM, but I think it's
31 within our purview to say that we have enough concerns
32 about this one particular project that we should
33 consider, potentially not funding that, or any other
34 project if it brings up yellow or red flags to this
35 level.

36
37 MR. SIEKANIEC: Uh-huh.

38
39 MR. PELTOLA: And if we are to do that
40 it would -- I think, my personal opinion, is that it
41 would fall under the guidelines established for the
42 program, and, two, for example -- if we decided to move
43 it -- I'm not advocating for it or opposing that, but
44 if we decided to remove 20-351, that would mean that
45 anywhere from the 214,677 as stipulated on Page 16 or
46 the \$100,000 stipulated on Page 39 would be available.
47 What I would anticipate and hopefully expect then is
48 that since -- if that project was not funded, through
49 the funding decision of the Acting ARD at this time,
50

1 that he sit down with Staff, look at the ranking within
2 that region, if they're under the percentile for that
3 region, and determine whether they go to the next
4 project or not.

5

6

Long answer, yes.

7

8

MR. DOOLITTLE: And, therein lies the
9 reason for the last leg of the five-legged stool, is to
10 really look at these and look at these comments for the
11 ARD in the decision process and this review process and
12 take into those comments. So the role of the Board, as
13 part of this, very similar to what the role of the
14 Regional Advisory Councils are in the process, is to
15 provide comment, both on process and when they see, you
16 know, like these kinds of discrepancies. And this
17 particular one, again, you know, will be addressed, and
18 it was going to be addressed, you know, anyways, you
19 know, in the final decision process and the second
20 obviously part of that, is whether there's the
21 available funds. And when there's available funds, you
22 know, if there's less money, then, again, the rankings
23 come into play about where everything shifts again, and
24 that's an important concession to make in all of this,
25 is that, none of these will come down for the final
26 decision until we have a realized budget.

27

28

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you. Thank you,
Gene, for those explanations. So I'm trying to figure
out -- so, Pippa, you said there were a number of them
that kind of rose to that last year's perspective on
yellow because, you know, last year we were given this
red, yellow, green way to look at the projects -- this
year there's -- I thought you had said, there's a
handful of yellow projects that are in there, so I'm
trying to figure out what we would do, what we should
do with that as a Board. It feels like we should
almost say, well, if the yellow projects still need to
have work with the principal investigator, from a Board
decision, we should pull those yellow projects off,
agree with those that have risen to that level of
absolutely everything is there that's needed and ask
them to be revisited and then come back to us with a
conference call and say, okay, this is what it should
look like now, we've negotiated that out with the
principal investigators, Gene, just as you had
indicated, seems to be the right time.

1 MR. PELTOLA: I -- through the Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead,
4 Gene.

5

6 MR. PELTOLA: Based on Pippa's response
7 to your earlier question, I get a feeling like there's
8 a fixed spot where a project is green, and then a fixed
9 spot where a project is yellow and a fixed spot where a
10 project is red, so to speak. That varies for every --
11 that would vary -- this year it may be at a project
12 that was scored 66 or above was green, but that all
13 depends on the number of projects that the program has
14 received, what the TRC has scored them at, potentially
15 with what level of funding is available through -- for
16 the FRMP, so that is -- that's a fluid position. It'
17 snot fixed on a chart somewhere.

18

19 And the way the system is established,
20 I would have -- let's go back to 20-351, if the Board
21 feels like that shouldn't be funded, I'm okay with that
22 decision, if we decide as a group. So what then would
23 happen with the 200 or \$100,000 available, I would
24 expect the ARD to say that, okay, we're dealing with
25 the Kusko, that is slated for 26 percent, we're
26 currently funded at 22 percent, I could bring the next
27 one up on the list, whatever that may be, or if we pull
28 it out and they happen to be three percentile over, and
29 at 25 percent, then that's where the overall ranked
30 projects as the program sees it, as come out by the
31 TRC, so the next ranked one, since we are at already
32 the funding level for the Kusko, we might go to the
33 next one on the list. The next one on the list may be
34 \$47,000 for, you know, Region Y, and they are under
35 funded and so I would expect the ARD to take the next
36 on the overall ranking list and apply it to a different
37 region.

38

39 So it's -- I have no problem with the
40 ARD making those determinations.

41

42 I don't think the Board has to get into
43 the position where we give it back to Greg and to Pippa
44 and say come back and redo your homework and come back
45 and give us -- I don't think we need to come back in in
46 a teleconference. I think if we're going to take an
47 action, and, say, like 20-351 is this sticking point
48 because it's something that has red-flagged us,
49 especially when in the pamphlet materials there's a 50

50

1 percent reduction in the budget so there's something
2 going on there.....

3

4 MR. SIEKANIEC: Something going on,
5 yeah.

6

7 MR. PELTOLA:so I would have no
8 problem with the Board saying, let's look at that one
9 particular project, nothing else is flagged, should we
10 consider funding that, I think that's within the
11 purview of the Board, as long as we don't start saying,
12 well, I like the third one down after that project so
13 we should fund that one instead of the next one on the
14 list.

15

16 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg.

17

18 MR. RISDAHL: Mr. Chairman. So just
19 another example to speak to what Gene is talking about.
20 It varies. It would vary depending on the projects you
21 get, the quality, how they're scored, how they fall out
22 in the total ranking. So in this case 351 was at the
23 bottom based on the amount of funding we thought we
24 could afford so we decided that -- about -- we could
25 afford about \$1.8 million for new projects for 2020, it
26 was right at the bottom. Now, if we decided that we
27 could afford a full two million that project wouldn't
28 have been a problem at all to just bring it in, but
29 because there was questions about it, the project, we
30 would -- there are certain aspects about the project
31 that are definitely beneficial, so by bringing it in at
32 a lower level we could possibly help fund that project.

33

34 Now, we haven't even spoken with these
35 people, I haven't, certainly, to ask them about how
36 this would be done, but we felt there was value in that
37 project. But there were also things that were probably
38 being done -- this is what -- you know, I'm not
39 supposed to go into details about it but there were
40 things about it that didn't make it rank as high. It
41 was at that lower level.

42

43 But based on the amount of funding that
44 we have available, we thought we could possibly fund
45 that project at a lower level as well.

46

47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg.

48

49 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

50

1 Gene, thanks for the clarification on these, you know,
2 in process, and, you know, I, like you, I have not been
3 party to any of the scoring perspectives or ranks. So
4 I'm still at a little bit of a spot on how we move
5 forward with this because I think we need to move
6 forward with it and give them the opportunity to get on
7 with their business. Right now I think I would be
8 inclined to say that we ought to pull 20-351 just off
9 the slate for right now, while you work through whether
10 the, you know, those issues can be addressed, and then I
11 agree, Gene, then move forward and let the Assistant
12 Regional Director figure out how they want to move that
13 funding down into the rest of the proposals.

14

15 Yeah, and, unless, I hear other things,
16 that seems like that'd be a reasonable way for the
17 Board to respond then.

18

19 MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, Greg, and Gene,
20 both, and respectfully to the Chair, is, instead, I
21 think again giving that ARD purview in that
22 recommendation to look at those last projects and how
23 that was done, and with the full understanding, you
24 know, there's no issue there. In the past the Board
25 was the one that actually, you know, provided the
26 recommen -- you know, the -- basically said who was
27 going to get funded and not years ago. And so it was
28 decided by the Board that, you know, we would go
29 through this five-legged stool process and so I would,
30 you know, it -- it really -- in a future review, in a
31 future work session, you know, as we go through this
32 process, I think it's always good before we get to the
33 2022 cycle, is that, we work through some of these
34 nuances where we've seen problems, or whether we could
35 do it better or not. But, again, to -- to make the
36 recommendation for that further review and that
37 scrutiny on that particular project, it seems very
38 reasonable.

39

40 But on the other aspects, to have
41 additional meetings and also to take on the
42 responsibility that the Board is going to basically,
43 rather than recommending a list for funding, suddenly
44 become the decisionmaker, that used to be -- you know,
45 that now as the ARD, I think needs to go through a new
46 process considering that we published in the NOFO,
47 we've gone through an ISC recommendation, we've gone
48 through, you know, the TRC's review, and -- and I think
49 that that's an important caveat to remember, as far as
50

1 a matter of process.

2

3 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

4

5 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Rhonda.

6

7 MS. PITKA: So from my perspective, I
8 disagree with the Board being the final decisionmaker
9 on the FRMP process just because the fact is that we
10 fund a lot of Fish and Wildlife Service proposals, a
11 lot of government proposals and I think, that in it
12 itself, is a conflict of interest; that we never really
13 get transparent about.

14

15 I've seen through reading this book
16 that several of these proposals have no letters of
17 support submitted. So that, to me, brings a level of
18 concern also. Is that a requirement for this program,
19 and if it is and if people are not submitting those
20 letters of support, does that then drop their scoring,
21 is, I think, my main question.

22

23 And then my other question is just some
24 of the -- yes, some of the -- it's just a little off
25 for me.

26

27 Can you explain?

28

29 Thank you.

30

31 MS. KENNER: Thank you for the
32 question. Through the Chair. Ms. Pitka.

33

34 So, yeah, an applicant is required to
35 submit a letter of support if they are actually
36 partnering with another organization. So if they're
37 going to partner with the tribe or another rural
38 organization, we need a letter from that organization
39 saying we are partnering, and that usually has to do
40 with budgeting. They're going to be receiving some of
41 the funds.

42

43 On the other hand, when somebody is
44 applying to do research in an area, maybe not
45 specifically with a participating community, sometimes
46 with a community they want to participate with them,
47 for instance, in doing harvest surveys, you're not
48 required to submit a letter of support.

49

50

1 The TRC does take that into account.
2 We have really good projects with no letters of
3 support, we have lower scoring projects with letters of
4 support.

5
6 Thank you.

7
8 MS. PITKA: Thank you. Thank you for
9 that clarification.

10
11 I had one more specific question about
12 a specific project and it's 20-352 on Page 24. The
13 improving communications and sharing of information.
14 So it doesn't list out the partners. Is the Kuskokwim
15 River InterTribal Fish Commission one of the partners
16 on that project? And my concern here is that we don't
17 duplicate work that's already being done by the
18 Kuskokwim River InterTribal Fish Commission.

19
20 MS. KENNER: Thank you. Through the
21 Chair. Ms. Pitka. We're confirming that we know that
22 on Page 24, we're referring to the project number 20-
23 352 improving communication. This was not a formal
24 partnership with another organization although there
25 would be communication probably with the InterTribal
26 Fish Commission and agencies, and definitely with
27 communities. This was primarily led by the Alaska
28 Department of Fish and Game, Subsistence Division.

29
30 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair.

31
32 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Gene.

33
34 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
35 With regard to 20-352, if I recall one of the slides
36 out there, one of the key terms we had was outreach, it
37 was part of your FRMP presentation, you had those areas
38 we do not fund; one of those was outreach, and this
39 proposal talks about communication and outreach so
40 there's kind of a conflict there.

41
42 And with regard to, it seems like part
43 -- a lot of the discussion is 20-351, it sounds to me
44 like Board Member Pitka's comments -- and I might be
45 reading between the lines, is that, she might be
46 stipulating that -- and correct me if I'm putting words
47 in your mouth.....

48
49 MS. PITKA: I will.

50

1 MR. PELTOLA:but it seems like
2 leave the decision up to the ARD and not have Board
3 direct the decision; and I'm fine with that as well, as
4 long as it's a process we can articulate and justify
5 those actions.

6
7 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Rhonda.

8
9 MS. PITKA: So I think what I was
10 pointing out was having clarity, I suppose, between the
11 Board's role and the ARD's role, because the ARD is
12 ultimately the decisionmaker in this process, right?
13 Am I correct in that? I mean it goes through this
14 whole process, but ultimately the ARD makes the
15 decision.

16
17 MS. KENNER: (Nods affirmatively)

18
19 MR. DOOLITTLE: Mr. Chair.

20
21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Tom.

22
23 MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, and thank you,
24 Rhonda, for that, and, again, as that comment --
25 because, again, the five-legged stool. The Board
26 comments are part of that for the ARD's, you know,
27 final decision, and then in looking at that project and
28 then also from Mr. Peltola's position, all are
29 digested, along with RAC comments as well, and why we
30 go through this process, exactly, is that it becomes a
31 more formed [sic] and objective way for the
32 decisionmaker. So that's what I like to see.

33
34 And then also in the -- in the working
35 group, because I've been out in Bethel, is that, again,
36 InterTribal Fishery Commission does participate as a
37 member, along with other stakeholders and are invitees
38 to those kinds of meetings, at least they have in the
39 past.

40
41 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

42
43 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair.

44
45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Gene.

46
47 MR. PELTOLA: One general comment is
48 that Staff had presented to me concerns about 20-351,
49 in general, and the thing that raised it to a different
50

1 level for me, when I look at 351 versus the others, it
2 was the only proposal line that had a 50 percent
3 reduction. And would it bring this much attention if
4 we had two differing figures between 19 and Page 39,
5 maybe not, but since that did occur, the yellow flag
6 became a really bright chartreuse flag, so to speak.
7 And my comments are not about the project itself, it
8 may be a very good project, we have very good principal
9 investigators, but since we had a 50 percent reduction
10 then my question became how applicable is it to Federal
11 management then if one, the proposal came in and we
12 considered it, oh, but then we cut it in half, so
13 that's why it raised the amount of concern from the ISC
14 Staff and myself.

15

16 MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

17

18 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Charlie.

19

20 MR. BROWER: So let me get this right.
21 We're thinking of pulling 351 out, is that right?

22

23 MR. SIEKANIEC: It's an option.

24

25 MR. PELTOLA: It's an option, yeah.

26

27 MR. BROWER: Then if that's an option,
28 how many unrated other proposals -- are you coming back
29 to fill it at that amount or it's just lesser amount of
30 funding?

31

32 MS. KENNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
33 This is Pippa Kenner to Mr. Brower.

34

35 So 20-351 was the next fundable project
36 and so given the comments that we're receiving from the
37 Board, which we appreciate, we would have left 351 off
38 the list. It takes us over our estimated budget. I
39 looked at previous years and Staff did try to hit close
40 to what our estimated budget was so we have 1.8
41 million, this puts us to 1.875. This project would not
42 -- if we were to do what you're asking us to do we'd
43 just remove it from the list. And I think that it
44 sounds like several people on the Board have a concern
45 about that.

46

47 Because it would be the next fundable
48 project, it was the last one.

49

50

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank
2 you, Pippa.

3
4 And I guess Charlie was getting at we
5 would just move down to the next priority pointed
6 project on the list.

7
8 MS. KENNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair, for
9 that question. This is Pippa Kenner. So what I'm
10 saying is this would be the next fundable project and
11 so we would stop at just under 1.8 million, we'd stop
12 there, that's our funding estimate for now, we can't
13 reach the next project, so this project would not be on
14 the list. And if funding were reduced, it would be the
15 first one to go because it's the last ranked project.

16
17 Not in -- it's not the last ranked
18 project in the pool of projects -- we got you.

19
20 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg.

21
22 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
23 Are you ready for a motion.

24
25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, I am.

26
27 MR. SIEKANIEC: You've been ready for
28 one for quite some time.

29
30 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

31
32 (Laughter)

33
34 MR. SIEKANIEC: At this point in time,
35 after all of the discussion and comment, and having
36 heard concerns from both Gene and Staff on, you know,
37 the 20-351, I would like to move to approve the 2020
38 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Plan with modification of
39 removing Project 20-351 for consideration at this time.

40
41 MR. BROWER: Second.

42
43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion's been
44 made and second. Any further discussion.

45
46 (No comments)

47
48 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
49 call for the question.

