

1 FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE BOARD
2
3 PUBLIC REGULATORY MEETING
4

5
6 VOLUME III
7

8
9 EGAN Convention Center
10 ANCHORAGE, ALASKA
11

12 April 14, 2016
13 8:30 o'clock a.m.
14

15
16
17
18
19 MEMBERS PRESENT:

- 20
21 Charles Brower
22 Anthony Christianson
23 Bud Cribley, Bureau of Land Management
24 Karen Clark, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
25 Bert Frost, National Park Service
26 Bruce Loudermilk, Bureau of Indian Affairs
27 Beth Pendleton, U.S. Forest Service

28
29
30
31 Ken Lord, Solicitor's Office

32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Recorded and transcribed by:
42 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
43 135 Christensen Drive, Second Floor
44 Anchorage, AK 99501
45 907-243-0668; sahile@gci.net

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Anchorage, Alaska - 4/14/2016)

(On record)

ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Good morning.
We're going to go ahead and get started if folks could
take their seats.

(Pause)

ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: So, again,
good morning. My name is Beth Pendleton, I'm the
Regional Forester for the US Forest Service. And
Chairman Tim Towarak asked that I would Chair the
meetings for today.

I thought I would just take a minute
and let the Board know what business we still have left
to do today just to get some perspective and then we'll
go to public comments.

So there will be a clarification, after
public comment, on WP16-13, that was the last item that
we took up yesterday.

From there we will go to our continued
deliberations on the remaining non-consensus proposals,
of which we have 11, across four of the -- actually
five of the regions, so we have quite a bit of work to
do.

Then we'll go to the adoption of the
consensus agenda.

Following that work we have a couple of
business items inclusive of scheduling our next work
session, our winter public meeting and then several
other business items.

So, with that, we will go to public
comments on the non-agenda items.

(No comments)

ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Let's just
check to see if we have anybody on line who would like
to make comments, if you could identify yourself.

1 (No comments)

2

3 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. And not
4 hearing that and not seeing anybody come forward in the
5 room. We will go to public comments on the consensus
6 agenda items. Would anybody like to make comments here
7 in the room.

8

9 (No comments)

10

11 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, not
12 seeing anybody, we'll go to the phone. Is there
13 anybody on the phone line that would like to make
14 comments on the consensus agenda items.

15

16 OPERATOR: And on the phone lines,
17 please press star one if you do have any comments or
18 questions at this time.

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 OPERATOR: We have no comments.

23

24 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you,
25 Operator.

26

27 So we're going to go back to the non-
28 consensus agenda proposals. Yesterday we ended with
29 Wildlife Proposal WP16-13 and for the record need to
30 make a clarification and I'll go ahead and do that.

31

32 The clarification to be made is
33 reference to one State permit, and that State permit
34 will be updated or amended to reflect the Federal hunt
35 dates of September 1st to June 30th.

36

37 Okay. From here we're going to go to
38 our continued deliberations on the non-consensus
39 proposals. We're going to begin -- we still have two
40 proposals left from Southcentral. So the first item up
41 is WP16-15 -- excuse me, 19, it's WP16-19 and we will
42 begin with the analysis, Staff analysis.

43

44 MS. LAVINE: Good morning, Madame
45 Chair. Members of the Board. My name is Robbin LaVine
46 and I'm an anthropologist of the Office of Subsistence
47 Management. And the analysis for Proposal 16-19 begins
48 on Page 524 of your meeting book. And for those in the
49 audience, copies can be found outside the door.

50

1 Proposal 16-19 was submitted by the
2 AHTNA Heritage Foundation and requests permission to
3 harvest either one bull moose, or two caribou, between
4 July 15th and August 31st by Federal registration
5 permit for the AHTNA Heritage Foundation's Culture
6 Camp.

7
8 In May 2004 the Board adopted Proposal
9 04-26 establishing the current unit specific regulation
10 that allows the Glennallen BLM Field Office Manager to
11 issue permits to the AHTNA Heritage Foundation Culture
12 Camp for either one bull moose, from August 1st to
13 September 20th, or two caribou between August 10th -
14 September 20th. In the years following 2004, the
15 process for issuing harvest permits statewide for
16 cultural and educational programs have gone through a
17 number of changes. In 2010, Wildlife Proposal 10-03
18 requested the addition of a general provision in
19 Federal subsistence management regulations to allow the
20 harvest of fish and wildlife by participants in a
21 cultural or educational program. The Board adopted the
22 proposal with unanimous support from all Regional
23 Advisory Councils creating a statewide Federal
24 regulation and that can be found on Page 13 of our
25 current regulation books.

26
27 This regulation allows a cultural camp
28 or education program to deal directly with the land
29 manager by delegated authority on an annual basis, once
30 an initial permit is approved by the Federal
31 Subsistence Board. And it is under this regulation
32 that cultural camps and educational programs now
33 request their permit from the Board at any time
34 throughout the year. The AHTNA Heritage Foundation
35 Culture Camp was established prior to this general
36 provision.

37
38 For Wildlife Proposal 16-19 the
39 proponent requests a modification of the current
40 regulations for the AHTNA Heritage Foundation Culture
41 Camp allowing the culture camp designee the opportunity
42 to harvest one bull moose or two caribou 16 days
43 earlier than the current regulations for Unit 13.

44
45 The OSM conclusion is to support
46 Proposal 16-19 with modification, to remove the AHTNA
47 Heritage Foundation Culture Camp from Unit 13 specific
48 regulations, approve a cultural and educational permit,
49 and delegate authority to the Bureau of Land Management
50 Field Office manager to issue future permits for this

1 culture camp. A culture and educational permit would
2 give AHTNA the opportunity to request a permit directly
3 from the land manager on an annual basis outside of the
4 regulatory cycle or special action process. This would
5 allow, both AHTNA and BLM Staff to address fluctuating
6 camp and harvest dates with greater flexibility.

7

8 And that ends my analysis, thank you.

9

10 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you. At
11 this point we'll see if there are any questions from
12 the Board.

13

14 (No comments)

15

16 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, not
17 seeing any, we will go to the summary of public
18 comments and go to the Regional Council Coordinator.

19

20 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madame Chair.
21 There are no written public comments on this proposal.

22

23 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you. At
24 this point we will go to the open floor for any public
25 testimony and we do have one here.

26

27 Gloria Stickwan.

28

29 MS. STICKWAN: Good morning. My name
30 is Gloria Stickwan. We support 16-29 [sic] with
31 modification to remove the AHTNA Culture Camp from Unit
32 13 specific regulations and to delegate authority to
33 BLM to issue a permit to AHTNA Heritage Foundation and
34 to coordinate decisions with all affected Federal and
35 State managers.

36

37 I talked to the Chair of the AHTNA
38 Heritage Foundation and she liked the way it is as in
39 the past and she agreed to that. This will allow us to
40 teach the younger generation more of AHTNA's way of
41 life. The younger generation and elders will be able
42 to interact with each other and learn how to cut,
43 preserve, cook and care for salmon, moose and caribou
44 meat, learn the AHTNA stories, legends and values and
45 history of the AHTNA people. And the elders will be
46 able to have -- be outside during the warmer months to
47 teach the younger people life-giving survival tools.

48

49 Thank you.

50

1 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you,
2 Gloria. See if there are any questions for Gloria.
3
4 (No comments)
5
6 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you. So
7 let me go to the line and see if there are any public
8 comments with regard to this proposal.
9
10 OPERATOR: Again, on the phone lines if
11 you have a comment, please, press star one at this
12 time.
13
14 (No comments)
15
16 OPERATOR: W e have no comments.
17
18 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you,
19 Operator.
20
21 At this point now we'll go to the
22 Regional Council recommendation. We'll go to
23 Southcentral, Mr. Encelewski.
24
25 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, good morning,
26 through the Chair.
27
28 Yeah, we support exactly what Gloria
29 said. The Southcentral, we supported it with
30 modifications for the date and they didn't have any
31 heartburn with the delegation of authority or
32 regulation so that was the Southcentral recommendation.
33
34 Thank you.
35
36 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
37 Any questions from the Board.
38
39 (No comments)
40
41 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you,
42 very much.
43
44 So we have another affected RAC, we're
45 going to go to you, Sue, are there any comments.
46
47 MS. ENTSMINGER: We did not take the
48 proposal up.
49
50 Thank you.

1 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, thank
2 you. At this time we will go to the Native Liaison for
3 any Tribal, or Alaska Native Corporation comments.

4
5 Orville.

6
7 MR. LIND: Good morning, Madame Chair.
8 Board members. There were no Tribal or Corporate
9 comments.

10
11 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you. So
12 now we'll go to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game
13 for your comments.

14
15 MS. OLSON: Thank you, Madame Chair.
16 Lisa Olson with Fish and Game.

17
18 The Department supports this proposal
19 as modified by OSM to remove the culture camp from the
20 specific regulations and delegate the authority to the
21 land manager.

22
23 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
24 Any questions for the State from the Board.

25
26 (No comments)

27
28 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you. So
29 we'll now here from the InterAgency Staff Committee
30 comments.

31
32 MS. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair.
33 Ameer Howard, for the InterAgency Staff Committee.

34
35 The standard comments for the ISC apply
36 to this proposal and they read:

37
38 The ISC found the Staff analysis to be
39 a thorough and accurate evaluation of the proposal and
40 that it provides sufficient basis for the Regional
41 Advisory Council recommendation and Federal Subsistence
42 Board action on the proposal.

43
44 And then moving forward today, if the
45 ISC standard comments apply to other proposals I will
46 simply state that.

47
48 Thank you.

49
50 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you. Any

1 comments or questions.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: With that then
6 we're ready for Board discussion with Council Chairs as
7 well as with the State.

8

9 (No comments)

10

11 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Any discussion
12 from the Board.

13

14 (No comments)

15

16 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: So we'll now
17 move to the Federal Board action.

18

19 MR. CRIBLEY: Madame Chair. I would
20 like to make a motion and I would like to move to adopt
21 WP16-19 as modified in the OSM conclusion as shown on
22 Page 523 of the Board book. And with a second I will
23 provide a justification.

24

25 MR. LOUDERMILK: Second.

26

27 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: So we have a
28 second, we'll go to your justification.

29

30 MR. CRIBLEY: Okay. Moving BLM's
31 administrative and management responsibilities from
32 regulations to a delegation of authority will allow
33 greater flexibility for both AHTNA and land managers to
34 address change in camp dates and logistical issues that
35 are confronted annually.