50

1 MR. SIEKANIEC: Question.
2
3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been
4 called. Roll call.
5
6 MR. DOOLITTLE: Alrighty. So.....
7
8 REPORTER: Tom, your microphone.
9
10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, hold on one
11 second.
12
13 REPORTER: I just want Tom to turn his
14 microphone on.
15
16 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.
17
18 MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay. Alright.
19 Everybody's heard the motion and we'll start with the
20 vote on accepting the projects for proposed funding by
21 the Federal Subsistence Board.
22
23 We'll start with Public Member Rhonda
24 Pitka.
25
26 MS. PITKA: Yes. I support.
27
28 MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay. Charlie Brower.
29
30 MR. BROWER: Yes.
31
32 MR. DOOLITTLE: BIA, Eugene Peltola.
33
34 MR. PELTOLA: Yes.
35
36 MR. DOOLITTLE: U.S. Forest Service,
37 David Schmid.
38
39 MR. SCHMID: Yes, I support.
40
41 MR. DOOLITTLE: U.S. Fish and Wildlife
42 Service, Greg Siekaniec.
43
44 MR. SIEKANIEC: Yes.
45
46 MR. DOOLITTLE: Bureau of Land
47 Management, Chad Padgett.
48
49 MR. PADGETT: Yes.
50

1 MR. DOOLITTLE: National Park Service,
2 Donald Striker.
3
4 MR. STRIKER: Yes.
5
6 MR. DOOLITTLE: And last, but not
7 least, Chairman Anthony Christianson.
8
9 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.
10
11 MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay. That passes with
12 everybody unanimous.
13
14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay.
15
16 MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you.
17
18 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Let's take a
19 break, five minutes.
20
21 MR. PADGETT: Mr. Chair.
22
23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, one second,
24 Chad.
25
26 MR. PADGETT: Sorry. Just really quick
27 before we take a break. I just have an important
28 announcement, do you mind if I make it.
29
30 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead.
31
32 MR. PADGETT: I'm sorry, something I
33 failed to do this morning when we were talking about
34 information exchange. I just want to make everybody
35 aware of a couple of things.
36
37 One, yesterday in the building we had
38 an incident with an IED, or an incident -- an explosive
39 device, sorry, I can never say it, here. It made the
40 news last night but I just want to make everybody
41 aware, we did have that, it was contained at the
42 courthouse. so for safety purposes in case we have any
43 further incidents, just so everybody's aware, do not
44 use the elevator, and there will be a notification, but
45 do not use the elevator, we'll leave through the
46 stairwell to the right, there's also another stairwell,
47 you'll see exit signs down the left, so you can use
48 either of those two ways. Our muster point is behind
49 the museum on the Fifth Avenue side by the bus stop.
50

1 So I just want to make sure in case we have another
2 incident, that everybody knows where to go.
3 Unfortunately we were not notified yesterday of the
4 incident, at least BLM wasn't, it was just a few
5 agencies. I believe it was contained in the
6 courthouse. So we're working through that now, so.....

7
8 (Laughter)

9
10 MR. PADGETT: So I would hope that we
11 would notified this time. So I apologize, I should
12 have mentioned that this morning.

13
14 Thank you.

15
16 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for
17 that.

18
19 (Laughter)

20
21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll be
22 looking around the corners differently now, thank you.
23 Be back in 15 minutes.

24
25 Thank you.

26
27 (Off record)

28
29 (On record)

30
31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll go ahead
32 and get back to the meeting here.

33
34 (Pause)

35
36 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: That brings us
37 to the RFR, request for reconsideration for Unit 2
38 deer.

39
40 Terry.

41
42 MR. SUMINSKI: Good afternoon. I'm
43 Terry Suminski with the United States Forest Service.
44 I manage the -- oh, I'm sorry, it's actually morning
45 still, isn't it.

46
47 (Laughter)

48
49 MR. SIEKANIEC: It may not feel that
50

1 way.

2

3

(Laughter)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 The threshold analysis for request for
11 reconsideration RFR18-01 begins on Page 41 of your work
12 session books.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. SUMINSKI: I guess I was getting ahead of ourselves. I manage the subsistence program for the Tongass National Forest.

The threshold analysis for request for reconsideration RFR18-01 begins on Page 41 of your work session books.

In response to Wildlife Proposal, WP18-01, submitted by the Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council, the Federal Subsistence Board reduced the deer harvest limit for non-Federally-qualified users hunting under State of Alaska hunting regulations on Federal public lands in Unit 2 from four male deer, to two male deer.

The proposal also asked for a reduction in the State managed deer hunting season in Unit 2 but that portion of the proposal was not supported by the Council or the Board.

The Council submitted this proposal after public testimony during their winter 2017 meeting in Craig where Federally-qualified subsistence users testified that they had a harder time harvesting deer in Unit 2 during the 2016 season. In supporting its proposal, the Council felt that subsistence needs were not being met and a reduction in the harvest limit for non-Federally-qualified users would provide a rural resident priority. The Council also believed that non-Federally-qualified users would not be adversely affected since the average -- since they averaged two deer per hunter and a reduction from four to two male deer would not make a huge difference in the overall harvest. The Council voiced concerns that if the Alaska Department of Fish and Game harvest objectives continued to be exceeded there could be an imminent conservation shortage if the Council did not take preemptive action to provide for a rural subsistence preference.

Subsequently the Board received six requests for reconsideration. One from the State of Alaska and five from residents of Ketchikan, specifically Matt Allen, Chas Edwardson, Jeff

1 Hendrickson, Andy Mathews, and William Meck. The full
2 text of those requests can be found in Appendix 1,
3 which begins on Page 55 of your books.
4

5 The Federal Subsistence regulations
6 outline the guidelines for submitting a request that
7 the Board reconsider regulatory decisions. The Board
8 will accept a request for reconsideration only if the
9 request meets one or more of the following criteria.
10

11 1. Provides information not previously
12 considered by the Board.
13

14 2. Demonstrates that existing
15 information used by the Board is incorrect.
16

17 3. Demonstrates that the Board's
18 interpretation of information, applicable law, or
19 regulation is in error or contrary to existing law.
20

21 Each request was carefully reviewed,
22 consolidated and organized by criterion by the OSM and
23 Forest Service Staff. A total of 12 claims were
24 identified.
25

26 I will now go through each claim.
27

28 Under Criterion No. 1, which is the
29 information previously not considered by the Board.
30 Claim 1.1 was from the State of Alaska. The Board did
31 not consider the impacts of creating more regulatory
32 confusion where State and private lands are found
33 throughout the game management unit. The preliminary
34 assessment of Claim 1.1 is that the extent of Federal
35 public lands was described on Page 4 of the Staff
36 analysis by stating that Federal public lands
37 compromised approximately 72 percent of Unit 2 and
38 consist of 72 percent U.S. Forest Service managed
39 lands. The Staff analysis also specifies that the
40 regulation would not -- would only apply to Federal
41 public lands, and the issue of differing regulations on
42 Federal and non-Federal lands was specifically
43 discussed during the Board meeting on April 11th, 2018.
44 In the motion to adopt the harvest limit portion of
45 Proposal 18-01, Board Member Pendleton mentioned the
46 effects of having different regulations on both Federal
47 and non-Federal lands in her jurisdic -- in her
48 justification for supporting the proposal.
49
50

1 Based on the information, the Staff
2 analysis and the discussion of the issue in the April
3 11, 2018 Board meeting, it appears that the Board
4 considered the effects of having differing regulations
5 on Federal and non-Federal lands in Unit 2. In any
6 event, while reduction in the potential for confusion
7 over differing regulations is desirable, the
8 Solicitor's Office has advised that it is not a legally
9 justifiable reason to reverse a prior Board decision.
10 This claim does not appear to meet the criterion.

11
12 For Claim 1.2. This is from the State
13 of Alaska, Mathews and Meck. The Board should have
14 considered other alternatives within its authority,
15 such as not allowing the harvest of one doe as
16 currently allowed in the five deer bag limit or
17 designated -- or limiting designated hunting or closing
18 Federal lands to hunting. The preliminary assessment
19 of Claim 1.2, is the failure of the Board to consider
20 every possible alternative does not compel
21 reconsideration of its decision. Nevertheless, the
22 alternative of restricting the take of does was
23 discussed in the Board meeting of April 11, 2018 by
24 Board Member Greg Siekaniec, raised the issue during
25 discussion and the effectiveness of reducing doe
26 harvest was addressed in a response by Council Chair
27 Don Hernandez. Over the years the Board has received
28 numerous proposals to limit designated hunting and
29 generally the Board has not restricted designated
30 hunting to reduce harvest. Harvest has typically been
31 reduced using changes of methods, means and open and
32 closed areas. The importance of the Federal designated
33 hunting provisions was described in Proposal WP18-09,
34 which was considered at the same meeting as WP18-01.
35 This claim does not appear to meet the criterion.

36
37 Under Claim 1.3, from Edwardson,
38 Hendrickson and Meck, the Board did not consider the
39 negative impacts on the economy of Prince of Wales.
40 The preliminary assessment of Claim 1.3 is although the
41 economies of the communities in Unit 2 are very
42 important, the Board is under no legal obligation to
43 consider the economic impact of complying with its
44 statutory obligation under Title VIII of ANILCA, which
45 is to provide a meaningful priority for rural users.
46 For that reason, economic impacts do not constitute
47 relevant information that the Board failed to consider.
48 This claim does not appear to meet the criterion.

49
50

1 Under Claim 1.4, from Hendrickson and
2 Mathews. Increases in wolf and black bear populations
3 in Unit 2 have had an effect on deer populations and
4 should be addressed. Under preliminary assessment of
5 Claim 1.4, regulations are in effect to regulate the
6 sustainable harvest of wolves and black bears in Unit
7 2. The OSM analysis presented information about the
8 effect of wolves and black bears on deer populations to
9 the Board. Wolves and black bears are the primary
10 predators present in Unit 2 and may reduce deer
11 populations or decrease recover times after severe
12 winters. Additionally, to the extent that the
13 requestors may be suggesting that the Board should
14 engage in predator management for the purposes of
15 increasing deer populations, the Board has a
16 longstanding policy of deferring predator related
17 actions to individual land management agencies to act
18 in accordance with the specific mandates of those
19 agencies. This is described in the Board's predator
20 management policy in Appendix 3 starting on Page 73 in
21 your books. This claim does not appear to meet the
22 criterion.

23
24 Now, moving on to Criterion No. 2,
25 which is the existing information used by the Board is
26 incorrect.

27
28 Under Claim 2.1, from the State of
29 Alaska. We have reason to believe the actual number of
30 deer harvested in some Unit 2 communities is far higher
31 than harvest estimated by ADF&G's Division of Wildlife
32 Conservation. Under the preliminary assessment of
33 Claim 2.1, the issue was described in comments from
34 ADF&G in the Board meeting book. ADF&G compared 1997
35 household survey deer harvest information with the 1997
36 mail-out deer hunter survey for Hydaburg, Craig and
37 Klawock and concluded that ADF&Gs mail-out hunter
38 surveys, and more recently by harvest ticket reports,
39 may greatly underestimate the actual number of deer
40 harvested by residents of those communities. The Board
41 understood that this was a possibility but rejected it
42 as a relevant consideration after considering the
43 scientific data available for deer in Unit 2 through
44 the OSM analysis and information provided by ADF&G. In
45 addition to biological data presented, the Board also
46 considered substantial public testimony asserting that
47 the subsistence needs were not being met and a long
48 history of conflict regarding deer allocations in Unit
49 2. This claim does not appear to meet the criterion.

50

1 Under Claim 2.2, which was submitted by
2 Mr. Allen. This regulation does not take into account
3 the amount of reasonably necessary for subsistence as
4 defined by the State. Preliminary assessment of Claim
5 2.2, the amount reasonably necessary for subsistence is
6 a measure used by the State and does not have a role in
7 the Federal Subsistence Board's determination of
8 whether or not the rural priority for subsistence uses
9 is being properly implemented. This claim does not
10 appear to meet the criterion.

11
12 So now for Criterion No. 3, which is
13 the Board's interpretation of information, applicable
14 law, or regulation is in error, or contrary to existing
15 law.

16
17 Claim 3.1 from the State of Alaska,
18 Edwardson, Hendrickson and Mathews. The biological
19 data shared by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game
20 was used incorrectly. A one year decline in estimated
21 harvest is not justification for permanent regulatory
22 decisionmaking to reduce bag limits. The preliminary
23 assessment of Claim 3.1 is that the Board was clearly
24 aware of the scientific data available for deer in Unit
25 2 through the OSM analysis and information presented by
26 Alaska Department of Fish and Game at the Board
27 meeting. In addition to biological data presented the
28 Board also considered substantial public testimony
29 asserting that subsistence needs were not being met and
30 the long history of conflict regarding deer allocations
31 in Unit 2. The Board weighed many sources of
32 information to arrive at its decision, not just one
33 year of biological data. Moreover, regulatory
34 decisions are never permanent, they can be rescinded or
35 modified by the Board, as appropriate, in response to
36 changing circumstances or new information. This claim
37 does not appear to meet the criterion.

38
39 Claim 3.2 which was submitted by the
40 State of Alaska, Allen, Edwardson, Hendrickson and
41 Mathews. The Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional
42 Advisory Council is making recommendations based on
43 public testimony and potentially personal bias, not on
44 available science. So the preliminary assessment of
45 Claim 3.2, as evidenced by the background section of
46 this threshold analysis, the Council has a long history
47 of listening to users of deer in Unit 2 and considering
48 scientific information that has been provided by OSM
49 Staff analysis and ADF&G in formulating their
50

1 recommendations. A fundamental function of the
2 Council, under Title VIII, Section .805(a) of ANILCA is
3 to incorporate local feedback into its process of
4 developing recommendations to the Board. To this end,
5 the Council submitted this proposal after public
6 testimony during the winter 2017 meeting in Craig,
7 where Federally-qualified subsistence users testified
8 that they were having a harder time harvesting deer in
9 Unit 2 during the 2016 season. In supporting its
10 proposal, the Council felt that subsistence needs were
11 not being met and a reduced harvest limit for non-
12 Federally-qualified users would provide a rural
13 resident priority. The Council also felt that non-
14 Federally-qualified users would not be adversely
15 affected since the average two deer per hunter and a
16 reduction from four to two male deer would not make a
17 huge difference in their overall harvest. The
18 Council's consideration of scientific information for
19 WP18-01 is evident in their deliberation. For
20 instance, the Council voiced concerns that if the ADF&G
21 harvest objective continues to be exceeded, there could
22 be an imminent conservation shortage if the Council did
23 not take preemptive action to provide for a rural
24 subsistence preference. This claim does not appear to
25 meet the criterion.

26
27 Under Claim 3.3, which was submitted by
28 the State of Alaska, the Board does not have the
29 authority to unnecessarily restrict State of Alaska
30 subsistence or other uses. The preliminary assessment
31 of Claim 3.3 is the Board adopted the proposal at issue
32 based on a finding under Section .815(3) of ANILCA,
33 that restricted the taking of deer on public lands was
34 necessary for the continuation of subsistence uses as
35 such population. The fact that the Board rarely
36 exercises its authority in this manner does not
37 diminish that authority. The claim does not appear to
38 meet the criterion.

39
40 Claim 3.4 from the State of Alaska.
41 Consultation is necessary to evaluate whether proposed
42 Federal regulatory actions are consistent with
43 management of fish and wildlife in accordance with
44 recognized scientific principles and assure the
45 continued viability of fish and wildlife population,
46 which Congress recognized is the purview of the State.
47 The preliminary assessment of Claim 3.4, ADF&G provided
48 significant information related to Unit 2 deer and is
49 always encouraged to participate at many points
50

1 throughout the regulatory process by submitting
2 proposals, providing input to OSM analysis, and
3 providing comments on proposals at InterAgency Staff
4 Committee, Council and Board meetings. Although
5 ADF&G's participation is integral to the process,
6 ANILCA does not reserve to the right [sic] an oversight
7 role to determine if Federal regulatory actions are
8 consistent with management of fish and wildlife in
9 accordance with recognized scientific principles and
10 assure that continued viability of a fish or wildlife
11 population, rather ANILCA requires the Secretaries of
12 Agriculture and Interior to ensure that the Federal
13 regulatory actions are consistent with management of
14 fish and wildlife in accordance with recognized
15 scientific principles and assure the continued
16 viability of a fish or wildlife population. The Board
17 has been delegated that authority and obligation by the
18 Secretaries. Under ANILCA the Board also must consider
19 the continuation of subsistence uses as stated in
20 Section .815(3) of ANILCA and provide a meaningful
21 priority for Federally-qualified users on Federal
22 public lands as stated in Section .804 of ANILCA. This
23 claim does not appear to meet the criterion.
24

25 Under Claim 3.5, from the State of
26 Alaska, the Board's bag limit restriction is
27 unnecessary and unjustified in these circumstances and
28 this is the first known occurrence of Board -- of the
29 Board reducing State of Alaska bag limits. Adoption of
30 this proposal was arbitrary and contrary to the science
31 and recommendations provided by Staff. So under the
32 preliminary assessment of Claim 3.5. Title VIII,
33 Section .815(3) of ANILCA addresses the restriction on
34 the take of fish and wildlife for non-subsistence uses.
35 The Council recommendation, the InterAgency Staff
36 Committee comments support that the restriction was
37 necessary. The Board was clearly aware of the
38 recommendations of Staff and the scientific data
39 available for deer in Unit 2 through the OSM analysis
40 and information presented by the Alaska Department of
41 Fish and Game. The Board also heard substantial public
42 testimony directly and through the Council and
43 considered the long history of conflict regarding deer
44 allocations in Unit 2. The Board weighed all sources
45 of information and determined that the restriction of
46 non-subsistence uses was necessary to continue
47 subsistence uses of deer in Unit 2. The justification
48 for the restriction was stated by Ms. Pendleton at the
49 April Board meeting. This claim does not appear to
50

1 meet the criterion.

2

3

4 Under Claim 3.6 which is from the State
5 of Alaska. Assuming the Board was authorized to change
6 the bag limit, the Board did not clearly delineate the
7 conditions under which State management would resume.
8 This lack of consideration and clear criteria make it
9 almost impossible for the State of Alaska to regain
10 management once the Board has superseded State of
11 Alaska regulations. The preliminary assessment of
12 Claim 3.6 is the Board provides the opportunity for
13 anyone to submit proposals to change the wildlife
14 regulations every other year. The Board also provides
15 opportunity for anyone to submit a special action
16 request at any time. The Board accepts requests to
17 reconsider an action. And through any of these avenues
18 the Board may determine that the situation has changed
19 to the point that the restriction is no longer needed
20 or should be modified. This claim does not appear to
21 meet the criterion.

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

22 So in summary, the claims submitted by
23 the State of Alaska, Matt Allen, Chas Edwardson, Jeff
24 Hendrickson, Andy Mathews, and William Meck do not
25 appear to meet the criteria.

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

27 No new relevant information was
28 presented for the Board's consideration. None of the
29 information the Board relied on was shown to be
30 factually incorrect. There was no demonstration that
31 the Board's interpretation of information, applicable
32 law, or regulation was in error or contrary to existing
33 law. The OSM conclusion is to oppose the request to
34 reconsider WP18-01, with the justification that the
35 proponents claims individually and collectively failed
36 to reach the threshold for reconsideration as required
37 under Federal Subsistence regulations 36 CFR 242.20 and
38 50 CFR 100.20.

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

40 Thank you.

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

42 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
43 Terry. Any questions for Terry.

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

45 (No comments)

46

47

48

49

50

47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay.

48

49

50

49 OPERATOR: We will now begin the

1 question and answer session. If you would like to ask
2 a question, please press star-one, unmute your phone
3 and record your name clearly. If you need to withdraw
4 your question, press star-two.

5

6 One moment, please.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing nobody
11 on line.

12

13 OPERATOR: Showing no questions in cue
14 at this time.

15

16 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. No
17 Board questions for Staff on the presentation, okay,
18 we'll move on to the Board discretion on public
19 comment, but I would always want to hear from the
20 public if there's anybody here who wants to speak to
21 the proposal, request for reconsideration on the Unit 2
22 deer.

23

24 I would open the floor at this time for
25 the public.

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: That also
30 includes anybody on line from the public who may want
31 to speak to the request for reconsideration, this would
32 be your opportunity to speak up.

33

34 (No comments)

35

36 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing no one,
37 or seeing nobody, we'll go ahead and call on the Alaska
38 Department of Fish and Game.

39

40 Mark.

41

42 MR. BURCH: Thank you, Mr. Chair and
43 Board members.

44

45 REPORTER: So, Mark, can you turn your
46 microphone on.

47

48 MR. BURCH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
49 Alaska Department of Fish and Game still contends the

50

1 action of the Board was contrary to existing law.

2
3 The argument against reconsideration
4 based on Claim 3.5 appears to be a real stretch. The
5 Staff analysis cited by the InterAgency Staff Committee
6 as being thorough and accurate and sufficient to base
7 decisions concluded, and all I'm doing is going back
8 through and taking a couple of quotes from that
9 original analysis; so reducing the harvest limit for
10 non-Federally-qualified users in Unit 2 as allowed
11 under ANILCA is not necessary at this time for
12 conservation or to meet subsistence needs. It further
13 concluded, the data do not support the perception that
14 needs of Federal-qualified subsistence users are not
15 being met. Further, the analysis stated, that current
16 harvest data suggest these priorities are benefiting
17 Federally-qualified subsistence users, a reduction to
18 non-qualified subsistence users is not necessary at
19 this time.

20
21 Based on the justification put forward
22 by Ms. Pendleton at the time during the Board meeting,
23 it appears the Board adopted the proposal in deference
24 to the Regional Advisory Council.

25
26 Section .805 of ANILCA requires the
27 Board to consider recommendations of the Regional
28 Advisory Councils except when the recommendations are
29 not supported by substantial evidence, violates
30 recognized principles of fish and wildlife
31 conservation, or would be detrimental to the
32 satisfaction of subsistence needs.

33
34 Based on the effort and harvest data
35 presented by OSM and by the Department of Fish and
36 Game, it is questionable whether the difficulty that
37 some subsistence users experienced as they sought to
38 harvest deer makes the case for this restriction as
39 necessary to provide for subsistence as required in
40 ANILCA.

41
42 The Department of Fish and Game
43 continues to urge the Federal Subsistence Board to
44 reconsider this decision.

45
46 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

47
48 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any questions
49 for the State or Mark.

50

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing or
4 seeing none, thank you for your presentation, Mark.

5

6 InterAgency Staff Committee
7 recommendation. Suzanne.

8

9 Oh, Gene, go ahead.

10

11 MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, Mark, if I may, I
12 have one question.

13

14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We have a
15 question for you Mark, thank you.

16

17 MR. PELTOLA: Sorry about that. I was
18 trying to formulate it in my mind.

19

20 When you got your citations, if I
21 understand correctly, your citations you presented came
22 directly out of the analysis for the original proposal,
23 correct?

24

25 MR. BURCH: Yes, through the Chair.
26 That is correct.

27

28 MR. PELTOLA: Okay. Thank you.

29

30 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
31 other questions for Mark.

32

33 (No comments)

34

35 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Appreciate it,
36 Mark, thank you.

37

38 Suzanne.

39

40 MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And
41 good morning everyone. My name is Suzanne Worker. I
42 am the Acting Policy Coordinator for the Office of
43 Subsistence Management, and in that capacity I am
44 serving as the Chair of the InterAgency Staff
45 Committee.

46

47 The InterAgency Staff Committee or the
48 ISC recommends that the Board does not support Request
49 for Reconsideration RFR 18-01.

50

1 The ISC found the threshold analysis
2 for RFR18-01 to be a thorough evaluation of the request
3 and that it provided sufficient information for Federal
4 Subsistence Board action on this request. According to
5 regulations under Subpart B 36 CFR, Part 242.20 and 50
6 CFR Part 100.20, the Board will accept a request for
7 reconsideration only if it is based upon information
8 not previously considered by the Board, demonstrates
9 that existing information used by the Board is
10 incorrect, or demonstrates that the Board's
11 interpretation of information, applicable law, or
12 regulation is in error or contrary to existing law.

13
14 The ISC concurs with the following
15 conclusions presented in the RFR 18-01 threshold
16 analysis. No new relevant information was presented
17 for the Board's consideration. None of the information
18 the Board relied on was shown to be factually
19 incorrect. There was no demonstration that the Board's
20 interpretation of information, applicable law, or
21 regulation was in error or contrary to existing law.
22 And, finally, there are sufficient conservation
23 concerns to warrant restriction for non-subsistence use
24 as outlined in Section .815 of ANILCA, while Section
25 .804 of ANILCA establishes that subsistence is the
26 priority consumptive use on Federal public lands. The
27 claims of the State of Alaska, Matt Allen, Chas
28 Edwardson, Jeff Hendrickson, Andy Mathews and William
29 Meck do not appear to meet these criteria.

30
31 None of the claims in RFR 18-01 meet
32 the threshold for reconsideration of the Board's
33 decision on Wildlife Proposal WP18-01.

34
35 That concludes the ISC comment.

36
37 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

38
39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
40 Suzanne. Any questions for the InterAgency Staff
41 Committee recommendation.

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing or
46 seeing none, thank you for your presentation.

47
48 That opens up the floor for Board
49 discussion.

50

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

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Board action.

Dave.

MR. SCHMID: Yes, Mr. Chair. I'd like to -- I would move to accept the six requests to reconsider WP18-01 through RFR18-01 which were submitted by the State of Alaska and the following five residents of Ketchikan, Matt Allen, Chas Edwardson, Jeff Hendrickson, Andy Mathews and William Meck. The threshold analysis for RFR18-01 is included on Pages 41 to 75 of the Board book.

Following a second, I will explain why I intend to oppose my motion.

MR. BROWER: Second.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chair. I oppose the request to reconsider WP18-01 for the reasons clearly outlined in the OSM threshold analysis and by the InterAgency Staff Committee recommendation.

Again, no new relevant information was presented by requesters for the Board's consideration. None of the information the Board relied on was shown to be factually correct [sic] -- there was no demonstration that the Board's interpretation of information, applicable law or regulation was in error or contrary to existing law. The requesters claims individually and collectively fail to reach the threshold for reconsideration as required under Federal Subsistence regulations 36 CFR 242.20 and 50 CFR 100.20.

And also I guess I would add on here that the Southeast RAC supported the Board's regulatory decision for WP18-01. The existing Unit 2 deer regulations will continue to provide opportunity for non-Federally-qualified deer hunters on Prince of Wales Island while providing for a subsistence priority and conservation of deer. And, again, 72 percent of Prince of Wales is Federal public lands.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Thank you, Dave, for your justification there. And

1 just for a matter of the record, when you restated the
2 second bullet there you said factually correct and I
3 think you intended to say, incorrect?
4

5 MR. SCHMID: Factually incorrect --
6 yes, thank you for correcting -- factually incorrect.
7

8 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. Thank
9 you. Just for the record just to make sure that that
10 says, incorrect.
11

12 MR. SCHMID: Reading a bit too fast
13 there.
14

15 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank
16 you. Just so you know I'm paying attention.
17

18 (Laughter)
19

20 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Or somebody is.
21

22 (Laughter)
23

24 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right. Any
25 further Board discussion.
26

27
28 (No comments)
29

30 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the
31 question.
32

33 MR. SIEKANIEC: Question.
34

35 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been
36 called. We'll do roll call, Tom, please.
37

38 MR. DOOLITTLE: Alrighty. This is for
39 the -- whether the threshold.....
40

41 REPORTER: Tom. Tom.
42

43 MR. DOOLITTLE:analysis has.....
44

45 REPORTER: Tom. I need you to turn the
46 microphone on for the record.
47

48 MR. DOOLITTLE:been met.....
49
50

1 REPORTER: Tom, no one can hear you on
2 the phone if the mic is not on.
3
4 MR. DOOLITTLE:for the request
5 for reconsider.....
6
7 MR. SIEKANIEC: Microphone Tom.
8
9 MR. DOOLITTLE: Whoops, yep. The
10 thresh -- again, we'll start all over.
11
12 REPORTER: Thank you.
13
14 MR. DOOLITTLE: This will be -- a
15 motion has been made to support that the threshold has
16 been met for reconsideration by the Federal Subsistence
17 Board for Unit 2 deer.
18
19 We'll start with U.S. Fish and Wildlife
20 Service, Greg Siekaniec.
21
22 MR. SIEKANIEC: Oppose. Oppose, thank
23 you, Tom.
24
25 MR. DOOLITTLE: That's a no vote. U.S.
26 Forest Service, David Schmid.
27
28 MR. SCHMID: Oppose.
29
30 MR. DOOLITTLE: Bureau of Land
31 Management, Chad Padgett.
32
33 MR. PADGETT: I'm going to support
34 based on the Claim 3.1 that the -- a one year decline
35 in estimated harvest is not a justification for a
36 permanent regulatory change.
37
38 MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Mr. Chad
39 Padgett.
40
41 National Park Service, Don Striker.
42
43 MR. STRIKER: Oppose.
44
45 MR. DOOLITTLE: Bureau of Indian
46 Affairs, Eugene Peltola.
47
48 MR. PELTOLA: Oppose for the
49 justification provided by OSM and ISC in the
50

1 reconsideration analysis.
2
3 MR. DOOLITTLE: Public Member, Rhonda
4 Pitka.
5
6 MS. PITKA: Oppose for the
7 justification listed on Page 54 of the book.
8
9 MR. DOOLITTLE: Public Member, Charlie
10 Brower.
11
12 MR. BROWER: Oppose as stated through
13 the justification.
14
15 MR. DOOLITTLE: And, last, but not
16 least, Anthony Christianson, Chair.
17
18 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I oppose as
19 recommended by ISC.
20
21 MR. DOOLITTLE: Alright, motion fails.
22
23 MR. BURCH: Mr. Chair.
24
25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Mark.
26
27 MR. BURCH: I think we could do this
28 just informally.....
29
30 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Come on up,
31 yeah, let's have a discussion.
32
33 MR. BURCH: It doesn't really make any
34 difference to the outcome but I thought I heard BLM
35 [sic] say that they supported it for the reasons stated
36 by OSM -- I don't know if I misheard that -- I'm sorry,
37 I heard BIA say that, not -- BLM I understood, BIA, I
38 think I misunderstood.
39
40 MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, I said I voted to
41 oppose accepting the RFR based on the justification
42 provided by OSM and the ISC and the analysis.
43
44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Does that
45 clarify that for you.
46
47 MR. BURCH: (Nods affirmatively)
48
49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. All
50

1 right, it looks like we'll take a lunch break.
2
3 MR. BROWER: Come back at 3:00.
4
5 (Laughter)
6
7 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: What time is it
8 now here.
9
10 MR. BROWER: Quarter to.
11
12 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: 1:15, hour and
13 a half.
14
15 MR. DOOLITTLE: That's a long time.
16
17 MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair. I have a
18 question, Mary, do you have a conflict this afternoon?
19
20 MS. COLLIGAN: No, I can come back.
21
22 MR. SIEKANIEC: Okay.
23
24 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: For.....
25
26 MR. SIEKANIEC: Well, I was going to
27 ask, do you have a conflict where we need to move the
28 budget presentation up in the agenda, if that
29 would.....
30
31 MS. COLLIGAN: I can rearrange my
32 schedule. It would be useful if the budget
33 presentation could be after lunch but if it's not then
34 I can rearrange my schedule.
35
36 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. Well, if
37 there's no objection here we can have her on the agenda
38 following lunch.
39
40 MR. SIEKANIEC: So budget presentation
41 up first after lunch.
42
43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Up first
44 prior.....
45
46 MR. SIEKANIEC: And then put the other
47 agenda back in order.
48
49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep. And then
50

1 we can do fisheries, partner monitoring after that if
2 there's no objection from the Board.

3

4 (No objections)

5

6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. So,
7 Mary, you'll be first up after lunch.

8

9 MS. COLLIGAN: Thank you, Greg.

10

11 MR. STRIKER: So is that an agenda
12 change?

13

14 MR. DOOLITTLE: Yep, that's an agenda
15 change.

16

17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Do we have to
18 make a motion on that when we get back?

19

20 MR. DOOLITTLE: No.

21

22 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, lunch.

23

24 (Off record)

25 (On record)

26

27 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, it's
28 1:16, we'll go ahead and come back from lunch.

29

30 And before the break we said we would
31 do a change to the agenda and have a budget discussion
32 so we'll welcome up Mary Colligan and Brian and Tom.

33

34 MR. SIEKANIEC: Maybe we could give
35 Brian just a bit.

36

37 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Are we waiting
38 for Brian?

39

40 MR. DOOLITTLE: Well.....

41

42 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We could wait a
43 minute if we need to.

44

45 (Pause)

46

47 MR. SIEKANIEC: I say start it.

48

49 MR. DOOLITTLE: We'll start, Mr. Chair,

50

1 if that's okay with you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. Yep, you
4 have the floor Tom.