36

37 And, I guess, personally, I'd like to
38 say I'm really excited about the opportunity for BLM to
39 work with this cultural camp and to do everything we
40 can to help make it successful.

41

42 Thank you.

43

44 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
45 Cribley. Are there any discussion now from the Board.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: I think we're
50 ready for a call of the question.

1 MR. FROST: Question.
2
3 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: All in favor,
4 say aye.
5
6 IN UNISON: Aye.
7
8 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Any nays.
9
10 (No opposing votes)
11
12 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: The motion
13 passes unanimously.
14
15 So we'll now go to the next order of
16 business WP16-20. And we will begin with the Staff
17 analysis.
18
19 MR. EVANS: Good morning, Madame Chair
20 and Members of the Board. My name's Tom Evans and I
21 work as a wildlife biologist for the OSM.
22
23 I'll be presenting Proposal WP16-20,
24 which can be found on Page 537 of your Board book. It
25 was submitted by the Eastern Interior Alaska
26 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council and it requests
27 that the harvest limit for sheep on Federal public
28 lands on Unit 11 be modified from one sheep to one ram
29 with three-quarter inch curl or larger.
30
31 The proponent made this proposal to
32 reduce the hunting pressure on ewes and younger lambs.
33 It was stated that it was a conservative approach
34 needed due to the declines in the sheep populations,
35 low sheep densities and the relatively easy access to
36 sheep populations from the road system.
37
38 Aerial surveys have been conducted in
39 the selected trend count areas by Wrangell-St. Elias
40 and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. There are
41 many sheep populations within Unit 11. Population
42 estimates and sheep densities are variable. Typically
43 the sheep densities and populations are greater in the
44 northern half versus the southern portion of the range.
45 Overall, sheep populations in the Wrangell-St. Elias
46 National Park and Preserve have declined approximately
47 30 to 50 percent since the late 1980s. Basically it
48 went from like 25,000 to 8,000.
49
50 However, that being said, they

1 conducted surveys in 2015 in two count areas and that
2 indicates that some of the sheep populations there are
3 stable and potentially increasing. During these
4 surveys the lamb production was the highest ever
5 recorded at 40 to 45 lambs per 100 ewes. However,
6 there are still areas where it's low populations.

7
8 Currently, most of the sheep harvested
9 are full curl rams. Since 1991/92 the sheep harvest,
10 along with the number of hunters has declined. The
11 mean number of sheep harvested from 2005 to 2014 was
12 54, from 2005 to 2014, the non-local residents average
13 28 compared to the local residents which average 26, so
14 it's about a 50/50 split there. Currently a majority
15 of the sheep harvested, again, in Unit 11 and 12 are
16 full curl rams.

17
18 There was another alternative
19 considered. Biologists from the Wrangell-St.Elias
20 National Park and Preserve and Department of Fish and
21 Game designed a study to look at the effect of removing
22 large rams, three-quarter inch curl or bigger, on the
23 population dynamics of the sheep populations.
24 Information from this study would help determine what
25 is the best harvest strategy for lambs. The hypothesis
26 was that the removal of the large rams may result in
27 more juvenile rams participating in the rut, which
28 typically involves more harassment of the ewes, less
29 tending of the ewes, prolonged mating seasons and
30 prolonged mating seasons which may result in increased
31 energy expenditure for both the rams and the ewes,
32 which, in turn, may result in decreased overwinter
33 survival. Because there has been a full-curl harvest
34 in Unit 12 for a long time and a less restrictive
35 harvest in Unit 11, for both the State and Federal
36 hunters, Wrangell-St.Elias National Park and Preserve
37 is a good location to conduct this study. The plan is
38 currently to start this study here during the fall of
39 2016 and it'll be a two year study, so 2016/2017.

40
41 The movement data that's gained from
42 this study may also be used in other remote censusing
43 projects within the Park to assess the effects of
44 climate change on Dall sheep.

45
46 The biologists would like to defer this
47 proposal until the end of the new study or to modify
48 the proponent's request to any ram versus a ram with
49 three-quarter inch curl or larger until the study is
50 done. This alternative was not selected because of the

1 potential disturbance to ewes and younger lambs, which
2 was the proponents original concern.

3

4 Adopting this proposal would help
5 reduce the disturbance to cows and ewes, while still
6 providing a meaningful priority to Federally-qualified
7 subsistence users and three-quarter -- because they
8 would have a three-quarter inch versus a full curl.
9 And the changes to the regulations would hopefully aid
10 in the recovery of the sheep populations.

11

12 OSM's conclusion was to support
13 Proposal WP16-20.

14

15 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
16 We'll see if there are any questions from the Board to
17 Mr. Evans.

18

19 (No comments)

20

21 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: So we will go
22 to the summary of public comments to the Regional
23 Council Coordinator.

24

25 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madame Chair.
26 Board members.

27

28 There's one -- two written public
29 comments, beginning on Page 549 in your meeting
30 materials and in your supplemental folders you have a
31 comment from Wrangell-St. Elias SRC.

32

33 The first comment is from the AHTNA C&T
34 use committee. They oppose WP16-20, Unit 11C proposal.

35

36

37 Sheep populations in Unit 11 are stable
38 and regulatory change of horn size isn't necessary at
39 this time. Subsistence qualified users hunt only for
40 -- if Unit 11 sheep regulations will restrict
41 Federally-qualified subsistence users to hunt only for
42 large ram, if the proponent has a concern about the
43 population of sheep in Unit 11, a proposal to the
44 Alaska Board of Game could address these issues. On
45 average sporthunters harvest as many or more sheep than
46 Federally-qualified subsistence users. Sporthunters
47 are the main concern in most areas. They harvest more
48 sheep in Unit 11 than Federally-qualified subsistence
49 users.

50

1 The Wrangell-St.Elias Subsistence
2 Resource Commission provided a comment to the Board --
3 to the Federal Subsistence Board dated October 21,
4 2015. The SRC supports an amended version of WP16-20
5 and the SRC recommends amending the proposal to
6 restrict the harvest of dall sheep in Unit 11 to any
7 ram given the stable to increasing sheep populations in
8 the area. A three-quarter curl or larger restriction
9 for subsistence users is not needed at this time.
10 Protecting ewes helps to build sheep populations.

11
12 That concludes the written public
13 comments, Madame Chair.

14
15 Thank you.

16
17 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
18 Mike. Are there any questions or comments.

19
20 (No comments)

21
22 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. At this
23 point we'll go to the floor if there's any public
24 testimony.

25
26 Ms. Stickwan.

27
28 MS. STICKWAN: My name is Gloria
29 Stickwan. Federal qualified users cannot use planes to
30 harvest sheep and they shouldn't be penalized to
31 harvesting three-quarters curl sheep. Surveys suggest
32 that 45 per 100 ewes are in Unit 11 and Unit 12. It is
33 difficult to determine sheep populations, between Unit
34 11 because sheep move back and forth between these
35 units. This proposal should be deferred until the two
36 year cooperative study between Fish and Game and
37 Wrangell-St.Elias is complete.

38
39 According to Fish and Game reports and
40 OSM analysis, Unit 11 and 12 ram and sheep's population
41 are in slight decline, however, they are considered a
42 stable population. Sporthunters should have
43 restrictions placed on them and not the Federally-
44 qualified subsistence users. It is the sporthunters
45 who are taking all the large rams on National Preserve
46 lands. They use airplanes to hunt with and they can
47 see large rams and harvest them the next day.

48
49 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
50 Any questions for Gloria.

1 (No comments)
2
3 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Ms.
4 Stickwan.
5
6 We will go to the phone lines and see
7 if there are further comments.
8
9 OPERATOR: And, again, on the phone
10 lines if you have a question or comment, please press
11 star one.
12
13 (No comments)
14
15 OPERATOR: We have no comments.
16
17 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you,
18 Operator.
19
20 At this point we will go to the
21 Regional Advisory Council recommendations. We have
22 recommendations from both Southcentral and Eastern
23 Interior RACs. We'll go to the Eastern Interior RAC
24 first.
25
26 Ms. Entsminger.
27
28 MS. ENTSMINGER: This was an Eastern
29 Interior Proposal and I'll have to admit I might be
30 part of the reason why it came up.
31
32 In Game Management Unit 12, for
33 subsistence, is full curl, and Game Management Unit 11,
34 which adjoins it is any sheep. And given the history
35 of the sheep populations, we thought it was a
36 conservative approach to three-quarter curl ram. And I
37 serve on the SRC also and we kind of came to an
38 agreement that any ram was better, but the Eastern
39 Interior went with the proposal as written.
40
41 And I will note that if you look at
42 both the State and Federal -- well, the State book it's
43 already full curl ram for the non-subsistence user, for
44 both game management units, which has some bearing on
45 that. And what had happened in the past in the
46 Wrangell-St.Elias was there was a ewe hunt for
47 everybody because in the State everybody was a
48 qualified subsistence user and there were pockets of
49 areas along the road system where the ewes were heavily
50 taken out on the Nabesna Road and the McCarthy Road.

1 And this was the concern that we had as a Council to
2 bring this forward.

3

4 Thank you.

5

6 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.

7 Any questions for Ms. Entsminger, from the Board.

8

9 (No comments)

10

11 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, then we

12 will now move to Mr. Encelewski from the Southcentral

13 RAC.

14

15 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Madame Chair. The
16 Southcentral Regional Advisory Council opposed this,
17 and basically we opposed it for the exact reasons that
18 Gloria stated, I thought she did a good thing in her
19 testimony there. But one thing we felt is this study
20 was coming up, 2016/2017 and we didn't feel there was a
21 conservation concern now and we didn't want to lose the
22 opportunity for them, the subsistence hunter.

23

24 I do have a couple comments here I just
25 want to mention. I know that Chairman Lohse, who
26 preceded me here, he said, I don't see any reason to do
27 anything with this proposal simply because when you're
28 taking one ewe every two years, I really don't think
29 you're affecting the population.

30

31 And we had other comments, I just can't
32 see closing an opportunity for the people that need
33 meat if we wanted the option to get an ewe.

34

35 Anyway there was also a comment from
36 me, and my comment was if it wasn't broken we didn't
37 need to fix it as of right now.

38

39 But our recommendation was to oppose it
40 and I hate to go against the Eastern Interior but that
41 was what we came up with.

42

43 Thank you.

44

45 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.

46 Any questions from the Board.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. At this

1 point we will now move to the comments from the Native
2 Liaison on any Tribal, or Alaska Native Corporation
3 comments.

4
5 MR. LIND: Madame Chair. There are no
6 Tribal or Corporate comments.

7
8 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
9 The Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments.

10
11 MR. BUTLER: Good morning, Madame
12 Chair. The Department supports this proposal that
13 reduces pressure on both the ewe component of the
14 population and the younger ram component.

15
16 There's been a lot of discussion
17 statewide, on the State side, as to what's causing the
18 recent trends in sheep populations and we're trying to
19 investigate that as best we can and address it on the
20 State Board of Game side. However, we do recognize
21 that this population is stable and that we are working
22 cooperatively with the Park Service to try to
23 understand the dynamics of selective harvest on sheep
24 populations. So we're amenable to the idea of
25 deferring a decision on the ram component at this point
26 for future -- to a future date to try to evaluate
27 better the effects, again, of harvest on State and
28 Federal lands under different management regimes.

29
30 However, again, we do still continue to
31 support the proposal, and, particularly, the removal of
32 the ewe component of the harvest.

33
34 Thank you.

35
36 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
37 Butler. Are there any questions from the Board for the
38 State.

39
40 (No comments)

41
42 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. At this
43 time we will go to the InterAgency Staff Committee
44 comments.

45
46 MS. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair.
47 In addition to the standard comments, the InterAgency
48 Staff Committee also recognized that WP16-20 is a
49 crossover proposal where the Eastern Interior and
50 Southcentral Subsistence Regional Advisory Councils

1 disagree. The Board may consider deferring the
2 proposal, as has been stated by the State and by public
3 comment here today, to allow time for the completion of
4 the NPS/ADF&G cooperative study to determine the
5 effects of selective harvest on the population
6 structure of rams.

7

8 While the proposal was submitted by the
9 Eastern Interior RAC, the proposed change would
10 directly affect harvest regulations for Unit 11, which
11 is within the Southcentral region. Deferring WP16-20
12 will maintain the status quo for sheep hunting in Unit
13 11, which is consistent with the Southcentral RAC's
14 recommendation to oppose the proposal. It will also
15 provide time for completion of the cooperative study to
16 determine whether the survival of young rams is
17 influenced by the removal of a large portion of the
18 older dominate rams from the population. This
19 information is important to inform future action on
20 WP16-20 and deferral should not create a conservation
21 concern at this time since Unit 11 sheep population
22 appears to be stable and not declining.

23

24 Thank you.

25

26 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Ms.
27 Howard. Any questions.

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. At this
32 point we will go to any Board discussion with Council
33 Chairs or the State.

34

35 Mr. Frost.

36

37 MR. FROST: Yeah, question for the
38 State. Would you guys be all right with an any ram
39 proposal?

40

41 MR. BUTLER: Through the Chair. Yeah,
42 we would. We, actually, use any ram bag limit in
43 several other areas and it's proven to be sustainable.
44 So there isn't a direct concern associated with it,
45 provided the harvest is limited or regulated in some
46 manner, and it appears that looking at the sheep
47 population, the sheep harvest in this case, there's a
48 sustainable harvest of rams at this point.

49

50 So, again, we're amenable to that

1 concept to maintaining an any ram bag limit for Unit
2 11.

3
4 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Any other
5 questions.

6
7 Mr. Cribley.

8
9 MR. CRIBLEY: Not exactly, I'll direct
10 this towards the State just to put them on the spot.

11
12 But the one question I have is the
13 suggestion of deferring to allow for the study to see
14 if there are any true impacts and just curious, you
15 were talking about a two year study and is two years
16 going to be enough time to really come to conclusions
17 about the effects on the population, or it just seems
18 like a short period of time to do that type of a study
19 and I don't know if you're familiar enough to be able
20 to respond to that. Just kind of curious about that.

21
22 MR. BUTLER: Through the Chair. I'm
23 probably not as familiar as I should be but I'm going
24 to answer it anyway.

25
26 (Laughter)

27
28 MR. BUTLER: One of the studies that
29 we're proposing is going to be genetically based and so
30 two years would be a sufficient period of time to
31 collect genetic samples, and at least start to evaluate
32 that. I mean truly to evaluate it you'd need to close
33 harvest and in an area where we currently have
34 selective harvest for the lifetime of a ram, if not
35 longer, to see the genetic contribution to the
36 phenotypic traits of rams. But that's really just not
37 practical. We're not going to be able to do that on the
38 State level, close an area for a period of 10 or 20
39 years, so the best we can do is, again, indirect
40 studies, using genetics to see what the contribution of
41 younger rams are to the reproductive capacity of the
42 population. And the Park provides a really good
43 opportunity to evaluate, again, compare and contrast,
44 areas that have different management regimes where
45 there's selective harvest versus essentially no harvest
46 in Park areas. So we think we can do the best we can
47 in two years with that.

48
49 MR. FROST: Just a followup. So you
50 got two years of field work, right, and then you got

1 like a year of analysis and crunching data and all that
2 stuff and getting it written up, so it really might be
3 three or four years until we actually have an answer.

4

5 MR. BUTLER: Through the Chair. I'd
6 agree, for a publication, something that we can
7 reference that's been peer reviewed, it would be three
8 or four years, that's correct.

9

10 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Any other
11 questions for the State or the RAC Chairs.

12

13 Ms. Entsminger.

14

15 MS. ENTSMINGER: Yeah, I'm just trying
16 to wrap my head around this. The ewe component, if you
17 had just a ram and the ewe component was taken out,
18 would not change your study, right?

19

20 MR. BUTLER: Through the Chair. The
21 concern associated with the ewe harvest is more from a
22 reproductive level, it's not associated with the
23 genetic. The idea -- the concept, at least, is the
24 selective harvest is reducing larger rams in the
25 population and there may be some social hierarchy
26 effects associated with that. They aren't well
27 supported in the literature. The literature is
28 actually pretty well split on that particular concept,
29 so that's why we want to take a closer look at it and
30 try to see if we can introduce some new information,
31 which, again, hasn't been looked at by geneticists,
32 it's been looked at by biologists who are trained in
33 other arenas.

34

35 So, again, we think the study will help
36 resolve or at least shed some light on some of the
37 controversy currently associated with this. There's a
38 lot of speculation but not enough data to support a
39 data driven discussion. The ewe component is purely
40 more from a conservation point of view.

41

42 And, sheep populations, again, are
43 declined statewide. We think that a component of that
44 is climate change, treelines are advancing up
45 mountains, we don't necessarily believe that it's been
46 an issue associated with the harvest regimes that are
47 currently applied in the state. We don't know that we
48 can get sheep populations back to historic levels in
49 all cases but, again, we are making those efforts
50 because that's what the public is asking from -- from

1 the State government. So we support, again, the
2 elimination of ewe harvest to the extent that it
3 doesn't contribute to the further decline of sheep.

4
5 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
6 Any other questions.

7
8 Yes, Mr. Collins.

9
10 MR. COLLINS: Ray Collins, Western
11 Interior RAC. We have currently on the book a
12 subsistence hunt in Denali Park and we established one
13 under the State regs for the people of Nikoli, Telida
14 and -- well, actually it's open to anyone but the
15 permits have to be picked up out there, and that's
16 because they traditionally hunted sheep for subsistence
17 purposes that were shared with the community. And I'm
18 surprised that there isn't more stress on the fact that
19 going to a three-quarter curl or larger, you're turning
20 it into a trophy hunt, which seems incompatible with a
21 subsistence hunt where you're interested in the meat
22 for sharing with the community.

23
24 So just a comment on that.

25
26 And I'm wondering if there was any
27 discussion in that realm. Because if you go to larger
28 rams only, you've turned a subsistence hunt into a
29 trophy hunt instead of providing meat for the
30 community, and I don't know if it's shared there like
31 it is in our area, but the meat was brought back and
32 shared with the whole community and they just wanted
33 sheep meat.

34
35 Thank you.

36
37 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you for
38 your comment. Is there any response or question.

39
40 Mr. Frost.

41
42 MR. FROST: Yeah, I guess responding to
43 Ray's comment, I think that's exactly why the SRC has
44 proposed that it's an any ram instead of a three-
45 quarter curl, because it is about the meat, it's not
46 about the horns and by taking any ram you're not
47 targeting those larger animals.

48
49 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
50 Any other discussion or questions.

1 (No comments)
2
3 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: At this point
4 then we will move to Board action.
5
6 MR. FROST: I'd like to make a motion.
7
8 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Please
9 proceed.
10
11 MR. FROST: I move that we adopt WP16-
12 20 and after a second I'll speak to my motion.
13
14 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: A second?
15
16 MR. CRIBLEY: Second.
17
18 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
19 Cribley. Go ahead.
20
21 MR. FROST: I attend to amend my
22 motion. I move that we amend the proposal to limit the
23 harvest of dall sheep in Unit 11 during the regular
24 season to any ram. This modification was recommended
25 by the Wrangell-St.Elias National Park Subsistence
26 Resource Commission. It would be a compromise between
27 the two Regional Advisory Council positions.
28
29 It would protect the ewe population,
30 which addresses concerns expressed by the Eastern
31 Interior Council, without unnecessarily restricting
32 subsistence users to a limited segment of the ram
33 population, which was a major concern for the
34 Southcentral Council.
35
36 The proposal as amended will protect
37 the ewe population while continuing to provide an
38 opportunity for local subsistence users to the harvest
39 of any ram. An any ram harvest limit will also allow
40 the NPS and the State to move forward on the
41 cooperative study to determine whether the survival of
42 young ram is influenced by the removal of a larger
43 portion of the older rams from the population.
44 Implementing a horn restriction at this time would
45 compromise the study design. Once that study has been
46 completed there'll be additional information to help
47 inform future decisions regarding the harvest limit for
48 sheep in Unit 11.
49
50 This amendment should not create a

1 conservation concern. Recent surveys by the NPS and
2 the State indicate that the dall sheep population in
3 Unit 11 is stable. Limiting the harvest of three-
4 quarter curl or larger ram would be unnecessarily
5 restrictive to the satisfaction of subsistence needs.

6

7 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
8 Frost. Are there any discussion now amongst the Board
9 relative to the amendment.

10

11 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Did we get a second
12 on that?

13

14 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: So we need a
15 second on that.

16

17 MR. CRIBLEY: Second.

18

19 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.

20 Discussion.

21

22

23 (No comments)

24

25 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: If not we'll
26 call for the question.

27

28 MR. CRIBLEY: Call for question.

29

30 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: All in favor
31 as amended say aye.