5

6 MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay. Thank you,
7 Board, for entertaining this. And we'll -- and this --
8 now this OSM budget update as a request from our last
9 Board meeting. Really it was an internal decision to
10 -- to really kind of combine efforts to explain the
11 flow of funding that comes from the Department to the
12 Fish and Wildlife Service headquarters and how it ends
13 up as the OSM consumable budget. And I -- and I think
14 that's an important process for us all to understand
15 and digest because it's not just a one -- a
16 straightforward deal. But it's also something that we
17 felt that was really important for the Program area for
18 -- whether a part of the appropriation of the Alaska
19 Subsistence Line Item, that we understand how that flow
20 of funding, you know, does occur, and how some of those
21 funds are -- are spent.

22

23 So, Mary Colligan, from -- from
24 Fisheries and Ecological Services and my colleague at
25 Fish and Wildlife Service is going to talk about some
26 of the fisheries program and she'll probably also talk
27 to Brian Glaspell's part to -- how the wildlife parts
28 of those monies are used as well. And now Mary won't
29 do that but.....

30

31 (Laughter)

32

33 MR. DOOLITTLE: And Brian will speak to
34 the Refuge's allocation of those monies and how Refuges
35 uses that.

36

37 I can't tell you that -- how happy I am
38 to be able to co-present with my colleagues at the
39 Service on the -- the -- the use of subsistence dollars
40 to the Board and to the public, and that we went
41 through many iterations of this to try to make it as
42 clear as possible and not -- in not a very clear
43 process, and so we're going to do our best that way.

44

45 If we look at the next slide, part of
46 the ask from the Board was really a directive from
47 three different items that regarded the Federal
48 Subsistence budget that came from the last program
49 review that we had from when Salazar was the Secretary

50

1 of Interior. And so this has been -- these directives
2 to the program have been in place for awhile and we've
3 met some of them well and some of them we've met
4 halfway and some of them we haven't done at all but
5 we've tried to, you know, to make sure we do our due
6 diligence and periodically we do kind of report on --
7 on where we've been at in this particular part of the
8 process. So these have been some guidance and there's
9 been interest by some of the Board members on adherence
10 to some of this guidance and where we're at.

11
12 In the first part, and that's the
13 direct the Federal Subsistence Board and to review and
14 submit recommendations for DOI and USDA consideration
15 in the annual budgets for the Federal Subsistence
16 Program, is that really there's not much that has been
17 done in this particular arena in a formal way where
18 there's something that's in a book that says this is
19 what the program's needs are for the budgets. But it's
20 been, you know, Energy and Natural Resources Committee
21 at the Senate level with Senator Murkowski as the Chair
22 of that group has, you know, kept the subsistence
23 program alive in that budget. It's also been in other,
24 in other administrations there hasn't been a line item
25 in the President's budget for -- for subsistence
26 management in Alaska. We're fortunate in the recent
27 history that it's been a line item, both for the Forest
28 Service and then as an appropriation that comes through
29 Interior for the program. Even though there hasn't
30 been an increase in those funds, the budget has been,
31 what I would say, like many budgets, has been static.
32 And so we've been, of course, in the world of
33 continuing resolutions and stable budgets and then
34 we've also -- but we've had -- at least it's been
35 fairly predictably there but, again, at decreasing
36 effectiveness because as we know, the longer you're
37 flatlined, the power of the dollar decreases.

38
39 The other aspect was establish an
40 Interior line item for the core subsistence program.
41 Again, there is a line item that comes to the
42 Department -- from the Department to Fish and Wildlife
43 Service, and then that is split up in two directions.
44 One through Fisheries and Ecological Services and the
45 other direction is through the Refuges program. And so
46 I always like to say, fish is on my right and my
47 wildlife is on my left, and so that's what Mary and
48 Brian will be talking to, is, their uses of the funds
49 that come down from their program areas, and then how
50

1 the lion's share of those funds come to OSM and then
2 how we distribute those monies so you have that in
3 front of you as well.
4

5 Direct and Interior InterAgency Task
6 Force Evaluation of OSM and related subsistence
7 budgets, organizational issues and diversity issues.
8 This one I don't really think that we've developed one
9 in a formal way. But, again, by providing this
10 information, this is, I believe information to the
11 Board on where we should kind of go from here to be
12 more effective as a program and our budgets in the
13 future. So we're just going to really, you know,
14 provide in this presentation the foundations of the
15 money that we have at hand, how we're using those funds
16 and then, you know, how OSM sees a realized consumable
17 budget.
18

19 And so at this particular time I will
20 turn the presentation over to Mary and she'll start
21 talking to the fisheries side of the equation and the
22 flow of funds from Fisheries and Ecological Services.
23

24 MS. COLLIGAN: Thank you. And my
25 apologies to -- I hate having my back to half the room,
26 so my apologies to the folks behind me.
27

28 So I'm going to talk about the Alaska
29 subsistence fisheries line, that one stream of flow of
30 funding coming down and -- am I okay with this?
31

32 REPORTER: Yes, thanks.
33

34 MS. COLLIGAN: All right. So as Tom
35 mentioned we have at the national level, funding that
36 comes in through Alaska subsistence fisheries and
37 Alaska subsistence wildlife, two separate lines, comes
38 into our headquarters office and then branches out to
39 the two programs, the Fisheries program on the left,
40 the Subsistence Wildlife program on the right. I'm
41 going to talk about the blue part on the left. We'll
42 kind of walk through each of the pieces of this
43 schematic through our presentation, so we'll come back
44 to this multiple times to kind of orient you to where
45 we are.
46

47 So, again, I'm going to walk down the
48 Alaska subsistence fisheries funding portion of this
49 graphic.
50

1 So, again, the purpose of this presentation is
2 to lay out for you the funding that comes through
3 Alaska subsistence fisheries part and how it has been
4 spent over the past -- I'm going to show the past four
5 years just to give you a few years of kind of the trend
6 and how things have been moving.

7
8 So the annual allocation -- again, I've
9 got 2016, '17, '18 and '19 here, so I'm going to --
10 I'll just use '19 numbers to walk down through so at
11 the national level there's \$9.554 million allocated to
12 Alaska subsistence fisheries. Off the top of that
13 comes service-wide enterprise costs, and you can see
14 they've varied quite a bit over the years. I'll
15 explain the difference between 2018 and 2019 in just a
16 second. But those enterprise-wide costs cover such
17 things as IT support, network security, emergency
18 management, kind of some base functions provided
19 throughout the Service to all the programs, so those
20 dollars are taken off -- each program is charged per
21 FTE, per body, to generate the funds to provide those
22 functions.

23
24 MR. PELTOLA: So by this chart, you're
25 referring to.....

26
27 REPORTER: Gene. Gene, turn on your
28 mic.

29
30 MR. PELTOLA:1335 -- 1335.

31
32 MS. COLLIGAN: 1335, correct.

33
34 MR. PELTOLA: 1335, okay.

35
36 MS. COLLIGAN: Yeah. These are 13 --
37 the code is 1335 fisheries dollars, correct.

38
39 The big increase you see from 2018 to
40 2019 in the Service-enterprise cost, that is
41 attributable to a move within the Service called Joint
42 JAO, or Joint Administrative Office. So in the past
43 some of these functions and charges related to them
44 were taken at the regional level. In 2018 moving into
45 2019 those functions were consolidated at a national
46 level to provide more efficient service to the Service.
47 So we paid more at the headquarters level and less at
48 the regional level for those functions. So that's why
49 you see that increase there.

50

1 2017 was -- had an unusual adjustment
2 back to us called Director deferred, more dollars came
3 back to the program, so I won't go into that in detail.
4 But from this graph or from this table you can see --
5 so we get the annual allocation coming in from
6 Congress, that Service-wide enterprise cost comes off
7 the top and then that leaves the balance available to
8 the programs. So I'm going to take the bottom row from
9 this table and that's now going to become the top row
10 in the next table I'm going to move us into.

11
12 So diving a little bit deeper in the
13 Alaska subsistence fisheries allocation, again, the top
14 line in this table came from the previous table. So in
15 2019 there's 9.273 available to the programs and then
16 that is allocated out to OSM. FES is Fisheries and
17 Ecological Services, that's the program that I'm in.
18 And NWRS is the Refuge program.

19
20 So this formula that's presented at the
21 bottom of this table, that's the formula that we have
22 used consistently throughout the years. Gene and I
23 have had conversations about this, it's actually not --
24 I cannot trace back the exact origins of this formula,
25 how it was originally negotiated, but it has been used
26 consistently within our program. So whatever dollars
27 come in in that top row, the balance available to the
28 programs, 83 percent of that goes to OSM, 10 percent is
29 retained by Fisheries and Ecological Services, and
30 seven percent is passed through to Refuges.

31
32 And I'm now going to talk about what
33 happens with -- how the 10 percent is spent within
34 Fisheries and Ecological Services.

35
36 There we go.

37
38 Okay. So the bottom row in this table
39 is that 10 percent. 10 percent of that total
40 allocation, this is how much is retained by Fisheries
41 and Ecological Services. And this is how we spread it
42 across our program to provide support to the fisheries
43 subsistence program. So we have an Anchorage Fish and
44 Wildlife Conservation office, we have a Fairbanks Fish
45 and Wildlife Conservation office and we have a Kenai
46 Fish and Wildlife Conservation office. They provide
47 similar functions to different geographies. So in
48 those offices we have folks that are servicing as in-
49 season managers, with delegated authority from the

50

1 Board, so these dollars are used to support those
2 individuals. We share a subsistence liaison or
3 coordinator with Refuges, Carol Damberg. Her position
4 is supported by these dollars.

5
6 So now I'm going to show you one last
7 slide that's going to dive a little bit deeper into
8 these Fish and Wildlife Conservation offices and I
9 wanted to just, again, reiterate what these offices do,
10 what their geographic focus is and then you'll
11 recognize some of these names on here as well.

12
13 So John Gerkin, who was here this
14 morning, but may not be here now, is from our Anchorage
15 Fish and Wildlife Conservation office and serves as an
16 in-season manager. I'll come back to genetics lab in
17 just a second. Fairbanks Fish and Wildlife
18 Conservation office, Fred Bue, as was mentioned this
19 morning by Greg, Fred has retired, but those in-season
20 functions will still be performed by that office. And
21 Jeff Anderson from our Kenai office serves as an in-
22 season manager. Our conservation genetics lab within
23 our Fisheries and Ecological Services program, we have
24 a genetics lab right here in town in our regional
25 office. They do a variety of genetics work to
26 fisheries work as well as ecological services genetics
27 work, and they do some of the mixed stock analysis,
28 particularly for the Yukon that feeds into the in-
29 season management decisions, working very closely with
30 the State on those genetic analysis.

31
32 So with that I'm going to turn it over
33 to Brian, and just to bring us back to this graphic
34 again, I covered that 10 percent that goes off to the
35 left from the fisheries. The 83 percent of that line
36 that goes to OSM, Tom, will cover when the presentation
37 goes to him. The seven percent of the fisheries line
38 that goes over to Refuges, Brian's going to talk about
39 that as well as the subsistence wildlife funding in the
40 blue now, so now we're over on the right hand side of
41 this graphic.

42
43 MR. GLASPELL: Good afternoon, Mr.
44 Chair and Board members. I apologize for nearly
45 missing my cue earlier. It turns out the stairs on the
46 other end of the building won't get you here from
47 there.

48
49 (Laughter)

50

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I don't blame
2 you, I came in that door here and thought I was on that
3 side.

4

5 (Laughter)

6

7 MR. GLASPELL: Well, as Mary indicated,
8 I'm going to describe how the subsistence wildlife
9 dollars flow from appropriators to the Fish and
10 Wildlife Service to Refuges and then on to the Office
11 of Subsistence Management. This is really a pretty
12 simple story but there's an important context.

13

14 What I'm focusing on here is just the
15 line item directed at wildlife subsistence but 15 of
16 our 16 Refuge in Alaska have a Legislated purpose to
17 provide subsistence opportunities as well. So separate
18 from what you see here, there are 10s of millions of
19 dollars spent on Refuges in support of biological work,
20 research and monitoring, law enforcement, outreach, you
21 name it, that arguably all, or certainly most of that
22 work ultimately supports subsistence delivery. So this
23 is kind of a narrow piece of that overall pie.

24

25 MR. PELTOLA: Brian.

26

27 MR. GLASPELL: Yes.

28

29 MR. PELTOLA: So when you talk about
30 the Refuge, and the things you talked about, 1261
31 funding, correct?

32

33 MR. GLASPELL: Correct.

34

35 MR. PELTOLA: Okay.

36

37 MR. GLASPELL: And just to go a little
38 further on that, Mary referred to the 1335 dollars,
39 fisheries subsistence funds, in Refuges our sort of
40 catch all fund is the 1261 and this is buried in that,
41 so when we fund Refuge programs, it mostly comes out of
42 that fund, there's this one line item that is
43 essentially passed through OSM, there's a whole bunch
44 of other activities funded from this same general pot
45 of money.

46

47 So, again, what you see here is that
48 line item, it's been flat, or nearly flat for a long
49 time. We can go back to about 2006 and it's been at or

50

1 around the \$3 million, it declined a little bit but in
2 the last four years that we're focused on here it's
3 been exactly the same. The only difference in what
4 ultimately goes to OSM is the changes in that
5 enterprise cost that Mary described previously.
6

7 So you see a big jump last year, but,
8 again, that doesn't necessarily tell you the whole
9 story because, again, we're sort of paying more for a
10 broad national program but less for some of the local
11 delivery, so there's a significant offset there. And
12 in 2018, we discussed this a little bit yesterday, for
13 folks that were there, but that was just a mistake, we
14 -- not, too surprisingly, big complicated budget
15 sometimes they forget to charge us or they over charge
16 us or what have you, and in this case we didn't pay
17 that assessment and we didn't charge that assessment,
18 the money just went straight through.
19

20 So this table shows you what we do with
21 that seven percent of the fisheries funds that comes
22 from Mary's shop. And in this case that money goes
23 directly to the field. It's allocated proportionately
24 based on the amount of subsistence related work that a
25 given Refuge has. You can see here that, far and away
26 the biggest chunk of the dollars go to Yukon Delta
27 Refuge, and that makes sense because that's our largest
28 and most active subsistence region in the state. Most
29 of these funds go directly to supporting Refuge
30 Information Technicians. And a few other incidental
31 things. But with the exception of Delta, really, you
32 can see there that it's not a big chunk of change when
33 you spread it across all of these Refuges.
34

35 And I think I'm passing it back if
36 there aren't any questions.
37

38 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Questions for
39 Brian.
40

41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, Tom.
42

43 MR. DOOLITTLE: Well, now it's back to
44 where the two lines converge on OSM. And so we'll look
45 at what aspects of the consumable budget and we'll do a
46 little bit of backtracking in the next slide.
47

48 One of the things that some Board
49 members noticed and then what Mary and Brian both
50

1 explained were the enterprise costs, and you can see in
2 2019 that those were about \$490,000 and so in
3 comparison to previous years, yes, that is considerably
4 higher. Some of the things that you will notice later
5 in this presentation is that our common services, kind
6 of those budgets that the region shares for buying
7 paper and doing other things that we all contribute to
8 from all programs in the regional office also markedly
9 decreased by almost \$100,000, and so some of those
10 things that are done at the regional level are now
11 taken out at the headquarters level.

12
13 One of the big things that we used to
14 pay for out of our core budget was IT services. Chris
15 Santos happens to be here and so I like to say that
16 Chris is part of my -- the headquarters assessment and
17 so.....

18
19 (Laughter)

20
21 MR. DOOLITTLE: And I'm very glad that
22 he's here as that he's making sure that our technology
23 is working, so what I'm getting at is IT costs have
24 been absorbed at headquarters level rather than coming
25 out at the regional office level.

26
27 Also we have a full-time database
28 manager that is stationed in Lakewood, Colorado, and he
29 manages our oracle database, and that database is what
30 organized all the Federal registration permit, draw
31 permits, all those sorts of permitting that we do on
32 that database and he makes sure that it works, and our
33 backup server that is based in Western Virginia, so we
34 have a redundant system and a pretty complex oracle
35 database system to manage our reporting and our permit
36 systems coming out of the Federal program. So this is
37 absorbed and those positions are absorbed as part of
38 the headquarter -- the headquarter assessment rather
39 than something that's coming out of the base budget or
40 consumable budget as OSM to pay for that Staff member's
41 funding.