32

33 IN UNISON: Aye.

34

35 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Any nays.

36

37 (No opposing votes)

38

39 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: So the
40 amendment passes unanimously. Thank you.

41

42 So we passed the amendment and now we
43 need to go back and vote on the proposal.

44

45 MR. CRIBLEY: Question.

46

47 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Question's
48 been called. All in favor say aye.

49

50 IN UNISON: Aye.

1 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Passes
2 unanimously.

3
4 Thank you.

5
6 So now we're going to move on to the
7 Western Interior and we'll go to 16-40, and we will
8 begin with the analysis. We'll give you a minute to
9 come on up, and this is on Page 692 of the Board books.
10 We will begin with the analysis.

11
12 (Pause)

13
14 MS. KENNER: Thank you, Madame Chair.
15 Members of the Board. Council Chairs. Again, my name
16 is Pippa Kenner and I'm an anthropologist at the Office
17 of Subsistence Management here in Anchorage. The
18 analysis for the proposal begins on Page 692 of your
19 meeting book and copies are also available at the front
20 desk.

21
22 Proposal WP16-40 was submitted by the
23 Gates of the Arctic National Park Subsistence Resource
24 Commission. If the proposal was adopted residents of
25 Alatna, Allakaket, Bettles, Evansville, Hughes and
26 Wiseman hunting black bears at den sites would be
27 allowed to use an artificial light. They would also be
28 allowed to harvest a sow accompanied by a cub at a den
29 site. Both activities would be allowed in the portion
30 of Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve that
31 is within Unit 24 from October 15th through April 30th.

32
33 The impetus for this proposal can be
34 found on Page 698 under relevant regulations.

35
36 Effective January 1st, 2016, the
37 National Park Service now prohibits the use of an
38 artificial light when hunting and the harvest of a bear
39 cub or sow accompanied by a cub within any National
40 Preserve, "except for subsistence uses by local rural
41 residents pursuant to applicable Federal law and
42 regulation" therefore, adopting this proposal, WP16-40
43 would allow our regulations and National Park Service
44 regulations and would make these activities legal.

45
46 The OSM conclusion has changed from
47 what the Western Interior Council commented on. The
48 OSM preliminary conclusion that was presented to the
49 Council modified the proposal to the use of only a
50 headlamp or a handheld artificial light. The new

1 conclusion is described in the addendum on Page 702 of
2 the analysis.

3

4 I write an addendum when the OSM
5 conclusion has changed from what the Council commented
6 on.

7

8 The conclusion is to support the
9 proposal, without modification, followed by this
10 justification.

11

12 While the Western Interior Council
13 recommended supporting the proposal with the OSM
14 modification, a similar proposal, WP16-35 was supported
15 by the YK-Delta and Bristol Bay Councils without the
16 OSM modification in Unit 18. Subsequently the OSM
17 recommendation changed to support Proposal WP16-35
18 without the OSM modification. This proposal, WP16-40,
19 as written, would parallel State regulations in
20 Interior Alaska wildlife management units, therefore,
21 the proposal, as written, would likely provide more
22 clarity in regulations.

23

24 The OSM conclusion has been changed to
25 support the proposal, as written.

26

27 Thank you, Madame Chair.

28

29 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Ms.
30 Kenner. Are there any questions from the Board.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Not seeing
35 any, we will go to the summary of public comments.

36

37 MR. STEVENSON: Good morning, Madame
38 Chair. My name is Zach Stevenson with OSM for the
39 Western Interior and Northwest Arctic RACs. There was
40 one public written comment submitted regarding Wildlife
41 Proposal 16-40 included in your supplemental packets.

42

43 I'm referencing the letter dated
44 November 25th, 2015 submitted by the Gates of the
45 Arctic National Park Subsistence Resource Commission.

46

47 The SRC voted to support Wildlife
48 Proposal 16-40 with OSM's modification. The
49 justification being that this is a longstanding
50 traditional way of hunting black bears for the Koyukon

1 and Athabaskan people of the region. The letter was
2 signed by Mr. Louie Commack, Chair of the Gates of the
3 Arctic SRC, as well as Mr. Jack Reakoff, Vice-Chair.

4
5 Thank you.

6
7 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
8 Any questions from the Board.

9
10 (No comments)

11
12 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. We will
13 move to any public testimony from the floor.

14
15 (No comments)

16
17 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Not seeing
18 any, so we will go to the phone lines, if there's
19 anyone on line that would like to provide testimony at
20 this time.

21
22 OPERATOR: Thank you. On the phone
23 lines, if you do have a comment please press star one.

24
25 MR. REAKOFF: Hello, Madame Chair.
26 This is Jack Reakoff.

27
28 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Go ahead, Mr.
29 Reakoff.

30
31 MR. REAKOFF: As Vice Chair of the
32 Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission, we
33 adopted the OSM -- the modified language but I'm
34 amicable to the revised OSM position that was taken
35 place through 16-35 for any light.

36
37 This is customary and traditional
38 practice for the Koyukon people and these subunits and
39 so that's why we supported this.

40
41 This method was allowed under Board of
42 Game regulations, fell out of -- with the proposed --
43 the Park Service's proposed rule last year so we
44 submitted this proposal to align with customary
45 practices.

46
47 Thank you, Madame Chair.

48
49 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
50 Reakoff.

1 Any questions for Mr. Reakoff.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Not seeing
6 any, we will go to the Regional Council recommendation.

7

8 MR. REAKOFF: I'm back again as
9 Regional Advisory Council Chair. We were supportive of
10 the modified language. There's not a lot of difference
11 in the definition of the light of the headlamp and
12 handheld light is what's customarily used, previously
13 there was birch bark or some light source used for
14 denning but the broader interpretation of any light
15 would be fully amicable.

16

17 Thank you, Madame Chair.

18

19 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
20 Reakoff.

21

22 Any further questions for Mr. Reakoff.

23

24

25 (No comments)

26

27 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you. So
28 we'll now move to the any comments from Tribes, or
29 Alaska Native Corporations to the Native Liaison.

30

31 Orville.

32

33 MR. LIND: Madame Chair. There are no
34 Tribal or Corporate comments.

35

36 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
37 Move to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

38

39 MR. BUTLER: Madame Chair. The
40 Department supports this proposal.

41

42 As it's been noted, it would align our
43 regulations with the Federal regulations so we
44 definitely think that that would be beneficial to
45 resource users. And as was previously noted, while we
46 typically don't have an opinion when it comes to
47 methods and means, we do note that it provides for
48 human safety. Selective harvest of bears allows people
49 to identify what their target is, make humane kills and
50 so forth. And so we believe that there is

1 justification to support the proposal in this case.

2

3 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
4 Butler. Any questions or comments from the Board.

5

6

7 (No comments)

8

9 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you. We
10 will go to the InterAgency Staff Committee comments.

11

12 MS. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair.

13

14 The InterAgency Staff Committee
15 standard comments apply for this proposal.

16

17 Thank you.

18

19 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you. Go
20 to any Board discussion with Council Chair Reakoff or
21 with the State.

22

23 (No comments)

24

25 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Any discussion
26 from the Board.

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Not seeing
31 any, we will go to the Board action.

32

33 MR. FROST: I move that we adopt WP16-
34 40, and after a second I'll speak to my motion.

35

36 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Do we have a
37 second.

38

39 MS. CLARK: Second.

40

41 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Ms.
42 Clark. Go ahead and proceed.

43

44 MR. FROST: I intend to vote in favor
45 of the proposal as originally submitted by the Gates of
46 the Arctic National Park Subsistence Resource
47 Commission in the spirit of honoring the traditional
48 Koyukon Athabascan practice of hunting black bears in
49 their dens.

50

1 In order to keep Federal subsistence
2 regulations as simple as possible for subsistence
3 users, I support the original proposal which does not
4 specify the type of light to be used. The language for
5 the proposed regulation appears on Page 696 of the
6 Board book and parallels existing State regulations for
7 using artificial light to hunt black bears in other
8 Interior Alaska game management units. This will be
9 the first Park specific allowance to authorize the use
10 of artificial light when hunting and harvesting black
11 bears, including sows and sows with cubs for
12 subsistence uses on NPS managed land. It is the direct
13 result of a collaborative effort between the Gates of
14 the Arctic National Park Subsistence Resource
15 Commission and the National Park Service to allow a
16 traditional hunting practice that would be otherwise
17 prohibited under NPS regulations.

18
19 I believe the analysis provides
20 sufficient information for this Board to authorize the
21 taking of black bears, including a sow accompanied by
22 cubs at a den site using artificial light. This
23 proposal recognizes the longstanding Koyukon Athabascan
24 tradition of hunting black bears in their dens and
25 provides an additional method and means for Federally-
26 qualified subsistence users to harvest black bears in
27 those portions of Units 24A, 24B, and 24C within Gates
28 of the Arctic National Park and Preserve.

29
30 There is no conservation concern for
31 black bears in this area and this proposal should not
32 cause a significant impact on the resource.

33
34 Thank you.

35
36 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
37 Frost. Are there any questions or comments.

38
39 (No comments)

40
41 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Not hearing
42 any, we'll call for the question.

43
44 MR. CRIBLEY: Call for question.

45
46 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: All in favor
47 say aye.

48
49 IN UNISON: Aye.

50

1 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Any nays.

2

3 (No opposing votes)

4

5 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. Motion
6 passes unanimously.

7

8 Thank you.

9

10 Next up is WP16-41 on Page 705 of the
11 Board books and invite Staff up. So when you're ready
12 we will go ahead and begin with the Staff analysis.

13

14 MS. WORKER: Thank you, Madame Chair
15 and members of the Board. My name is Suzanne Worker,
16 I'm an OSM biologist and I will be presenting the Staff
17 analysis for WP16-41.

18

19 This analysis begins on Page 705 of
20 your meeting materials and it was submitted by Gates of
21 the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission.

22

23 They request changing the harvest
24 limits in Units 24A and 24B within Gates of the Arctic
25 National Park from three sheep to three sheep not to
26 exceed one ewe. And they also request that sheep
27 harvested within the Park be exempted from the State
28 sealing requirement.

29

30 The sheep population in the Brooks
31 Range has experienced a sharp decline since 2012.
32 Current estimates indicate that the population has
33 declined to approximately one-third of its 2010 size
34 and during this decline the proportion of lambs has
35 been quite low. There is some ambiguity about the
36 permitting and sealing requirements for sheep taken
37 within the Park boundaries and it's also difficult to
38 know exactly how much harvest occurs under this
39 specific regulation, but it's assumed to be pretty low.