42
43 So it's not as severe as it looks and I
44 think that's the message to get across on that.

45
46 It is more but not as severe as it
47 looks.

48
49 When we look at total regional

50

1 subsistence budget by year, that regional assessment
2 becomes, you know, apparent in 2019 and likely to some
3 degree in 2020, and, again, we don't know what the
4 headquarters assessment will be for this fiscal year,
5 we'll find out soon. But you see that drop below the
6 12 million mark to about 11.9 million, that is what has
7 come down to the region after the headquarter's
8 assessment so that's why you see that drop below the
9 \$12 million on this particular graph.

10

11 MR. PELTOLA: Tom, may I.

12

13 MR. DOOLITTLE: Yep.

14

15 MR. PELTOLA: So if I understand this
16 graph correct, of the \$12,380,000 allocated to the
17 Federal Subsistence Program in Alaska every year, those
18 dots represent what makes it to the region before you
19 do the split in 1335 and 1261, is that right?

20

21 MR. DOOLITTLE: Absolutely.

22

23 The other aspect that does assist OSM
24 and funds many of the Southeast projects and
25 Southcentral FMRP [sic] projects, plus activities
26 within the Forest Service as are the -- the Forest
27 Service funds. OSM does see this year, probably almost
28 \$377,000 for support and for FRMP [sic] money, that's
29 at least a projection. But as you can see from the
30 Forest Service budget, that assists the annual
31 subsistence budget, is that what's coming to the Forest
32 Service is static also. I think that's the message
33 that you'll hear me and use that word fairly often
34 throughout this presentation is static.

35

36 So when we look at the budget that Mary
37 talked to, of the balance available to programs from
38 Fisheries and Ecological Services, and for Gene the
39 1335 monies, it starts off at 9. -- basically \$9.3
40 million and after the 17 percent comes out of those
41 monies, what OSM's 83 percent allocation that you saw
42 in Mary's presentation is about \$7.7 million coming to
43 OSM. So it's been relatively stable. My favorite word
44 again, static. And -- but one thing that becomes a
45 variable and the Board was just part of -- this part of
46 the discussion was -- was Fisheries Resources
47 Monitoring Program funding. And the government does
48 not write contracts to ourselves but, again, the
49 government, whether it's Fish and Wildlife Service or

50

1 other Federal agencies, have competed for these
2 fundings. So in the case of where this funding has
3 been competed for in our -- and the process that we
4 just went over, if those happen to be Fish and Wildlife
5 Service dollars, it depended on that annual funding
6 allocation, we do subtract some of those dollars, you
7 know, we do subtract those dollars from our budget and
8 then the rest of those dollars are what are used to pay
9 our wages and partners program and our Resource
10 Monitoring Program funds that we allocate through the
11 competitive process.

12
13 So when you look at these, you know,
14 some years that the competition for these Federal funds
15 has been better, you know, such as in 2017, while in
16 2018 they were less, and in 2019 they were slightly
17 more. So this is always going to be a variable, you
18 know, within the program that when I look at how much
19 money we really have to spend on other projects, that
20 that's the bottom and end point for me, as managing the
21 budget for OSM that I -- that I take a look at. So for
22 '19 that was about 7. -- 7.2 million.

23
24 When we look at the 1261 or the Refuge
25 wildlife dollars that Brian talked to, remember when I
26 talked about common services target in 2019, well, this
27 is where our common services come out, remember like
28 photocopying, paper and those sorts of things, and you
29 can see there's almost \$100,000 drop in that particular
30 budget of common services because the headquarters
31 assessment took over some of those. So when I was
32 getting at that at the beginning, you can see that drop
33 so, yes, that was an increase and affected our bottom
34 line to the region, but it is being buffered by a
35 decreased common services target, which many of my
36 peers know I really watch that one tightly because I'd
37 like to make sure that that, you know, stays at a
38 reasonable level.

39
40 Law enforcement. Without regulations,
41 I mean, what OSM does is that we have grant -- you
42 know, cooperative agreement process, such as our
43 partners and our FRMP program, but also our main job is
44 to set regulation, and so without regulation -- without
45 law -- you know, you need law enforcement for
46 regulation. So I work with the special agent in charge
47 to negotiate an annual bases for funding for
48 enforcement of subsistence regulations and so it's been
49 based at about 135,000 a year for a law enforcement

50

1 admin target. So, again, what's left over after you
2 subtract those monies is about \$2.4 million if we use
3 2019 as the basis of that.

4

5 MR. PELTOLA: Tom.

6

7 MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah.

8

9 MR. PELTOLA: So if I understand that
10 correctly, the 135,000 for law enforcement within the
11 Service does not come out of the 17 percent that goes
12 to Refuges or FES, it comes from the 9 million and
13 change that goes through OSM, it comes out of that pot,
14 correct?

15

16 MR. DOOLITTLE: This is actually coming
17 out of the, yeah, it does, from the tri -- from the FES
18 portion that's going to Refuges that comes as wildlife
19 dollars, you are correct about that, but the admin
20 target is a negotiable item. It's something that we do
21 talk about, you know, what's being done for those
22 monies and the special agent in charge and myself, you
23 know, talk about, you know, enforcement priorities for
24 subsistence, and that's -- you know, again, one of the
25 goals that we have for that.

26

27 MR. GLASPELL: If I could just add a
28 little more clarification there. The law enforcement
29 we're talking about here is the Office of Law
30 Enforcement, so these are special agents that typically
31 work off Refuge enforcing subsistence regs and things
32 like the Marine Mammals Protection Act and Migratory
33 Bird Treaty Act and so on. So on Refuges we have
34 Federal wildlife officers, those are the uniformed
35 officers you see in the field, that's funded through
36 Refuges and is part of that larger budget that I was
37 talking about. So there's a lot of law enforcement
38 directed at subsistence going on on the ground, this is
39 just a fraction of it.

40

41 MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, and then that's
42 very good point from, you know, that Brian just made,
43 is that, with many things, whether it's biological
44 programs for support of subsistence programs that
45 provides data for the Board to make decisions, and as
46 part of our public process as far as law enforcement,
47 not only does Fish and Wildlife Service, you know,
48 contribute to that but so does the Forest Service, Park
49 Service, BLM, all the land management agencies that

50

1 have boots on the ground doing work, all contribute to
2 the subsistence to some degree, external to this
3 specific appropriated dollars for Alaska subsistence
4 that comes into the Fish and Wildlife Service.

5
6 Another big, you know, hurdle that
7 we've had since the government service agency -- when
8 we renegotiated our space cost, as you can see, that
9 started -- that renegotiation of the space cost, it
10 came into effect in 2016 and this will continue to
11 increase as part of this agreement, but, again, that
12 part of the budget has been a substantial hit to the
13 program. We discussed this with the rural Board members
14 and in our preparations for this presentation to the
15 Board, is that, there's an effort within the regional
16 office to consolidate space so our footprint is less to
17 try to decrease our space cost as well and it won't
18 defer that increase in entirety but it will make a
19 difference in the short-term. So we're looking at all
20 the creative solutions as a leadership team on how to,
21 you know, wrestle with the increased space cost that --
22 don't just affect OSM, but the entire -- all the
23 programs within the regional office.

24
25 So if we go back to the regional
26 subsistence budget and the big picture, my numbers are
27 a little bit different here. You know, Mary expressed
28 about 17 percent but it gives you the general idea of
29 that's the support of the monies that are taken out and
30 about 83 percent being retained by our program, the OSM
31 program. About 30 percent of those funds going into
32 the FMRP [sic], and then eight percent going into our
33 partners program, and the remainder, you know, is
34 paying Staff and to pretty well -- you know, quickly
35 use up that allocation.

36
37 As you can see the funding levels in
38 the FMRP [sic] was, you know, we're asking for about
39 \$2.7 million in expenditure, that is, you know, less
40 than last year's expenditures but please keep in mind
41 that we also forward funded a fair bit. But also in
42 the previous years we've been in this 3.5 range, but in
43 2016 we had a more robust budget and the Board, at that
44 time, encouraged us to fund all the projects and that
45 was a \$4.6 FMRP [sic] budget. I can tell you right now
46 we are nowhere near being able to do that in this day
47 and age at all, in a short period of time.

48
49 So the bottom line. So what's coming

50

1 from the department to headquarters is about 12.4
2 million. As I've -- to reiterate what comes to the
3 region is about 11.9 million. After Refuges and
4 Fisheries and common services and law enforcement are
5 funded, the consumable budget at OSM is about 9.5
6 million. And then if you add some of the support,
7 which we're very grateful for, for assisting Forest
8 Service with subsistence work, we see about \$100,000
9 coming to the Service for assisting with Forest Service
10 projects and our projected FMRP [sic] support for
11 Southeast and Southcentral programs -- projects in 2020
12 is about \$277,000. So, you know, we're in that \$10
13 million for doing the whole shooting match for 2020 if
14 we have kind of the static budget, which is what we
15 think we'll have but we won't know for another month or
16 so what our actual budget will be.

17
18 Here's the bottom line again.
19 Increases to OSM -- and I -- there's my favorite word
20 again, static, consumable budget, is, again, a variable
21 increase of Fish and Wildlife Service headquarters
22 assessment and we saw the first impacts of that in
23 2019. And I mean variable is an important word, that
24 could go down, it could go up, but, again, that's
25 something that we work on as a team to make sure that
26 we're getting the services out of the new organization
27 to serve all of our programs in the best ability that
28 we can and provide that advice to headquarters, you
29 know, through, you know, Greg, as the Regional
30 Director.

31
32 Also an impact year starting in 2016
33 was the additional space cost. And, again, looking at
34 how we, you know, absorb those particular -- those
35 particular costs.

36
37 And then logical increases in annual
38 court reporting costs and increases in that. But,
39 again, that's just a cost of doing business and I'm
40 very thankful of having, you know, Tina, back here to
41 be able to assist with our program and somebody that's
42 willing to sleep in schools and has handled the program
43 for a number of years. But, again, we're -- we look at
44 that as, you know, an overall -- overall cost to the
45 program.

46
47 But the real biggest thing in the room
48 is annual inflationary costs. And if we look at, you
49 know, the average wage in -- you know, the wage

50

1 increase for Alaska Federal employees is about 3.2
2 percent, we look at inflationary rates which
3 fortunately are low in the 1.5 percent range, we can
4 average out that the dollar is going down, it's -- it's
5 practical use is about 2 to 4 percent per year. And so
6 that means within a decade we're losing half of our
7 buying power in a program if we're on a static budget
8 or on a flat budget. And so this is something the
9 program has to wrestle with and we do that, you know,
10 through all the conventional means, such as work force
11 planning, you know, making sure that we operate in the
12 leanest and meanest way possible. Also we're not going
13 to do more with less, we're going to do less with less.
14 We're realists about many things that we do. The
15 priorities that make our program function are being
16 able to have our RACs function and employees to do the
17 job that they need to do. And I'm so proud of our
18 employees that -- that really have make -- that really
19 make it work, and as you'll see in the next
20 presentation, about, you know, that we are down a
21 number of employees but I can say the people that we
22 have really know their job and do -- and do a great
23 job.
24

25 And I think that we need to do -- put
26 something together so, you know, hopefully that with a
27 higher service end and these changes in inflationary
28 costs that one day we do see, you know, an increase in
29 funding for our programs and that we take into account
30 of all the collective effort that all the agencies do,
31 you know, from the Bureau of Indian Affairs, you know,
32 right down to BLM and the Forest Service to all the
33 tribes and private organizations and our public and the
34 State, that all, in some way contribute to the Federal
35 Subsistence Program. The volunteerism that we see out
36 of our Regional Advisory Councils, they're paramount to
37 what we do and treating our volunteers in the most
38 respectful way for what they do is really part of this
39 program as well.
40

41 So there's a lot more that goes into
42 this and a lot more energy and human capital than what
43 I'm reporting on today with my colleagues.
44

45 Would entertain any questions that you
46 might have.
47

48 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I almost think
49 that would be a good thing, Tom.....
50

1 REPORTER: Tony.

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON:to show
4 case all that additional support.

5

6 REPORTER: Tony.

7

8 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, sorry. To
9 showcase that additional support of what it actually
10 takes to run this program because I know that 9 million
11 isn't it and it's drastically less than what we
12 operated on in the past, you know, and then we have
13 unfunded projects as well as some real regional or
14 statewide priorities that continue to miss the bus due
15 to various issues, you know what I mean. But I think
16 this program probably operates more at like 20 million
17 if I had to throw a number of there, and could probably
18 use a considerable amount more. And I don't know how
19 strapped we are on the lobbying and all that other
20 stuff, but how to get out there and try to do the
21 fundraising, you know. I know at the local level
22 that's what we have to do.

23

24 (Laughter)

25

26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I'm thinking
27 from a little guy here, you know, you got to get busy
28 and I know it's just a different can of worms at the
29 top.

30

31 MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

32

33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead,
34 Charlie.

35

36 MR. BROWER: Tom, the GSA seems to grow
37 every year, the rationale for that is what, the
38 increase of the rent or the building itself?

39

40 MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah. In fact when
41 there's an entering into agreement, usually again
42 they're building in the cost of doing business, you
43 know, for a facility and what it'll cost them into the
44 future when they negotiate agreement. And so the space
45 costs of -- you know, are something that we've wrestled
46 with a number of different options, and, again, we all
47 contribute to, you know, one pool of money to, you
48 know, to pay for the facilities that we have. And so I
49 can say that our leadership team is active in looking

50

1 at ways to cut those costs. And I don't think, even
2 though we come up with short term and some long term
3 remedies, that we're going to continually bring up that
4 issue.

5
6 MR. BROWER: There's no other options
7 of looking for other places cheaper than where you're
8 at right now or is it just the space availability that
9 you need?

10
11 MR. DOOLITTLE: We have looked for
12 other spaces in an informal way and some of them have
13 been less expensive but, again, the process of breaking
14 agreements and then looking, and being part of the team
15 effort relative to the solutions is really part of the
16 priority because we want to make sure that if we do any
17 move to save space cost, that we do it right. But
18 Charlie to answer your question, we have looked at
19 alternative sources but only in an informal way but
20 also we -- we address it as a team almost, routinely,
21 at least twice a year as part of a directorate team at
22 Fish and Wildlife Service.

23
24 MR. BROWER: Thank you. Thank you, Mr.
25 Chair.

26
27 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg.

28
29 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
30 Mary, Tom, Brian, thank you very much for the
31 presentation.

32
33 A couple of points. You know, I think,
34 Tony, you made a great one and that is it takes a heck
35 of a lot more than just the Office of Subsistence
36 Management to sort of manage and run a subsistence
37 perspective on behalf of the Department of Interior and
38 AG. You know, in thinking about that you would be also
39 incorporating Park Service, and BLM and Gene, your role
40 in BIA, it all comes together to really have a
41 subsistence program within the state of Alaska. You
42 know the budget picture that they painted, I can paint
43 in many areas within the Fish and Wildlife Service
44 itself here in Alaska as well, not just within OSM but
45 within Refuges and within the overall Fisheries and
46 Ecological Services, our law enforcement program,
47 aviation program, they all sort of have that same, you
48 know, scenario going on, you know, a two to four
49 percent per year over the course of -- I think the last
50

1 look I did, 17 years, we're operating between a third
2 and a half less on purchasing power than we were then.
3 And I'm guessing, as I look at Dave saying, yep, you
4 recognize that, and I'm betting Chad, you probably
5 recognize that -- now, Don, I don't know if I can speak
6 for Parks, you guys seem to do pretty well at times,
7 you know.