40

41 Most harvest within the Park is
42 attributed to residents of Anaktuvuk Pass, who have a
43 60 sheep community quota. If this proposal is adopted
44 a maximum of one ewe would be allowed to be harvested
45 within Gates of the Arctic National Park. Given the
46 population declines conservation of ewes is warranted
47 at this point.

48

49 As a result, the OSM conclusion is to
50 support with modification to require a Federal

1 registration permit. While the requirement for a
2 Federal permit would be somewhat burdensome to Federal
3 subsistence users, it would certainly be less onerous
4 than taking horns to Fairbanks to have them sealed. In
5 addition, a Federal permit could take the place of any
6 State reporting requirements unless the Board species
7 otherwise, and would ensure that we still have good
8 harvesting reporting for this population. It would
9 also resolve any ambiguity associated with State
10 sealing requirements.

11
12 As we'll hear shortly from the Council,
13 residents of some communities prefer community
14 reporting over individual reporting and they don't
15 support the use of a Federal registration permit.

16
17 One final thing to bear in mind is the
18 issue of navigating OMB requirements if the survey
19 provision were to be put into regulation.

20
21 So, again, the OSM conclusion is to
22 support with modification to require a Federal
23 registration permit.

24
25 Thank you. Madame Chair.

26
27 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
28 Are there any questions from the Board.

29
30 (No comments)

31
32 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. We'll
33 go to the summary of public comments to the Regional
34 Council Coordinator.

35
36 MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Madame
37 Chair. Zach Stevenson with OSM.

38
39 Two public written comments were
40 received. The first can be found on Page 705 of your
41 books. Pardon me, Page 717 of your book. Submitted by
42 Miki and Julie Collins, Alaska Freelance Writers and
43 Photographers of Lake Minchumina, Alaska. They support
44 Wildlife Proposal 16-41 stating that it presently does
45 not make sense to fly to Fairbanks to get horns sealed.
46 Additionally, they state that support -- they support
47 simplify regulations and more liberal seasons when
48 populations are strong and limiting take, e.g.,
49 Wildlife Proposal 16-63 when populations are low or
50 stressed in the area.

1 Additionally, they expressed support
2 for the traditional hunting methods and concern about
3 human safety and habituating bears associated with bear
4 baiting.

5
6 And, lastly, emphasize the need for
7 considering local knowledge when making wildlife
8 management decisions.

9
10 Secondly, Madame Chair, a written
11 comment was received from the Gates of the Arctic
12 National Park Subsistence Resource Commission dated
13 November 25, 2015 included in your supplemental
14 materials.

15
16 The SRC provides support for Wildlife
17 Proposal 16-41 stating that their position is similar
18 to that of the Western Interior RAC vote. Their
19 justification states that due to declining sheep
20 numbers in the Central Brooks Range, ewe harvest
21 limitations are needed at this time. Once sheep
22 numbers have recovered a proposal will be submitted to
23 revert back to any three sheep.

24
25 Additionally, support for the proposal,
26 not including OSM's modification, and replacing the
27 suggested Federal subsistence permit system with a
28 community harvest collection.

29
30 Thank you.

31
32 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
33 Are there any questions from the Board.

34
35 (No comments)

36
37 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. At this
38 point we will move to any public testimony from the
39 floor.

40
41 (No comments)

42
43 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: And we don't
44 have any unless there's somebody -- we'll go on line,
45 if there's anyone who would like to make testimony at
46 this time.

47
48 OPERATOR: One the phone lines, please
49 press star one.

50

1 (No comments)

2

3 OPERATOR: We have no comments.

4

5 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, thank
6 you, Operator.

7

8 At this point we'll go to our Regional
9 Council recommendation. Mr. Reakoff.

10

11 MR. REAKOFF: Thank you, Madame Chair.
12 Western Interior modified our fall recommendation to
13 include language so it would state:

14

15 No more than one of which may be a ewe,
16 sheep taken within the Gates of the Arctic National
17 Park are eliminated from sealing requirements by the
18 Federal registration permit except residents of
19 Allakaket and Alatna only, where reporting will be
20 community harvest recording system.

21

22 OMB requirements have to do with
23 surveying more than 10 people, but Allakaket and Alatna
24 only has about three to five hunters that actually go
25 into the Park to hunt sheep. So I still feel that a
26 harvest reporting system could be worked out with the
27 tribal -- Allakaket and Alatna Tribal offices to survey
28 the hunters and everybody knows who went sheep hunting
29 there, there's very few sheep that are actually taken
30 in the Park. It's quite a distance from those
31 communities. The other communities, Wiseman, Bettles,
32 Evansville and Hughes would be eligible to hunt under
33 this hunt and the harvest reporting, harvest report
34 would be totally fine for those communities but
35 Allakaket and Alatna have been resistant to having a
36 harvest ticket for dall sheep.

37

38 But as this population -- I've never
39 seen sheep this low in numbers. We've had some ice
40 events, we've had deep snow in the spring of 2013 being
41 extremely late, killed all the yearlings, killed all
42 the lambs that year and the next year, in 2014, was
43 very little reproduction -- lamb production, so there's
44 a need to reduce ewe harvest at this time and as our
45 proposal states if the population returns to previous
46 levels then we would revert back to any sheep.

47

48 Thank you, Madame Chair.

49

50 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.

1 Reakoff. Are there any questions for Mr. Reakoff.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Mr. McKee.

6

7 MR. MCKEE: Madame Chair. Just in
8 response to what Jack said, there's concern within OSM
9 that if the Board passes this modification that the --
10 the fact that the Board passes this into Federal
11 regulation, that there will be these OMB requirements.
12 I doubt the accuracy of Jack's statement that there may
13 be three or five people that hunt sheep in these
14 communities at any one time, but what happens if more
15 than 10 -- 10 or more people end up hunting in a given
16 year, so I think that we're still -- I still have
17 concern that we'll be under the burden of having to go
18 through the OMB process to have -- because it that
19 happens we have to -- they have to know who's going to
20 collect the information, how it's going to be collected
21 and what the information's going to be in that survey
22 and I think that if the Board passes this, that we
23 would still be under the obligation to go through OMB
24 process because you can never know how many people are
25 going to be harvesting sheep in any one year and that
26 process can take awhile, it can take -- you know, it's
27 not like if the Board passes this modification that it
28 would automatically be ready to go by the time the
29 season starts, so we're looking at -- I mean I don't
30 want to hazard a guess how long it would take, but it
31 wouldn't be an automatic situation.

32

33 So I just wanted to put that out there
34 for the record as something the Board might want to
35 think about when they're discussing this.

36

37 Madame Chair.

38

39 MR. REAKOFF: Madame Chair.

40

41 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Yes, just a
42 moment. Thank you, Mr. McKee. Mr. Reakoff.

43

44 MR. REAKOFF: Yeah, I understand that
45 aspect of it. As the Vice-Chair of the Gates of the
46 Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission there's been
47 virtually no harvest reporting for sheep outside of the
48 Anaktuvuk Pass hunt with the 60 community hunt, with 60
49 sheep quota. The rest of the communities have had
50 virtually no harvest reporting. There's been sheep

1 harvested every year by the other communities but
2 there's been no harvest reporting system so we do need
3 to have harvest reporting to assess the amount of
4 harvest by community and so I am in favor of harvest
5 reporting.

6

7 I want it to be clear to the Board that
8 I am in favor of harvesting reporting for all of the
9 harvest of sheep in the Gates of the Arctic.

10

11 Thank you, Madame Chair.

12

13 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.

14 Reakoff.

15

16 Mr. McKee, did you have a further
17 comment.

18

19 MR. MCKEE: I just wanted to clarify, I
20 wasn't -- I understand Jack's concern. That's also one
21 of the reasons why we passed a modification to require
22 a registration permit because if you are going to
23 eliminate the sealing requirement we still want some
24 mechanism by which to report harvest and the
25 registration -- the Federal permit would allow you to
26 have that kind of mechanism.

27

28 But, again, as was stated at the
29 Western Interior meeting, is that there are certain
30 cultural sensitivities for people in some communities
31 that don't feel comfortable reporting under a Federal
32 permit so that was at least part of the discussion.
33 But the reason for our modification was to make sure
34 that we do have some kind of reporting mechanism should
35 the Board vote to get rid of the sealing requirement.

36

37 Madame Chair.

38

39 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
40 Just pause here for a minute and see if there's any
41 questions from the Board for Mr. Reakoff or Mr. McKee
42 before we move on.

43

44 MR. FROST: Can I ask a rhetorical
45 question. When was the last time someone from OMB went
46 up to Alatna or Allakaket to check if they were using
47 the right form.

48

49 (Laughter)

50

1 MR. FROST: Just -- just -- I don't
2 need an answer.

3
4 (Laughter)

5
6 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
7 Frost. We will now move to the Native Liaison for a
8 summary of any of the Tribal, or Alaska Native
9 Corporation comments.

10
11 MR. LIND: Madame Chair. There were no
12 Tribal or Corporate comments.

13
14 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you. So
15 we'll now move on to the State for any comments.

16
17 MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Madame Chair.
18 We support the proposal to reduce the bag limit for
19 sheep in this area. As been noted, there are
20 conservation concerns associated with the sheep
21 populations so reducing the amount of ewe harvest would
22 be a desirable outcome.

23
24 We support our continued use of the
25 State sealing program. It's contributed valuable
26 information in terms of harvest but to the extent that
27 the Federal system could capture that harvest
28 information through a Federal permit, we'd also support
29 the use of that. So we're amenable to the
30 recommendation that we move to a Federal permit system
31 and not require the sealing but we'd like to see one or
32 the other to, again, better monitor and evaluate
33 harvest in the area.

34
35 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
36 Butler. From the Board, any questions.

37
38 (No comments)

39
40 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you. At
41 this time we will go to the InterAgency Staff
42 Committee.

43
44 MS. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair.

45
46 The InterAgency Staff Committee
47 standard comments apply for this proposal.

48
49 Thank you.

50

1 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
2 Board discussion with Council Chair Reakoff or the
3 State.
4
5 (No comments)
6
7 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Any
8 discussion.
9
10 (No comments)
11
12 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. At this
13 point then we'll move on to the Board action.
14
15 MR. FROST: I move that we adopt WP16-
16 41, and after a second I will speak to my motion.
17
18 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: A second.
19
20 MR. CRIBLEY: Second.
21
22 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
23 Cribley. Go ahead and proceed.
24
25 MR. FROST: I intend to amend the
26 motion. I move that we amend the original proposal put
27 forward by the Gates of the Arctic National Park
28 Subsistence Resource Commission by implementing a
29 Federal registration permit and making an allowance for
30 residents of Allakaket and Alatna. It would enable
31 them to report their sheep harvest by a community
32 reporting system.
33
34 After a second I will speak to my
35 amendment.
36
37 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Do we have a
38 second.
39
40 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Second.
41
42 MR. CRIBLEY: Second.
43
44 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
45 Christianson.
46
47 Go ahead and proceed Bert.
48
49 MR. FROST: My amendment is based on
50 the OSM recommendation, recommended modification to

1 manage the dall sheep hunt under a Federal registration
2 permit in order to exempt subsistence users from the
3 horn sealing requirement. The addition of an
4 alternative harvest reporting system for residents of
5 Allakaket and Alatna follows the recommendation made by
6 the Western Interior Council.

7
8 The Park Service recognizes the
9 cultural sensitivities concerning the harvest reporting
10 by registration permits in the communities of Allakaket
11 and Alatna. This amendment respects those
12 sensitivities by substituting a community reporting
13 system to be administered by Gates of the Arctic
14 National Park and Preserve.

15
16 There are significant conservation
17 concern for the dall sheep population in Units 24A and
18 24B. This community reporting system will provide
19 valuable information to help biologists and the NPS
20 manage dall sheep in Gates of the Arctic National Park
21 and Preserve. Since there are just a handful of rural
22 users from Allakaket and Alatna that travel into Gates
23 of the Arctic National Park to harvest sheep, a simple
24 harvest reporting system can be effectively implemented
25 in these two communities.

26
27 Thank you.

28
29 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you. Is
30 there any Board discussion with regard to the
31 amendment.

32
33 (No comments)

34
35 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Question.

36
37 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: We've got the
38 question. All in favor as amended say aye.

39
40 MS. CLARK: On the amendment.

41
42 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Yes, excuse
43 me, on the amendment say aye.

44
45 IN UNISON: Aye.

46
47 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Any nays.

48
49 (No opposing votes)

50

1 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: So the
2 amendment passes unanimously and now we need to go back
3 to the original motion.

4
5 MR. CRIBLEY: Call for the question.

6
7 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
8 All in favor say aye.

9
10 IN UNISON: Aye.

11
12 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
13 Motion passes unanimously.

14
15 We have one more in the Western
16 Interior so we'll go ahead and do that one and then
17 we'll take a short break. So next up is WP16-42, and
18 we will first go to the Staff analysis when you're
19 ready.

20
21 MS. WORKER: Thank you, Madame Chair.

22
23 WP16-42 begins on Page 718 of your
24 meeting materials and this proposal was submitted by
25 Gary Hanchett of Bettlesfield [sic].

26
27 He requests opening a winter moose
28 season in Unit 24B upstream of the Henshaw Creek
29 drainage. Currently there is a winter hunt in the area
30 downstream of and including Henshaw Creek so the
31 requested change would establish a large Unit 24
32 remainder, all of which would have a winter season.

33
34 This is a low density moose population,
35 which is pretty typical of Interior Alaska moose
36 populations but it is believed to be relatively stable.
37 I'll point out that the analysis indicates that the
38 most recent survey occurred in 2013 and that survey was
39 a little bit suspect, it showed a slight dip in
40 population but survey conditions were not great and so
41 those results could have been anomalous. We recently
42 received word from Mike Spindler, who manages the
43 Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge, that in November 2015
44 another survey was conducted and that survey actually
45 revealed a slight population increase. So this
46 population does seem to be relatively stable.

47
48 However, recruitment is low and
49 predation is believed to limit subadult survival.
50

1 In Unit 24 nearly all of the moose
2 harvest occurs under State regulation, 95 percent or
3 so, and it occurs between September 1st and September
4 25th, that 95 percent occurs between those dates that
5 is.

6
7 Local residents harvest only about 20
8 percent of the local harvest -- sorry, of the total
9 harvest -- and, again, that's under State regulation.
10 On average, only three moose per year are harvested
11 under Federal permit in fall and winter hunts,
12 combined. So participation is low in the Federal
13 hunts.

14
15 If this proposal is adopted a winter
16 moose season would be open December 15th through April
17 15th in all of Unit 24B, except the John River
18 drainage. So this would provide additional opportunity
19 for subsistence users when they're out and about doing
20 the things that they do in the winter.

21
22 This change is not expected to have an
23 adverse impact on the moose population due to the
24 historically low winter harvest in the area.

25
26 So as a result, the OSM conclusion is
27 to support WP16-42.

28
29 Thank you, Madame Chair.

30
31 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
32 Are there any questions from the Board.

33
34 (No comments)

35
36 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, not
37 seeing any, thank you.

38
39 We will go on to the summary of public
40 comments.

41
42 MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Madame
43 Chair. Zach Stevenson with OSM. One public written
44 comment was received regarding Wildlife Proposal 16-42.

45
46 Included in your supplemental materials
47 is a letter submitted by the Gates of the Arctic
48 National Park Subsistence Resource Commission dated
49 November 25th, 2015 signed by Mr. Louie Commack, Gates
50 of the Arctic, SRC Chair, and Mr. Jack Reakoff, Vice-

1 Chair. They provide support for Wildlife Proposal 16-
2 42 stating that it offers increased subsistence
3 opportunity.

4
5 Thank you.

6
7 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
8 Stevenson. Are there any questions.

9
10 (No comments)

11
12 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, at this
13 time we'll go to any public testimony from the floor.

14
15 (No comments)

16
17 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: We don't have
18 any submitted cards. So we will go to the phone lines
19 for any public testimony, Operator.

20
21 OPERATOR: Once, again, if you do have
22 any comments please press star one at this time.

23
24 (No comments)

25
26 OPERATOR: We have no comments.

27
28 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you. We
29 will now go to the Regional Council recommendation.

30
31 Mr. Reakoff.

32
33 MR. REAKOFF: Thank you, Madame Chair.
34 Western Interior Regional Advisory Council supported
35 the proposal.

36
37 And I wanted to note that the bull/cow
38 ratio in the last survey in 2015 is 56 bulls per 100
39 cows. This hunt, this winter hunt regime was
40 established through multiple proposals by the Western
41 Interior Regional Advisory Council to have a winter
42 bull hunt and so we worked out a system with the State
43 of Alaska in 2010 to have the December 15 to April
44 15th, antlered bull. So once the bulls began growing
45 antlers in the springtime those are available to
46 harvest again. There's a period of time when bulls
47 cannot be harvested when they don't have antlers, they
48 have to be showing an antler growth or before they shed
49 antlers in December -- November, December. And so the
50 calf component this year is 50-55 calves per 100 cows,

1 so the area biologist said that the -- for the Koyukuk
2 River Advisory Committee, that the general population
3 there was 55 calves per 100 cows showing a good
4 recruitment. And so there's available resource to be
5 harvested and so the Western Interior Council and the
6 Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission
7 support this.

8
9 This would only apply to Federal lands
10 above the Kanuti -- or correction, the Henshaw River
11 drainage.

12
13 Thank you, Madame Chair.

14
15 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
16 Reakoff. For the Board, are there any questions for
17 Mr. Reakoff.

18
19 (No comments)

20
21 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. Not
22 seeing any, we will move on to the summary of comments
23 from Tribes or Alaska Native Corporations -- yes --
24 thank you -- Ms. Worker.

25
26 MS. WORKER: Madame Chair. I was just
27 going to note that I apparently skipped a small section
28 of my presentation and I just wanted to confirm that
29 what Mr. Reakoff said is true, this population has a
30 high bull/cow ratio and a high calf/cow ratio.

31
32 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, thank
33 you. So we'll go to Orville.

34
35 MR. LIND: Madame Chair. There are no
36 Tribal or Corporate comments.

37
38 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you. Go
39 on to the State then, Alaska Department of Fish and
40 Game.

41
42 Mr. Butler.

43
44 MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Madame Chair.

45
46 We're going to update our
47 recommendation to take a neutral stance. We don't
48 believe that sufficient information has been introduced
49 to document that there's been a change in harvestable
50 surplus, it's a low density moose population, so we

1 suggest that the Federal Board proceed with caution in
2 this arena.

3

4 But we do recognize the high bull to
5 cow ratio and there is potential for this hunt to be
6 sustainable. Again, we'd encourage you to use caution
7 and monitor the harvest, continue to evaluate the
8 effects, if this proposal is adopted, to make sure it
9 does not have a detrimental impact.

10

11 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
12 Butler. Any questions for the State.

13

14 (No comments)

15

16 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: We'll move on
17 then to InterAgency Staff Committee comments.

18

19 MS. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair.

20

21 The InterAgency Staff comments are the
22 standard comments for this proposal.

23

24 Thank you.

25

26 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you. So
27 Board discussion with Council Chair Reakoff or the
28 State. From the Board, are there any discussion or
29 questions.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, not
34 seeing.....

35

36 MR. REAKOFF: Madame Chair.

37

38 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Mr. Reakoff.

39

40 MR. REAKOFF: Yes, the harvest
41 currently in the winter hunt for Allakaket and Alatna
42 primarily has been like very low, one moose, or around
43 that annually in the winter hunt. The proponent of the
44 proposal is from Bettles, there's like 25 people there,
45 there may be one more moose harvested in the areas
46 upstream from the Henshaw drainage. But we can expect
47 very low harvest from the -- the performance for the
48 last six years has showed very low harvest but give
49 additional harvest opportunity when people are out
50 trapping or woodcutting or something.

1 So, thank you, Madame Chair.
2
3 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
4 Reakoff. At this time we will go to Board action.
5
6 MS. CLARK: I'd like to make a motion.
7
8 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Go ahead.
9
10 MS. CLARK: I make a motion to adopt
11 WP16-42 as recommended by the Western Interior Council
12 and included on Page 721 of your meeting materials.
13
14 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Do we have a
15 second on the motion.
16
17 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Second.
18
19 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
20 Christianson. Go ahead, Ms. Clark.
21
22 MS. CLARK: Establishing a winter
23 season in Unit 24B upstream of the Henshaw Creek
24 drainage is not expected to have an appreciable impact
25 on the moose population. The winter season downstream
26 of Henshaw Creek has been associated with low harvest
27 rates and appears to be sustainable.
28
29 Moose are an important resource in the
30 region and this would provide an increased opportunity
31 for those Federally-qualified subsistence users that
32 were not able to harvest a moose during the fall
33 season.
34
35 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
36 Any questions or discussion.
37
38 (No comments)
39
40 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Go ahead and
41 call for the question.
42
43 MR. CRIBLEY: Call for question.
44
45 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: All in favor
46 say aye.
47
48 IN UNISON: Aye.
49
50 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Any nays.