8

9 (Laughter)

10

11 MR. SIEKANIEC: But it is.....

12

13 MR. STRIKER: America's best idea.

14

15 MR. SIEKANIEC: Yeah. Yeah.

16

17 (Laughter)

18

19 MR. SIEKANIEC: Yeah, we're trying to
20 figure out how the second best idea fits in there.

21

22 (Laughter)

23

24 MR. SIEKANIEC: You know, it is, it's a
25 pretty amazing story for one and it gets pretty
26 complicated as you kind of really get into it and tease
27 it apart. So I think for the -- from the Board's
28 standpoint, what I would like to maybe have a
29 discussion at some point in time, so what are we going
30 to about it, you know. I advocate for Fish and
31 Wildlife Service budgets and, Dave, I'm sure you're
32 asked, you know, on your annual basis of appropriations
33 how it looks in regards to what the Department's are
34 proposing and, Chad, I'm sure you're getting -- you
35 know, in the same kind of discussions and, you know,
36 and you're advocating, Don, you know, for what you need
37 for subsistence within National Parks, you know, are we
38 effectively doing the best we can for an overall
39 perspective on subsistence by staying within those kind
40 of silos; I don't know, but it's probably a discussion
41 at some point in time we ought to have. And, you know,
42 whether we collectively come together and, you know,
43 build a perspective on what it takes to run an Office
44 of Subsistence Management in relation to all of the
45 needs that we have, you know, I think that's where we
46 really need to sort of come together and have that
47 dialogue at some point. Otherwise we're going to look
48 an awful lot like this again next year and the year
49 after. There are no budget increases in our future

50

1 from what I can see coming out of the proposed -- I
2 don't have the 2021 in my hands yet, but I'm certainly
3 not hearing -- a lot of rumblings about, boy, does this
4 look great.

5

6 So, you know, anyway, thank you.

7

8 Thanks.

9

10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Gene.

11

12 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
13 First off, I'd like to thank Brian, Tom and Mary for
14 their presentation. And some may wonder how OSM got to
15 where they're at within the Fish and Wildlife Service.
16 That's contained within Subpart of the regulations, 50
17 CFR 110.D9, stipulates that the Office of Subsistence
18 Management will be placed under the Fish and Wildlife
19 Service so that the Service can provide administrative
20 support.

21

22 Secondly, is that, I don't have any
23 particular questions for Brian, Tom or Mary, do
24 appreciate the effort of going through it. But I would
25 like to make an amendment to our earlier motion, to add
26 the Federal Subsistence Program budget, to our
27 executive session discussion later on today or
28 tomorrow, whenever that does occur.

29

30 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, so he
31 pulled it and now he wants it back in.

32

33 (Laughter)

34

35 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No, I'm just
36 trying to feed my mind.

37

38 MR. PELTOLA: I pulled the presentation
39 from the.....

40

41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, from the
42 executive session.

43

44 MR. PELTOLA:from the executive
45 session, and now I'd like to have a Board discussion
46 about the budget based on the presentation.

47

48 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. And it
49 looks like we still have budget discussion under
50

1 executive session.

2

3 MR. PELTOLA: Yes.

4

5 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I think we just
6 pulled the presentation.

7

8 MR. PELTOLA: Yes.

9

10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So I think it
11 still would hold merit as is.

12

13 Concurrence.

14

15 (Board nods affirmatively)

16

17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, okay.
18 Everybody's shaking their head. Okay. Did you have
19 something Dave.

20

21 MR. SCHMID: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
22 And, again, thanks for the presentation it was very
23 helpful for me, and I, like the Chairman, like to see
24 the full pictures at times and things. Our in-season
25 managers are funded differently, I think, thank others
26 and places. But, you're right, Greg, I've been
27 watching our budgets continue to decline two to four
28 percent. Forest Service, we were held under for a long
29 time, our fire funding was continuing to go up and the
30 result of that is about 50 percent less non-fire
31 positions in the agency than there was 10, 12 years
32 ago. We thought that would come back with a fire
33 funding fix, that hasn't taken place yet.

34

35 The Tongass has 30 percent of the
36 employees it had on it when I left here, 10, 15 years
37 ago.

38

39 And so something, we've got to look at
40 these cost centers that Charlie referred to, it's the
41 same thing, our leases across the country continue to
42 go up and, you know, our solutions, at least within the
43 Agency and regions I've worked in have been to try and
44 own your own building at times and try and -- and I
45 know, Greg and I, we've looked there, I've looked with
46 BLM on here how we can co-locate and continue to reduce
47 our footprint, and it's not for lack of trying but it's
48 a tough nut to crack. Some of these leases have just
49 gone up expeditiously. But, I agree if we don't do

50

1 anything other than complain about it, here in another
2 five or 10 years, or even in the next couple of years,
3 we'll be in a predicament, and there may be a way
4 better. I know within the Forest Service, for a period
5 of time there, depending which Administration, the
6 President's budget would take it out, and our
7 Delegation would put it back in and then it'd go out.
8 At least it's been flat and so I think it's -- it could
9 be worse than what it is. But if there's a way, maybe,
10 in executive session or hear others, that we can
11 collectively look at a way to ensure that we're being
12 good stewards here.

13

14 Thanks.

15

16 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, I think
17 that's a good place to bring the discussion is maybe to
18 look at a joint statement about some of the things you
19 hear our Staff stating, you know, it's not sustainable
20 at this level, you know, and the buying power and all
21 that going down, they really need to take a hard look
22 at what funding it is and then maybe have to
23 reestablish even our priorities and what we can fund.

24

25 We definitely need to have the Regional
26 Advisory Councils and the Staff support to get the
27 information through the system, you know, and then that
28 information, I guess, is our FRMP projects but, you
29 know, I'd hate to see us dwindle too much of that down,
30 too, because that local -- that FRMP project --
31 process, is, I believe what brings the rural and
32 Alaskans to the table, you know, and engages them in
33 this process and so the less we engage with them, the
34 less this program's going to be successful so hopefully
35 we can find a solution.

36

37 Any other discussion or questions for
38 Staff.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you very
43 much for your presentation. Appreciate your Staff and
44 all the hard work it takes to do this.

45

46 That brings us to the Partners for
47 Fisheries Monitoring and Alaska Native Science
48 Engineering Program, updates and introductions.

49

50

1 Karen Hyer.

2

3 (Pause)

4

5 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, yeah, you
6 have the floor.

7

8 MS. HYER: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman
9 and Board members. I'm Karen Hyer and I'm a fisheries
10 biologist with the Office of Subsistence Management. I
11 also work with our partnership programs and so we're
12 going to share a couple updates today before we start
13 with our Partners Program.

14

15 I was just going to talk about our
16 ANSEP, U.S. Fish and Wildlife partnership where we work
17 with the ANSEP program, and the ANSEP program is a
18 longitudinal educational program that is based out of
19 the university system and they start with the middle
20 school students and mentor them and guide them in STEM
21 careers, basically. They're trying to increase the
22 number of Alaska Natives and rural individuals in STEM
23 careers, and they start with the middle school and they
24 go through high school. And then we have internship
25 programs through the University system and they work
26 with students all the way through a graduate program,
27 and so our Staff is involved all the way through every
28 step. we teach at the high school and at the middle
29 school and then we employ internships at the Bridge
30 Program and then at the University Program. And so the
31 Bridge Program are students that are graduating from
32 high school and they're bridging to University. And
33 those students spend about three weeks getting all of
34 the training they need to work in the field, like
35 Dunker training and bear safety and firearms and then
36 after they complete that segment, they come and they
37 work with us for about six weeks.

38

39 And when you enter in and you see the
40 desk with Kayla, if you look to the right and kind of
41 around the corner, I've put our Bridge student posters
42 from last summer out there, so please take a moment to
43 see the Bridge students. And this summer we had eight
44 Bridge students total and they worked with U.S. Fish
45 and Wildlife Service and the Forest Service and many of
46 our partner organizations, and we were fortunate enough
47 to have some positions where students could intern for
48 three weeks with one organization and then move to
49 another, just to get a feel for what those

50

1 organizations do. And then in addition to that we had
2 seven University students that worked with us for the
3 whole summer, and those students come in May and they
4 work through August and they're an integral part of our
5 work force. And this year is the first year that every
6 single University position was filled by a returning
7 student. So that was really exciting for us because
8 our goal is to continue to mentor these students
9 through grad school. And we have a few students now
10 that are actually entering the grad program who have
11 interned with us.

12
13 So that's what's happening with the
14 ANSEP program.

15
16 Now in addition to that we also have
17 our Partners For Fisheries Monitoring Program where we
18 -- it's a competitive grant process. We fund
19 biologists, anthropologist and educators and those
20 positions are placed in rural and Alaska Native
21 organizations throughout Alaska, and it's a four year
22 grant, and we just finished up at the end of 2019, a
23 four year segment, and in 2020 we're starting another
24 four year segment.

25
26 So I have a few partners in the
27 audience that I'd like to introduce you to. We have
28 Odin Miller. Odin, can you wave. And Odin is with the
29 Ahtna InterTribal Fisheries Resource Commission.

30
31 And we also have Jennifer Halin, and
32 Jennifer is a new partner with us and she's with the
33 Yakutat Tribal -- or the Yakutat Tlingit Tribe.

34
35 And then we have Janessa Esquible with
36 ONC.

37
38 And then in addition to those partners,
39 we have a partner with Bristol Bay Native Association.
40 We have one with the Native Village of Napaimute. We
41 have one with the Native Village of Eyak. And we have
42 one with the Tanana Chiefs Council. And we have one
43 with the Q Tribe in Unalaska.

44
45 And so Jennifer is going to -- excuse
46 me, Janessa is going to present a bit about what she
47 has been working with. But before I let Jennifer
48 present, we also have another partner from NVE on the
49 line, and I would request that the Chair ask that his
50

1 line be opened so he could answer any questions after
2 the presentation. Tina, can you do that, or you'll let
3 the operator know, that's what Tina said we could do to
4 let him on.

5
6 REPORTER: Yes, let the operator know.

7
8 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Operator could
9 you please open, did you say James' line?

10
11 REPORTER: Dan Gillikin.

12
13 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Native
14 Village.....

15
16 REPORTER: Dan Gillikin.

17
18 MS. ESQUIBLE: Dan -- Dan Gillikin.

19
20 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, Dan
21 Gillikin should be on line, right, Tina.

22
23 REPORTER: Yes, he's on, just have her
24 open his line.

25
26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Could you
27 please open his line so he can comment. Thank you.

28
29 MS. HYER: Thanks. And with that, I'll
30 turn it over to Janessa.

31
32 MS. ESQUIBLE: Hi, everyone, my name is
33 Janessa Esquible. And before I begin, I just wanted to
34 share, I do have some materials, should I pass them out
35 now or after.

36
37 MS. HYER: I can do that.

38
39 MS. ESQUIBLE: Okay. So I've been
40 working with ONC for just a few months shy of four
41 years in Bethel as the Partners biologist, and I
42 believe ONC has had support from the OSM to have a
43 partners biologist working for them since like 2008.

44
45 Next slide.

46
47 Oh, and I should highlight some of
48 these youths. So these are youth that we employed this
49 past summer, and Karen has asked me to give you all an
50

1 overview of some of our project involvement in 2019.
2 So I'm really grateful to be here today. I'm not sure
3 if any of you are aware of what's been happening with
4 ONC and what projects we're involved with so that's the
5 goal for my presentation today. And these youth here
6 are all from within the Kuskokwim but they're all at
7 different stages in their life. We have high school
8 students there, college students, students that are
9 pretty close to graduating, some involved in ANSEP but
10 others not.

11
12 So one of the first programs that I'll
13 speak to is the in-season harvest monitoring program.
14 This is the longest standing project that the tribe has
15 been working with the Alaska Department of Fish and
16 Game on since 2001. And it's allowed us to build
17 strong standing relationships with locals. Throughout
18 the months of June and July, we go out to Bethel area
19 fish camps and in more recent years out to the Bethel
20 boat harbor. We ask them about their harvest, we
21 document catch composition, gear type that was used,
22 fishing progress, so how close are folks to meeting
23 their subsistence needs for the season for chum,
24 chinook and sockeye. And another important component
25 of this program is documenting their concerns. So
26 maybe this -- this past summer we had several concerns
27 mentioned about the flesh of the salmon being kind of
28 soft, some of the salmon flesh looked discolored, so we
29 sent some of those samples in to a pathologist, we're
30 still waiting to get back the results on that. But,
31 yeah, the fishers will express just a variety of
32 concerns, whether it be in regard to the fish
33 themselves or management of the fishery. And then
34 throughout the months of June and July, we compile the
35 information that the fishers have shared with us and we
36 present an overview to the Kuskokwim River Salmon
37 Management Working Group entailing harvest information
38 and then some of that's in the -- the overview of our
39 results is in this in-season harvest monitoring program
40 pamphlet, if you want to learn more about that.

41
42 Another component of this project is
43 the chinook salmon age, sex, length sampling program.
44 Again, these projects are supported through the FRMP
45 process. And this year we were really successful in
46 recruitment so we trained -- we recruit and train local
47 fishers to sample their subsistence chinook salmon and
48 this past season we recruited 25 local samplers, most
49 of them were from Bethel, and we haven't seen
50

1 recruitment this high since 2011. That was really
2 exciting. And we were able to pay out about \$7,000 to
3 community members because they each get paid for
4 sampling their catch and we received about 1,500
5 samples and 80 percent of them are ageable.
6

7 We also started helping out with the
8 otolith sampling. And an otolith, just shown here,
9 just the ear stone of the salmon. You can learn lots
10 from the otolith, where the fish was born, the age of
11 the salmon. And this is part of a larger effort in
12 coordination with the University of Washington, who's
13 really the lead on this project, and Alaska Department
14 of Fish and Game. So this past summer, our technicians
15 sampled the chinook salmon that were caught in the
16 Bethel test fishery and it's part of a larger effort to
17 understand the relative abundance of chinook salmon in
18 the tributaries in the Kuskokwim watershed, the
19 Nushagak and I also have an outline of some of that
20 work and kind of how these hot spots of salmon and
21 relative abundance are shifting year to year. And so
22 if you all want to read more on that, the document was
23 produced by Daniel Schindler and Sean Brennan. And
24 then once we're done removing the otoliths, our crew
25 will distribute fish to local elders, disabled and
26 widows. Many years ago they used to just have the fish
27 -- the Bethel test fishery would put the bin out to the
28 community, but as maybe some of you may or may not
29 agree with, there's some issues of equity there and
30 access of, you know, who can get the fish and who
31 can't. So my old boss, Greg Roczicka, designed this
32 fish distribution program and that's been really well
33 received in the community. There's Carry Nels on the
34 left, Barbara in the middle and then Esther Greene on
35 the right.
36

37 MR. BROWER: She looks happy.
38

39 MS. ESQUIBLE: Yeah. And we were
40 really fortunate enough to receive funding from the BIA
41 Tribal Youth Initiative program this past summer and
42 we'll continue the work into this next summer. We have
43 many, many partners who helped out with this and some
44 of you may have heard it referred to as a science and
45 culture camp. A couple years ago we worked with ANSEP
46 on a natural resource career exploration program, where
47 ANSEP students all came to Bethel, so it's kind of
48 evolved over the years. This will be the -- this
49 upcoming summer will be the fourth year that we're
50

1 going to be doing the program. And in 2019 we had 15
2 students that were engaged throughout the program from
3 six different communities, most of them were from
4 coastal communities, Kong, Kipnuk, Newtok, so that was
5 awesome because we hadn't really worked with that many
6 students from the coast before. And we had Fish and
7 Game in the top and middle, he led a small game
8 session. Students were learning about small game in
9 the area, any concerns about the population and life
10 history. They were also sharing their knowledge with
11 these wildlife biologists. And then on the top right,
12 that's Aaron Moses, he and Gary DeCossas were teaching
13 the students about the fish preservation project that
14 they ran last summer. And then on the bottom left
15 there's Patrick Snow with the Yukon Delta National
16 Wildlife Refuge, he's one of our biggest partners and
17 has really helped out a lot over the past few years in
18 supporting the science and culture camp. He led
19 lessons on mark/recapture, he took the kids out
20 birding, took the kids up to the Kwethluk weir, so he
21 really does a lot for the program.

22
23 The students also spent a lot of time
24 with local elders. So there was a strong cultural
25 component. They overnighted and spent a couple of days
26 at fish camp learning about guskeg, Yup'ik cultural
27 values, and they had the opportunity to go fishing.
28 They also spent a lot of time doing ethnobotony
29 activities, so learning about traditional medicinal
30 uses of local plants with the elders. As you can see
31 down here there's Amy Obrien, Gloria Semien, and then
32 there's Doctor Sara Murray who's been helping us out as
33 the ethnobotonist. So they were making medicinal salve
34 on the bottom left that they then distributed to
35 instructors and elders who helped with the program at
36 the final ceremony. And then on the bottom right,
37 that's the students out at the sonar site just above
38 Church Slough, so Keegan Birchfield and his team, they
39 led the students through about a half day tour, really
40 hands on, and so they -- they got to learn more about
41 the assessment projects going on in the Kuskokwim.