1 (No opposing votes)
2
3 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Passes
4 unanimously.
5
6 Thank you.
7
8 So I will just note for the record that
9 Mr. Brower has not yet returned so we'll check on his
10 status. We're going to take a short break.
11
12 So I do have just a quick announcement
13 for the Board, that we do have outside the hall to the
14 left, there is the artwork for the cover of the
15 subsistence upcoming regulatory book, the student art
16 contest, so that work is out there. We'd really like
17 you to take a look at that and vote, either during the
18 break, or certainly by the end of the lunch period.
19
20 Thank you.
21
22 MS. HOWARD: Madame Chair. Just to
23 clarify the Board members and the Council -- each
24 Council Chair will get a ballot from Deb Coble and if
25 you can return those ballots to Deb by the end of lunch
26 or when you return from lunch, that would be great.
27
28 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you,
29 Ameer. Okay, we'll go ahead and take a break for 10
30 minutes -- well, let's come back at 10 after 10:00.
31
32 Thanks.
33
34 (Off record)
35
36 (On record)
37
38 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Welcome back.
39 We're going to move on to the Seward Peninsula, we have
40 a couple of proposals to take up. We will begin with
41 WP16-44. This is on Page 731 of the Board book, and
42 we'll begin with Staff analysis when you are ready.
43
44 MS. WORKER: Thank you, Madame Chair.
45 This is Suzanne Worker for the record. And I will
46 present the Staff analysis for WP16-44 which begins on
47 Page 731 of your Board book.
48
49 This proposal was submitted by the
50 Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory Council and they

1 request a liberalization of bear harvest throughout --
2 or in parts of Unit 22.

3
4 In Unit 22C they request changing the
5 season from the current August 1st through October 31st
6 and May 10th through May 25th split season to a single
7 continuous season that would run August 1st through May
8 25th.

9
10 In Unit 22D they request creating a new
11 hunt area in the southwest portion of 22D and
12 increasing the harvest limit from one bear to two bears
13 with a yearround season in that new hunt area.

14
15 Brown bears on the Seward Peninsula
16 haven't been surveyed particularly regularly, however,
17 preliminary results from a recent survey indicate that
18 there haven't been any major changes in brown bear
19 densities and the population is believed to be
20 productive. The State's management goal is to sustain
21 a three year mean harvest of at least 50 percent males
22 and that goal has been exceeded.

23
24 Since 1997 harvest has increased both
25 in Unit 22C and Unit 22D. Harvest for the past 15
26 years has averaged 16 bears in 22C and 17 in 22D.
27 However, in Unit 22D southwest, which is the new
28 proposed hunt area, under one bear per year has been
29 harvested on average.

30
31 The proposed regulation changes in Unit
32 22 don't represent a real increase in subsistence
33 opportunity because they're so little Federal land in
34 that area, it's, I think, under a square mile and it's
35 Barrier Island and Safety Sound, and because the season
36 extension would largely coincide with denning, so that
37 doesn't represent any real additional opportunity.

38
39 In Unit 22D the proposed changes do
40 represent some additional opportunity and given the low
41 harvest rates in this area, these changes wouldn't be
42 expected to have an appreciable affect on the bear
43 population.

44
45 As a result OSM's conclusion is to
46 support WP16-44 with modification to only support the
47 regulation changes in 22D.

48
49 The modification would also stipulate
50 that a Federal registration permit would be required

1 for the Unit 22D southwest hunt since currently brown
2 bear harvest is allowed by State registration permit
3 but the State limits harvest to one bear.

4

5 That's all I have but I would be happy
6 to take questions from the Board.

7

8 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Ms.
9 Worker. Any questions from the Board.

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
14 We'll now move on to the summary of public comment.

15

16 MS. DEATHERAGE: Madame Chair. Members
17 of the Board. I will be wearing my Council Coordinator
18 hat this time, my true hat.

19

20 There is one public comment from
21 Kawerak on WP16-44. I'll read this one paragraph that
22 pertains to this particular wildlife proposal.

23

24 Regarding WP16-44 to extend the season
25 dates for brown grizzly bear in GMU 22C and D, we
26 recommend a separate proposal be sent to the ADF&G
27 Board of Game as these units are under State
28 jurisdiction for hunting regulations being considered.

29

30 Thank you, very much.

31

32 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Ms.
33 Deatherage.

34

35 Are there any questions from the Board.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, at this
40 time we will go to the floor.

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: It doesn't
45 look like we have any slips submitted. So we will go
46 to the phone lines, if there are any public testimony
47 from the phone lines.

48

49 OPERATOR: Thank you. On the phone
50 lines, if you have any comments please press star one.

1 (No comments)
2
3 OPERATOR: We have no comments.
4
5 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you,
6 Operator.
7
8 We'll move on then to the Regional
9 Council recommendations.
10
11 Ms. Deatherage.
12
13 MS. DEATHERAGE: Thank you, Madame
14 Chair. Members of the Board. This is Karen
15 Deatherage, Council Coordinator, speaking for the
16 record for the Seward Peninsula Council.
17
18 The Council recommended support for
19 WP16-44 with a modification. The modification proposed
20 would be to change to a yearround season for brown bear
21 in Unit 22C. The justification for the modification in
22 22C is to allow for better access during the early
23 spring months for bear hunting in this unit.
24
25 Thank you, very much.
26
27 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Ms.
28 Deatherage. Are there any questions from the Board.
29
30 (No comments)
31
32 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you. So
33 we'll move on now to the summary Tribal, or Alaska
34 Native Corporation comments.
35
36 MR. LIND: Madame Chair. There are no
37 Tribal or Corporate comments.
38
39 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
40 Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments.
41
42 MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Madame Chair.
43 The Department supports the proposal and the OSM
44 recommendations.
45
46 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
47 Butler. Any questions for the State from the Board.
48
49 (No comments)
50

1 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, not
2 seeing any then we will go to the InterAgency Staff
3 Committee.

4
5 Ms. Howard.

6
7 MS. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair.

8
9 The InterAgency Staff Committee has
10 standard comments for this proposal.

11
12 Thank you.

13
14 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you. So
15 we're at Board discussion with the Council Chair
16 representative or the State. Any discussion or
17 questions.

18
19 Mr. Frost.

20
21 MR. FROST: I just want to make a
22 comment that, while I plan to support this proposal, I
23 think we just need to put on the record that there
24 could be some conservation concerns here in the future.
25 With a recent survey that was just done with the State
26 and the Park Service over this entire Unit 22 it shows
27 that -- some of the preliminary analysis shows that the
28 harvest rates are at a pretty high level in relation to
29 sustainability of brown bear populations.

30
31 So while I plan to support this, I
32 think we just need to understand that we need to
33 continue to watch the situation.

34
35 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you,
36 Bert. Any other comments or discussion.

37
38 (No comments)

39
40 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: So we will
41 move then to Board action.

42
43 MR. CRIBLEY: Madame Chair, I'd like to
44 make a motion.

45
46 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Go ahead and
47 proceed.

48
49 MR. CRIBLEY: I move to adopt WP16-44
50 and once seconded I would like to immediately modify my

1 original motion by adopting the modified language
2 proposed by the Office of Subsistence Management on
3 Page 738 of the Board book. I'll provide my reasoning,
4 if my modification is seconded.

5
6 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Do we have a
7 second.

8
9 MR. FROST: Second.

10
11 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you. Go
12 ahead and proceed, Mr. Cribley.

13
14 MR. CRIBLEY: Okay. Liberalizing the
15 harvest limit and season dates within the newly
16 described section of Unit 22D will expand subsistence
17 opportunity, but as stated in the analysis and is
18 anticipated to have minimal effect on Unit 22D's
19 overall brown bear harvest rate. Because Federal
20 regulations will not be in alignment with State
21 regulations a Federal registration permit will need to
22 be needed to coordinate the hunt in the newly described
23 area of 22D. A Federal registration permit will help
24 quantify effort and harvest by subsistence users.

25
26 I understand the Seward Peninsula RAC
27 is in support of a yearround brown bear season in Unit
28 22C and in the newly described portion of Unit 22D, the
29 State has a split season in Units 22C and D that would
30 not align with the Federal yearround season. The RAC's
31 recommendation included continued use of a State
32 registration permit. There are very few State
33 Federally-managed lands in Unit 22C. Accurately
34 identifying those small parcels of Federal land in
35 order to hunt a longer season under Federal regulations
36 would likely create -- serve to create a more confused
37 -- create more confusion than opportunity for both
38 subsistence hunters and agencies. For Unit 22C Federal
39 alignment with the State season is a much preferred
40 regulatory option where there are very few Federally-
41 managed lands on which to hunt.

42
43 In the correspondence from Kawerak,
44 Incorporated on Page 741 a request to establish a
45 yearround brown bear season in Unit 22C and D are more
46 appropriately made to the Alaska Board of Game where
47 accessible State-managed lands predominate.

48
49 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
50 Cribley. I do need a second on the amendment as

1 proposed.

2

3 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Second.

4

5 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you. At
6 this time then we'll move on with any discussion. So
7 you've heard the amended motion and the rationale so
8 any further discussion on that from the Board.

9

10 (No comments)

11

12 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, not
13 seeing any then we will move to Board action and call
14 for the question.

15

16 MR. C. BROWER: Question.

17

18 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: The question's
19 been called. All in favor of the amendment say aye.

20

21 IN UNISON: Aye.

22

23 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Any nays.

24

25 (No opposing votes)

26

27 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: So the
28 amendment passes unanimously. So now we will go back
29 to the original motion and we need a call for the
30 question.

31

32 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Question.

33

34 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, the
35 question's been called. Second.

36

37 MR. CRIBLEY: Second.

38

39 MR. FROST: No.

40

41 MR. CRIBLEY: No.

42

43 (Laughter)

44

45 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. All in
46 favor say aye.

47

48 IN UNISON: Aye.

49

50 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Passes

1 unanimously so we're done with that one.