42
43 And then on the top left, we have Mary
44 Peltola, she came with Robert Lekander and they also
45 worked with the Refuge in talking to them about the
46 complex co-management structure that they have but
47 there's been success over the past couple of years, and
48 the elders shared with the students, you know, what do
49 they use to make decisions and the importance of local
50

1 involvement in the management process.

2

3

4 And they also had the chance, on the
5 bottom left, to participate in a mock RAC meeting that
6 Karen Hyer and Alissa Rogers led. And in the RAC
7 meeting they identified the concerns in regards to fish
8 and wildlife, and a few of those students then followed
9 up on deliberated to the actual YK RAC last fall on
10 those concerns that they gathered at the mock meeting.

11

12

13 Spencer Reardon did moose
14 radiotelemetry with the students. They did an oil
15 spill simulation. They went on YKUK, spoke about some
16 of the program highlights and then they did some salmon
17 aging as well.

18

19

20 Another project that we're involved
21 with is the post-season subsistence harvest survey
22 project, and this is another FRMP funded effort we work
23 with Fish and Game on, and have been for many, many
24 years. This past season we hired seven locals, we just
25 about achieved our sample size goal, completing 518
26 surveys. And then one new addition to this past season
27 was that we had this one page summary, which I think
28 you all should have in front of you. So in prior
29 years, they've been -- you know, we work on this huge
30 report that most members of the public aren't really
31 going to read and we decided it'd be good to come up
32 with a deliverable that's more digestible. So this
33 past season all of the interviews, we distributed this
34 one page summary and it's in English and Yup'ik, and so
35 that was a highlight of this past season.

36

37

38 And -- I should back up, sorry, the
39 goal of this project is just to get an estimate of how
40 many chinook, chum, sockeye, coho salmon are harvested,
41 whether people met their needs or not, identifying, you
42 know, sharing, receiving, any fish that were lost,
43 concerns that the fishers may have about the prior
44 season.

45

46

47 This is another newer project that
48 we're working with the University of Alaska Fairbanks
49 on, so they had a team that came out in the fall of
50 2018, they met with the ONC Council and the subsistence
committee about the project, and this is a statewide
effort. I'll speak some to the goals and objectives
here soon. And we're going to be continuing the project
this year and next year. So there's a few objectives

51

1 that ONC has decided they want to focus on. One, being
2 identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the salmon
3 management system through a Yup'ik and Athabascan
4 perspective, and this is going to be done through
5 ethnographic interviews with multi-generational fishing
6 families, and then the other objectives were to
7 document Yup'ik and Athabascan values, knowledge,
8 governing mechanisms that they use for salmon systems
9 and how those can be better incorporated into the
10 current salmon management system. And so we'll
11 continue doing this work and conducting interviews in
12 communities all along the Kuskokwim.

13
14 One of my last couple of slides here,
15 so these students here participated in a monitoring
16 project of some sort of another. On the left we have
17 Calvin Samson from Bethel, top is Nikoli Chase, and
18 then the bottom students from left to right, Winni Lee,
19 Isabella Valcarce and Dylan Dementieff. So these
20 students, to the right, they went on the Aniak and
21 Salmon River math science expedition so all the
22 students utilized local data. We work with them and
23 the teachers at Bethel Regional High School to come up
24 with science fair projects. And on the far left, he
25 won first place last year at the LKSD science fair,
26 Nikoli won second. They both went on to state where
27 they also placed. And then these students at the
28 bottom won first and second place for the middle school
29 category. So it's been really great in working with
30 the students. They're utilizing local data that they,
31 themselves collected and, yeah, coming up with science
32 fair projects. And all of these students are planning
33 to work on projects these next couple months.

34
35 So for 2020, we're planning, like I
36 said to do a fourth annual science and culture camp.
37 We're hoping to continue all of our other projects. We
38 also are looking forward to the potential of working on
39 the Bethel sonar project, which was on the list of
40 recommended projects for funding with the State. The
41 tribal council has really been wanting to get more
42 involved with assessment projects so we're looking
43 forward to that potential and the possibility of the
44 sonar getting -- operations getting extended into
45 August.

46
47 So at this point we can either have Dan
48 go or if anyone has any questions, thank you for your
49 time. And, hopefully Dan's on the line?
50

1 REPORTER: Yes, he is.
2
3 MR. GILLIKIN: Yes, I am, can everybody
4 hear me?
5
6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.
7
8 REPORTER: Tony, turn the mic on or he
9 can't hear you.
10
11 MS. ESQUIBLE: Yes, you're good.
12
13 MR. GILLIKIN: Okay. Was there any
14 questions for Janessa or would you like me to begin my
15 presentation?
16
17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead and if
18 we have questions we'll just hold them until the end.
19
20 Thank you.
21
22 MR. GILLIKIN: Okay. Thank you. Well,
23 good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, Board Members.
24 Appreciate you spending your time to listen to our
25 programs here. Apologize for not being able to be
26 there in person. We're having some pretty cold weather
27 around here and I have livestock to tend and a
28 homestead to take care of so it makes it a little bit
29 difficult.
30
31 But, anyway, my name is Dan Gillikin,
32 and I'm the environmental director, and partners
33 biologist for the Native Village of Napaimute. I've
34 been with Napaimute now for about five years. I want
35 to apologize for my first slide, I already see an error
36 on it. I'm presenting my projects and outreach
37 activities for 2019, not 2018. That's what I get for
38 recycling slides I guess.
39
40 So next slide, please, Janessa.
41
42 So a little bit about the Native
43 Village of Napaimute for those who aren't familiar with
44 it. One interpretation of the word, Napaimute, means
45 people of the forest. It's a small seasonal village in
46 the middle of the Kuskokwim River, about 45 miles up
47 river from Aniak and we currently have a little over
48 100 enrolled members. It's a seasonally occupied
49 village with only one permanent resident in it right
50

1 now in the wintertime, but in the summer time it's used
2 as a fish camp, hunting camp, things like that and it's
3 pretty active in the summer time. We have several
4 program areas, which include the Indian General
5 Assistance Program, or the IGAP program through the
6 EPA. The Brownfield program and things like the Tribal
7 Transportation Program, for which we mostly spend our
8 funding on that related to putting in and maintaining
9 the ice road that is in place on the Kuskokwim River in
10 the wintertime. Right now we've got a road -- an ice
11 road, I believe all the way from Crooked Creek down to
12 Atmautluak, past Bethel, and there are plans to extend
13 it all the way up to Sleetmute this year, which will
14 make it, I believe, the longest road in Alaska, and on
15 the Kuskokwim forever.

16
17 We also have an enterprise side, where
18 it's a -- it's a non-profit, for business operation,
19 and it focuses on firewood and fuel sales, logistic
20 support up and down the river. We recently purchased a
21 landing craft that will be expanding our support
22 operations for and then we offer rough cut lumber and
23 cabin packages to local purchasers.

24
25 So next slide please.

26
27 So the Partners Program is a big part
28 of what I do. And it's obviously funded through OSM,
29 and we have received funding until 2023. And the
30 general areas that we try to help folks out with are,
31 interacting with agencies on monitoring projects, and
32 researchers out here, representing our tribal members
33 and the council, providing advice on fisheries related
34 concerns and getting stakeholders opportunities to
35 interact with managers and administrators related to
36 management of the fishery. We place a huge emphasis on
37 trying to build a local work force out here and
38 providing capacity to local stakeholders to be more
39 involved and earn a living, start a career in these
40 natural resource management areas. We've taken on
41 several ANSEP interns over the years and other interns
42 and much to my delight we are starting to see some of
43 the fruits of that labor. That lower picture on the
44 left hand side of the screen is Alex Nicori, and one of
45 the Hutlett twins, I believe it's Carlton, recent
46 graduates from UAF with fisheries degrees, both going
47 on to work on fisheries projects and I believe Carlton
48 is even going to start working on his Masters. So
49 we're slowly starting to build that local work force,
50

1 which hopefully will come back and help me out in time
2 before I finally retire from real from this work and
3 can take over for me. But then the other aspect is you
4 got to start young, and that's where we do a lot of the
5 outreach and education with local youths. And I'll
6 talk about that in more detail, but we have a couple of
7 projects that focus in that area as well.

8
9 So related to the fisheries monitoring.
10 We've been operating the Salmon River weir for four
11 years now. We did not receive funding last year for
12 it. We've been relying on year to year funding through
13 tribal wildlife grants, through Pacific States Marine
14 Fisheries Commission funding, pretty much whoever we
15 could find funding for to continue the operation of it,
16 and this year we do have funding from the Tribal
17 Wildlife Grant Program, but I also submitted an FRMP
18 proposal so hopefully it'll fund it for the next four
19 years so that we can focus more on our work out there
20 and less on chasing funding for that year to year to
21 year. The crew consists of four locals typically.
22 Usually a couple of them are interns and they're
23 usually local or ANSEP interns. The objective of the
24 weir operation is to just index abundance of chinook
25 and chum salmon. And we get about 90 percent of the
26 chinook salmon and about 85 percent of the chum salmon.
27 And this is one of the main tributaries of the Aniak
28 River, which has quite a bit of sportfishing activity
29 on it, a lot of subsistence rod and reeling activity
30 that occurs on it, and so it's really important that we
31 kind of keep close tabs on escapement within that
32 system.

33
34 Next slide please.

35
36 So we should be on 17, I believe
37 Janessa. And the Aniak test fishery is another
38 monitoring project that we've been funding annually
39 either with, you know, Tribal Wildlife Grant funds,
40 other funding sources, and we submitted an FRMP
41 proposal to also get that funded for the next four
42 years. Now, this information is being used by managers
43 in season, to look at the relative abundance and
44 ratios, chinook to chum and sockeye to inform them
45 about management decisions in the lower river and
46 determine whether or not we want to have an opening, or
47 not have an opening, whether it looks like we are
48 escaping enough fish to the middle river for fishermen
49 to have a reasonable opportunity to harvest up here
50

1 because that's been an issue in the past. And it's a
2 new project, but we've been operating it since 2015 and
3 we're starting to collect some fairly interesting
4 information from it. It's operated much like the
5 Bethel test fishery, follows a very similar protocol
6 and those fish get distributed, at least the ones that
7 -- or mortalities get distributed to the local Aniak
8 community and to neighboring villages.

9

10 Next slide please.

11

12 So fisheries outreach. Our big role in
13 outreach in-season, is to share information with
14 stakeholders on management actions, on how they can
15 participate in those decisionmaking processes, how they
16 can submit regulatory proposals. So we provide some
17 technical advice in those areas and assist them with
18 that if they request it. We interact with the
19 different advisory groups and the Kuskokwim River
20 InterTribal Fish Commission. We attend Board of Fish
21 meetings. And Federal Subsistence Board meetings, if
22 we -- if the Council decides that they want to submit a
23 regulatory proposal for any matter, and like I said we
24 provide technical assistance. One of our main recent
25 additions to social media is our Facebook page and I've
26 got the address up there. You can just Google
27 Kuskokwim River Fish Report, and that was posted by
28 Rebecca Wilmar from Red Devil, and she maintains it.
29 She's one of our fisheries resource information
30 technicians and she tries to keep that all up to date
31 with the most recent information and has proved to be
32 very popular. One of our tribal members, Megan Leary,
33 is on the Fish Commission, InterTribal Fish Commission
34 as one of the in-season managers, and so she also talks
35 with many people in the middle river here and brings
36 their ideas, their concerns to those in-season meetings
37 for the Commission to then act on if it's necessary.

38

39 Next slide please.

40

41 So these outreach projects, we have two
42 main projects there. And one is the George River
43 internship, which is actually indirectly funded by the
44 Fish and Wildlife Service and OSM through the George
45 River weir funding. We have a cooperative agreement
46 with ADF&G, where we take about a dozen high school and
47 a little bit older, actually, sometimes, interns up to
48 the George River for a week to 10 days, and up on the
49 George River we have a suite of sites that we are

50

1 sampling annually, and we have an established protocol
2 where we collect water quality parameters, hydrology
3 measurements, geomorphic measurements, basically going
4 over all -- and teaching them all the basic habitat
5 assessment techniques that you learn when you're, you
6 know, a technician with the Forest Service or with the
7 Fish and Wildlife Service assessing habitat. So those
8 are real skills that they can use to apply for jobs in
9 the future, but we're also starting to collect a very
10 interesting dataset in the same process. So that is
11 funded for the next four years also.

12
13 The math/science expedition is a
14 cooperative project. It's geared towards younger
15 students. It's a 10 day float on the Salmon and Aniak
16 Rivers where they learn some basic principles of
17 biology and fisheries. They do a lot of trapping and
18 they collect the data associated with their catch
19 efforts. And then they use that information, actually,
20 in post-project kind of assessment work.

21
22 Next slide, please, Janessa.

23
24 Where they, much like Janessa's group
25 does there, they use that actual data for their science
26 projects. And we've been very successful out here in
27 Aniak sending several competitors to the statewide
28 competition taking first and second place. And I can't
29 talk about this project without mentioning Doug
30 Molineaux, he's been so instrumental in the followup,
31 and the follow through with these young people and
32 encouraging them to continue participating in these
33 science activities.

34
35 These outreach projects couldn't happen
36 without partnerships. ExCel Alaska, ADF&G, the Kuspuk
37 School District, Janessa and her Staff, and then
38 previous interns. I have previous interns who come to
39 me all the time who want to go and participate and act
40 as, you know, mentors, to the younger students, and I
41 always highly encourage that.

42
43 So, with that, the last slide.

44
45 Any questions, for me or Janessa, I'd
46 be happy to answer.

47
48 (Pause)

49
50

1 MR. GILLIKIN: Hello.

2

3 MS. ESQUIBLE: We're still here.

4

5 (Laughter)

6

7 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Sorry, I was
8 sitting away from my microphone. Thank you for that
9 presentation. Always encouraging to see all the youth
10 involvement and getting ready for the next people to
11 take over this work load and always positive to see
12 that local engagement. So thank you guys for your good
13 work and wonderful presentation.

14

15 Is there any questions here for Dan and
16 Janessa from the Board here.

17

18 Rhonda.

19

20 MS. PITKA: I don't have any questions,
21 but a comment.

22

23 I really appreciate your use of
24 language and culture in all of your documents. And I
25 really -- it's really nice to see this in Yup'ik and in
26 language that people can understand. Normally we get,
27 you know, 17 pages faxed to our tribal offices and,
28 you're right, nobody reads them.

29

30 (Laughter)

31

32 MS. PITKA: Thank you for making that
33 readable.

34

35 (Laughter)

36

37 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Gene.

38

39 MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, I just wanted to
40 make one additional comment, is that, back at home in
41 Bethel, is Janessa's running around all summer long and
42 it would be 1:00 o'clock, 2:00 o'clock in the morning
43 and she'll be at the boat harbor, or it'll be 1:00,
44 2:00 or 3:00 o'clock in the morning and she'll be in
45 the boat with some of those students doing fish camp
46 visits because during the summer there is no sense of
47 time, you got to do what you got to do.

48

49 And in addition to, Dan, when he said

50

1 he'd been with NVN for five years, he kind of cut
2 himself a little bit short there. Yeah, he has been
3 with the Native Village of Napaimute for five years,
4 but also he was with KNA in Aniak for several years
5 prior to that. In addition to, prior to him retiring
6 to his little piece of paradise across the slough in
7 Aniak, he was the lead fisheries biologist for Yukon
8 Delta National Wildlife Refuge.

9
10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
11 other Board members have questions or discussion.

12
13 Greg.

14
15 MR. SIEKANIEC: I would just followup
16 with, again, thank you very much. I think Rhonda
17 started to get at it with a question of, like, so what
18 we can we do better, you know, I see the engagement
19 with ANSEP, the engagement with youth, is there
20 anything that jumps out at you as recommendations to,
21 you know, me, as the Regional Director of the Fish and
22 Wildlife Service, or others engaged, perhaps, in, you
23 know, future generations of conservation leadership;
24 anything we should be doing or thinking differently?

25
26 MS. ESQUIBLE: Well, we're really
27 grateful for all of the funding and support that OSM
28 has provided to us. It funds the partners position,
29 you know, I'm a tribal biologist, Dan's a tribal
30 biologist, they have Kevin with the Fish Commission.
31 And we've been like continuing to grow and build our
32 programs to the point that we can sustain them, but
33 there's also limitations in the fact that I am the only
34 biologist for the tribe, Dan is also the only biologist
35 for Native Village of Napaimute, and we have really
36 incredible partnerships with the State, U.S. Fish and
37 Wildlife Service, the University, there's -- you know,
38 the list goes on, but we really need to look into how
39 we can support another biolo -- more tribal biologists
40 to do this work. Because if we don't get funded for
41 another Partners Program, beyond four years, which in
42 our sustainability plan, we've kind of said that, you
43 know, we need to seek permanent funding, like the tribe
44 needs to seek permanent funding to secure a biologist
45 position in the future. Because otherwise who will
46 help facilitate and lead some of these projects. I'm
47 not sure what would happen at that point.

48
49 So we're trying our best to continue to
50

1 bring in funds wherever we can, applying for grants all
2 the time.

3

4 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you.

5

6 MR. GILLIKIN: And this is Dan.

7

8 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Dan.

9

10 MR. GILLIKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
11 would just hope that at every opportunity, that the
12 Board members would come out and visit with the
13 stakeholders. Just interact with the folks out here, I
14 mean I think that's -- that sends such a strong message
15 of support to, you know, their lifestyle and what's
16 important to them and I think it also benefits the
17 Board members. I know you're all very busy but it's a
18 -- as Gene can tell you it's a very beautiful place.

19

20 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Dan.
21 And I agree. I know that my two visits to the Kuskokwim
22 were very eye opening and we were well received at the
23 fish camps and gave us -- me, personally, a more clear
24 understanding of basically the sacrifice the rural
25 Alaskans have to make as they buy into these
26 conservation measures that we have to take as a Board,
27 which is hard to do, but when we went down there to see
28 that the rural residents have taken initiative and
29 they're doing the steps necessary to be involved and
30 engaged and to pull all the stakeholders together is,
31 just, something, I think, you should take a big pride
32 in and commend you and whatever we could continue to do
33 to support that, I'm fully behind.

34

35 MR. BROWER: Thank you.

36

37 MS. ESQUIBLE: Thank you for your time.

38

39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
40 appreciate it.

41

42 MR. GILLIKIN: Have a good afternoon.

43

44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You too. And
45 your pamphlet made me very hungry for Eskimo style
46 smoked fish strips here, I have to tell you that.

47

48 (Laughter)

49

50

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I thought you
2 were going to pull out a sample.

3
4 (Laughter)

5
6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: George does
7 that.

8
9 (Laughter)

10
11 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: That was
12 wonderful elk.

13
14 We are at Staffing issues with OSM, I
15 think it has to do with the short Staff we have, many
16 positions to fill. And so we'll get an update from
17 Tom.

18
19 MR. DOOLITTLE: I'm Tom Doolittle. And
20 Acting Assistant Regional Director for the record.
21 And, again, this is kind of one of the more somber
22 parts of leadership, is -- and -- and I'm only going to
23 go on my soap box a little bit and -- about what are
24 the woes within, you know, many groups.

25
26 But one of the -- you know, the
27 biggest, you know, biggest challenges, you know, for
28 the agency has been hiring, especially when you're
29 going through a new centralized process and -- and to
30 be honest it's a slow process. And, OSM, as you know,
31 and our program is specific to Alaska, and it's small.
32 We are the headquarters, regional office, and field
33 office all wrapped into one with our purpose being
34 advisors to this Board. And -- but I really do want to
35 make, you know, what's going on apparent to everybody
36 and be transparent about the process. And as you can
37 see, a number of positions are open, as of date, about
38 17. And they start from the top of the food chain --
39 after, you know, Gene had left, and over a year now,
40 seven months ago, to -- for a promotion to BIA, and
41 you'll see that, you know, many people have gone to --
42 for promotions, which is entirely -- which is entirely
43 normal. And -- but we've had an ability that's, you
44 know, quite slow to hire. And we feel the effects, a
45 little bit more acutely, because we're kind of that
46 canary in a coal mine, and as Greg knows, every time he
47 sees me, it's like, oh, here Tom comes again because
48 the first thing out of his mouth is going to be, so
49 what are we going to do about the hiring part and so
50

1 he's pretty used to that.

2

3

4 And so when we look at all these
5 positions that we have vacant, we're lean and mean, but
6 I -- and -- and the risk that we have to the program is
7 that we don't have a lot of depth yet, but the people
8 that we do have are seasoned and they excel at what
9 they do, so we're operating as business as usual. But,
10 again, but it -- it adds unnecessary stress to our
11 Staff, and so that's part of my soap box.

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

And -- but it's real.

As we go down and I look at a summary
is that in normal staffing of permanent positions from
our org chart there's about -- there's 41 positions
there, and with the 17 vacated positions, that means
we're about 41 percent down, and -- but if I add part
of Chris and part of Serene Dornisway, the -- our IT
folks that are supporting us, we're at about 25.5
people, I think, Chris, you're one of the -- it's half
of you sometimes, right.

(Laughter)

MR. DOOLITTLE: And -- but we're --
we're happy to have that. This -- we were at a similar
level back in 2013, late 2013 and we built back up and
-- and, again, the aspect of hiring has been slow.

But, however, when we look at the 17
positions that are down right now, we will be bringing
on three admin positions, some starting as early as
next week and we'll have, by the end of February, three
admin people. What I've learned without admin Staff,
is we all chip in as Tony and Rhonda and Charlie know,
is that, I sat and reorganized financial disclosure and
ethics training to handling timesheets to -- and I can
answer a phone pretty darn well, and transfer it, I'm
pretty proud of that.

(Laughter)

MR. DOOLITTLE: But the -- but we all
-- we all fill in to make sure to get it done and we
function. And -- but I'll be looking forward to seeing
those admin positions, you know, come on board.

We're also looking that -- we had a

1 person today that was -- that confirmed that they were
2 interested in a direct lateral into a budget analyst
3 and so we're working kind of every quick venue and ways
4 to fill -- to fill positions, so we'll be adding a
5 budget analyst within the next month as well.
6

7 The other thing is that we've got on
8 the docket as a priority for -- is a fishery biologist
9 7, 9, 11 to be hired within the next few months.
10 That's one of the regional priorities. And so that is
11 another step forward. So suddenly we're going from
12 four to five positions in 2020 that will come in so
13 that means that we're 12 down.
14

15 And then the remaining goal for 2020,
16 I'm being a realist with this, is to -- is to try to
17 get on board an anthropology lead position that if you
18 looked at the first page, that has been in wait for
19 almost three years now. And that's really, you know,
20 half of our program as far as analysis go, it's just
21 not a biological program, we're also a social science
22 program as well and we meld those worlds together, and
23 they've been without leadership for way, way too long.
24 And that is our organizational priority and not just go
25 after the low hanging fruit because it's an easy job to
26 fill.
27

28 And the other one is the Council
29 coordination lead that's been vacant for over a year
30 too. And I just got notice today that that position
31 was classified so that one would be ready to go as a
32 priority as well.
33

34 And if all goes well I'd like to see
35 the second fish biologist go through because as we see
36 the proposed rule is in for the fish regulatory cycle
37 and I'd like to make sure we have a compliment of fish
38 biologists on board to handle the analysis as well.
39

40 So it's a strange goal, but I'd like to
41 get down to that 20 percent range by the end of 2020,
42 you know, by the end of the fiscal year, is my personal
43 goal.
44

45 We are also looking at alternative
46 hiring means through the Directorate Fellows Program,
47 through the Presidential Fellows Program as well to add
48 wildlife biologists at, you know, first level
49 performance sorts, professional performance grades at
50

1 the GS9 level. What's unique is many of our positions,
2 we've created ladder positions such as GS9, 11 and 12s
3 so somebody coming in at a 9, we feel, early in their
4 career it's a great -- it's a great step and a great
5 way to start your Federal career.
6

7 So we are looking at all the
8 alternative venues that the agency has as well to be
9 able to fill this void. But it has been stressful on
10 the OSM Staff. And, again, as I said before in our
11 budget presentation on how proud I am of them and how
12 they step up with an ever changing environment, because
13 the pressures of a deadline-based agency don't change,
14 and it's very unforgiving.
15

16 The other thing that we have to
17 consider and the way I look at the future vision of the
18 program as well, is, you know, what's going to happen
19 in the next few years relative to retirements and I
20 would guess there'd be three to five retirements of the
21 existing Staff that we have as well that we're going to
22 have to plan for. So I don't want to see us hang in
23 that 30 to 40 percent range, I'd like to see us, you
24 know, really start to Staff up and have that goal of
25 being Staffed up by 2022, is what I think is going to
26 be the realistic parts of this.
27

28 And, again, the stress is, is that,
29 since we're all in one and we're a smaller outfit
30 within the Federal government, and within the agency,
31 that our susceptibility is higher. There has been
32 nothing malicious or anything that any agency has
33 really done, we just are caught up in the spin of the
34 bigger bureaucracy and a change in our hiring process,
35 and that's where we're at.
36

37 So I guess I'd leave it right there,
38 that's fairly short and simple and -- and if folks have
39 any questions or any aspects for a solution, I'm -- I'm
40 all open to that and answer any questions that you
41 might have.
42

43 Thank you.
44

45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for
46 that, Tom. Is there any questions for Tom. I think it
47 was thorough, we can look at what we're missing, and,
48 again, I think you guys do a good job so keep it up.
49
50

1 Rhonda.

2

3 MS. PITKA: Not so much a question,
4 just a comment. So like the inability to hire people,
5 is that because the positions are not being advertised,
6 is it pay, is it -- I mean, we have a certain amount of
7 budget every year for Staff, right, and it doesn't seem
8 to change much, I don't -- I don't really understand.
9 I'm not really familiar with Federal process. I'm sure
10 everybody else in the room is like, yeah, whatever,
11 Rhonda, but.....

12

13 (Laughter)

14

15 MS. PITKA:I mean you know you
16 put an ad in the paper, you get some applicants, I
17 don't know.

18

19 MR. DOOLITTLE: Rhonda, you're trying
20 to make sense of the not sensible.

21

22 MS. PITKA: Yeah, simple.

23

24 (Laughter)

25

26 MR. DOOLITTLE: To say the least.

27

28 MS. PITKA: Yes, please enlighten me.

29

30 MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, in that reality,
31 I mean many times there's certain series where in the
32 national picture there may be a whole lot of positions
33 and so they want to regroup. A good example was a
34 freeze that went for over a year on admin positions, so
35 even though we were losing people, there was an
36 inability at our office to hire admin people. Now, that
37 went on for over an entire year after, you know, people
38 had left. That wasn't something that was directed at
39 the Alaska region, or directed at OSM, that was a
40 national -- that was a national push and we got caught
41 up in that part, you know, when people moved on. So
42 that was a reality of, for instance, in the national
43 positions.

44

45 When there's any reorganization, too,
46 of a process, such as hiring, human resources, and
47 those sorts of things, again, it takes a while,
48 sometimes for government to catch up. Before we were
49 -- there was a joining human resources department

50

1 between BLM and the Fish and Wildlife Service, but the
2 Fish and Wildlife Service, as an agency, on a national
3 level, decided to go separate and so did the Alaska
4 region at that particular time. And so those positions
5 and that process is at its formative stages but that
6 means it's slow. And if you think that I'm knocking on
7 Greg's door about it, every program lead is knocking on
8 his door about it and every program lead in every
9 region is knocking on their supervisor's door about it.
10 And it's trying to get this process caught up so we can
11 deal with the realistic work load.

12
13 So the long and short of it is that
14 we're into a new process that hasn't caught up with
15 need. Right now for OSM it's not a budgetary issue but
16 it's still a work force issue, it makes us plan around
17 -- when we do add positions that we're doing it in a
18 frugal way so we are sustainable to be able to provide
19 the services such as the Partners Program that's
20 providing aspiring biologists that are becoming part of
21 local work forces that are really the essence of
22 capacity building, which those programs were developed
23 for. That's the same for, as we went through the day,
24 with the funding of the Fisheries Resource Monitoring
25 Program, and those sorts of things.

26
27 So it is, in part, a budget process,
28 but it's more synergistic than that. It's that -- when
29 you do add a position, it's really the decision of, you
30 know, what do you really need and what don't you need
31 and that's always going to be a continuing, you know,
32 conversation in a fairly flat budget environment, and
33 it should be in any budget environment for that matter.

34
35 MS. PITKA: Thank you.

36
37 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other
38 questions. Comments.

39
40 Don.

41
42 MR. STRIKER: You know I guess I would
43 just like to say, I'm sort of cautiously optimistic
44 that this is another area where we have some leverage
45 ability by working together across our bureaus and
46 agencies, because what might be a barrier for Fish and
47 Wildlife may not be a barrier for Park Service, and if
48 we could work a little bit more creatively.

49
50

1 I also wanted to just congratulate you
2 for prioritizing that supervisory anthropologist. This
3 is my first exposure to your organization but it seems
4 to me like that's a really key position for ensuring
5 the inter-disciplinary nature of the organization so
6 I'm really happy to see that.

7
8 And I would challenge us to think about
9 if there are other creative ways when we're talking
10 about filling positions too, and that may have to do
11 with the location that they work, but trying to work in
12 local hire priority or leveraging, some of the other
13 youth engagement opportunities that we have with the
14 positions that we have in the office and trying to
15 figure out how to overcome some of those challenges.
16 So that's my two cents.

17
18 MR. DOOLITTLE: Don, I'll always take
19 Josh back.

20
21 (Laughter)

22
23 MR. SIEKANIEC: Is that what you meant
24 by creative Don.

25
26 (Laughter)

27
28 MR. STRIKER: You notice I didn't point
29 that out at the beginning of the day.

30
31 (Laughter)

32
33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other
34 questions or comments.

35
36 (No comments)

37
38 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
39 thank you for that insight then, Tom, on Staffing. I
40 think that brings us to the end of the public agenda.

41
42 We're going to go into an executive
43 here in a few minutes, so what we'll do is take a 10
44 minute break here so we can clear the room and we'll be
45 going into an executive session and give Tina time to
46 get her things, and that will conclude the public
47 session. We're not going to come back after, usually
48 what we do is come back and have a general discussion
49 about what executive is and we will do that at the
50

1 front end of our next meeting in April. So for process
2 that's what we're going to do today.

3
4 So I'd just like to thank everyone here
5 first, before you go, for coming in and engaging in the
6 Federal process and the State and the Partners and all
7 of the people who came and added input, or just came
8 for information.

9
10 Gene.

11
12 MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, if I may, Mr.
13 Chair. There's one thing I wanted to potentially
14 address before our April meeting. Is when our body met
15 in April and addressed the -- that would be -- there's
16 one deferred proposal that we addressed, which was 17-
17 05, which the Board voted down, there's some caveats
18 when that proposal was voted down.

19
20 One is that in discussion with the in-
21 season manager for the Kuskokwim, he committed to, and
22 I asked for an explanation of why the in-season manager
23 did not take any action on the Kuskokwim this summer
24 when we did a transition.

25
26 Two, is that the basis of 17-05 was to
27 establish a management plan for the Kuskokwim. At the
28 time the in-season manager had stipulated that he did
29 not need a regulation, a direction from the Board could
30 be done at any time, and he offered up that it would be
31 initiated in October and potentially present to the
32 Board in April for consideration. And our next meeting
33 is April and so I would look forward to something
34 coming out of Fish and Wildlife Service on that.

35
36 Thank you.

37
38 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank you
39 for that.

40
41 MR. BROWER: Thanks for the jerky.

42
43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, thank you
44 for the jerky.

45
46 MR. SIEKANIEC: Well done, George.
47 Well done.

48
49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, that was
50

1 very good.

2

3 MR. DOOLITTLE: Gene, just as a --
4 Board Member Peltola, so for clarification, you would
5 like that added to the April agenda?

6

7 MR. PELTOLA: Yes, because that's
8 commitments made by the Kusko in-season manager to this
9 body.

10

11 MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you.

12

13 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right.
14 We'll take a 10 minute recess and go into executive
15 session when we return.

16

17 Again, thank you all, drive safe and
18 have a wonderful day.

19

20 (Off record)

21

22 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

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

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

THAT the foregoing, contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE BOARD MEETING, WORK SESSION taken electronically by our firm on the 28th day of January 2020 in Anchorage, Alaska;

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

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 3rd day of February 2020.

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