2

3 Thank you.

4

5 Okay, next up is the final proposal
6 then from the Seward Peninsula WP16-46 and that starts
7 on Page 758 of the Board book. So when the Staff is
8 ready we'll begin with the analysis.

9

10 MS. WORKER: Thank you, Madame Chair.
11 WP16-46 begins on Page 758 of your Board materials.
12 And this proposal was submitted by the Seward Peninsula
13 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council.

14

15 This Council suggests -- requests
16 rescinding the closure to moose harvest by non-
17 Federally-qualified users in Unit 22E. The proponent
18 believes that the closure is no longer justified given
19 the recovery of the moose population in the area.

20

21 This closure was established in 2002 in
22 response to the population decline in the 1990s and
23 beginning in 2008 both the State and the Federal Boards
24 began liberalizing moose harvest as the population
25 recovered in this area.

26

27 The moose population in Unit 22E is
28 currently believed to be relatively stable and it's
29 estimated to be around 700 animals, which does exceed
30 the State's management goals.

31

32 The reported harvest in Unit 22E is
33 relatively low, averaging 14 moose per year for the
34 years 2004 to 2013, although the harvest is believed to
35 be under reported. Most of this harvest is
36 attributable to local residents.

37

38 If this proposal is adopted, Federal
39 public lands in Unit 22 would be open to non-Federally-
40 qualified subsistence users for the harvest of moose.
41 This action is not expected to have a detrimental
42 effect on subsistence users and does not currently pose
43 a conservation risk for the species.

44

45 For this reason the OSM conclusion is
46 to support WP16-46.

47

48 Thank you, Madame Chair.

49

50 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Ms.

1 Worker. Are there any questions from the Board on the
2 Staff analysis.

3

4 (No comments)

5

6 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, not
7 seeing any, then we will move to the summary of public
8 comments.

9

10 MS. DEATHERAGE: Thank you, Madame
11 Chair. This is Karen Deatherage, Council Coordinator
12 for Seward Penn. There is one public comment on Page
13 765 of your book from Kawerak.

14

15 Again, I will read the paragraph
16 pertaining to WP16-46.

17

18 Regarding WP16-46 we support deleting
19 the language for Federal public lands being closed to
20 the taking of moose "except" by Federally-qualified
21 subsistence users in GMU 22E. Current data indicate
22 that the moose population in 22E is healthy and on the
23 rise.

24

25 Thank you, Madame Chair.

26

27 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Ms.
28 Deatherage. Any questions from the Board.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you. We
33 don't have any requests for public testimony but just
34 making a check out there just to make sure there's no
35 one here in the room that would like to make testimony
36 at this time.

37

38 (No comments)

39

40 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. Then
41 we'll go to the phone line, please, if there's any
42 testimony requested.

43

44 OPERATOR: Again, on the phone lines,
45 please press star one.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 OPERATOR: We have no comments.

50

1 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you,
2 Operator.

3
4 So we will go back to you, Ms.
5 Deatherage, for Regional Advisory Council
6 recommendation.

7
8 MS. DEATHERAGE: Thank you, Madame
9 Chair. Karen Deatherage speaking on the record for the
10 Seward Peninsula Council.

11
12 The Seward Peninsula Council, as noted,
13 submitted this proposal for consideration and at the
14 time supported WP16-46. However, at the fall meeting
15 in Nome, the Council heard a report by Fish and Game
16 biologist, Tony Gorn, regarding the moose population in
17 this region and the Council did vote unanimously to
18 oppose WP16-46 based on that information.

19
20 The information revealed that there is
21 still concern over moose populations in 22E. They are
22 growing slowly but during a survey Mr. Gorn found that
23 the moose populations in 22D were actually dramatically
24 decreased and there is some concern that moose may be
25 migrating between those two areas and so that any
26 increase in 22E might be the result of a migration of
27 moose from another area.

28
29 With that in mind the Council members
30 believed that opening up additional moose hunting on
31 this particular population in 22E would be detrimental
32 to the continued growth of that herd and so they would
33 like to, again, oppose the proposal.

34
35 Thank you.

36
37 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Ms.
38 Deatherage. It looks like we have a question -- or
39 questions from the Board. Bud, did you have a
40 question.

41
42 MR. CRIBLEY: Oh, I'm sorry, no.

43
44 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. Any
45 questions from the Board.

46
47 (No comments)

48
49 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, so thank
50 you. We will move on to summary of comments from

1 Tribal, or Alaska Native Corporation.

2

3 Mr. Orville Lind.

4

5 MR. LIND: Madame Chair. We don't have
6 any Tribal or Corporate comments.

7

8 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
9 We'll now move to the State, Alaska Department of Fish
10 and Game.

11

12 MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Madame Chair.
13 The Department supports this proposal.

14

15 We believe that the moose closure in
16 Unit 22E should be rescinded given the status of the
17 moose population. The moose population is above the
18 objective. Our objective is to maintain 200 to 250
19 moose in that area and keep it at that level. And as
20 has been noted we're currently at 700 moose. So we're
21 well exceeding our population objectives and believe
22 that there's no reason to continue a Federal closure in
23 this area.

24

25 Thank you.

26

27 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
28 Butler. Questions from the Board.

29

30 Mr. Christianson.

31

32 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, I have a
33 question for the State, Madame Chair.

34

35 I was just wondering what your
36 anticipated use would be if you opened the area, do you
37 have an idea of the number of permits you'd be issuing
38 for non-subsistence users?

39

40 MR. BUTLER: Through the Chair. I'm
41 trying to evaluate what we are currently offering. But
42 we do have antler restrictions in place for a portion
43 of that season so opportunity would be limited through
44 various mechanisms to -- again, through our State
45 system we typically don't restrict the total number of
46 people but there are a lot of places in the state to
47 hunt moose so I don't think you're going to get a lot
48 of outside users necessarily going to this area, it
49 only has 700 moose, to try to hunt and participate.
50 And, again, to the extent that they do, it'll be

1 limited through things like antler restrictions and
2 season limits. So it's difficult to quantify the
3 behavior of hunters.

4

5 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Ms. Clark.

6

7 MS. CLARK: So I heard for the State
8 that Ms. Deatherage talked about a presentation to the
9 RAC that made them subsequently decide to oppose their
10 own proposal. Do you have any more information that
11 would help us understand that better?

12

13 MR. BUTLER: Through the Chair. Yeah,
14 it's just been kind of a moving target as to what the
15 moose population should be. There's been some
16 discussions to whether or not we should adjust our
17 objectives now that we've realized that the population
18 can actually be at a larger size than, again, our
19 management goals originally stated. We were thinking
20 we had to limit the population at one point and
21 currently what we're seeing is that the area is
22 sustaining a much larger population size. So I think
23 that's what the biologist was trying to discuss with
24 the RAC and it may have influenced their position.

25

26 But, again, at this point we have no
27 information to see a conservation, no reason to believe
28 that the harvest can't be sustained and, you know,
29 possibly even grow the population. Things are
30 changing. Moose are migrating out into new areas.
31 This population showed up in the early 1900s and we
32 need to be adaptive in our management and that's part
33 of what you're seeing is that we're currently in the
34 process of rethinking what we thought we knew.

35

36 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
37 Any other questions for the State.

38

39 (No comments)

40

41 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. Seeing
42 no further questions we'll move on to the InterAgency
43 Staff Committee comments.

44

45 MS. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair.

46

47 The InterAgency Staff Committee
48 comments are the standard comments for this proposal.

49

50 Thank you.

1 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
2 Board discussion with Ms. Deatherage or the State, Mr.
3 Butler. Any further discussion or comments at this
4 time.

5
6 (No comments)

7
8 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, seeing
9 no further discussion we will then move forward with
10 the Board action.

11
12 MR. FROST: I'd like to make a motion.

13
14 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Go ahead, Mr.
15 Frost.

16
17 MR. FROST: I move that we adopt WP16-
18 46 and after a second I will speak to my motion.

19
20 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Do we have a
21 second.

22
23 MR. CRIBLEY: Second.

24
25 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Go ahead and
26 proceed.

27
28 MR. FROST: I attend to vote against
29 WP16-46 consistent with the recommendation of the
30 Seward Peninsula Subsistence Regional Advisory Council.

31
32 While the most recent moose surveys
33 show moose numbers above the State's management
34 objective, I share the Council's concern that increased
35 harvest on this population may create a conservation
36 concern. 22E is an area with very low moose density,
37 less than half a moose per square mile, adjacent area
38 are experiencing declining moose numbers.

39
40 In addition, there is little
41 information about the habitat, availability of browse,
42 and overall health of the moose population in 22E.

43
44 According to the State testimony at the
45 Council's October 2015 meeting the apparent increase in
46 the 22E moose population may possibly be explained by a
47 redistribution of the herd in 22D during low snow
48 years. This information, together with observed
49 declines in other species important to subsistence
50 supports the Council's recommendation.

1 My vote to oppose is based on potential
2 conservation concerns for the 22E moose population and
3 the continuation of subsistence uses for rural
4 residents in the area.

5
6 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
7 Frost.

8
9 Discussion from the Board.

10
11 (No comments)

12
13 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Question.

14
15 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: The question's
16 been called. All in favor say aye. Aye.

17
18 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: And at this
19 point we'll hear -- maybe we need to go by names, but
20 those not in favor say nay, please.

21
22 IN UNISON: Nay.

23
24 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, so we --
25 it fails.

26
27 Okay, the motion fails. So it will
28 stay under current regulation, it'll stay the same.

29
30 We're going to go ahead and take a five
31 minute break while we make sure that our appropriate
32 RAC member is here to take up the next proposal, so
33 just a five minute break.

34
35 (Off record)

36
37 (On record)

38
39 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: So we're now
40 going to move here in just a minute to the Northwest
41 Arctic proposals. We've got three proposals from the
42 Northwest Arctic region. We will go about until noon,
43 it'll depend on this first proposal and the timing for
44 that and how long it takes us to work through WP16-48.

45
46 And just to let folks know, too, that
47 we will take additional public comment when we come
48 back after the lunch recess for those of you that are
49 interested in making public comment.

50

1 (Pause)

2

3 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: So we're going
4 to go ahead and invite Staff up for the Northwest
5 Arctic proposals. The first one on the agenda then is
6 WP16-48. And when the Staff is ready we'll go ahead
7 and do the Staff analysis.

8

9 DR. HARDIN: Thank you, Madame Chair.
10 I'm Dr. Jennifer Hardin and I'm the anthropology
11 Division Chief for the Office of Subsistence Management
12 and I'll be presenting the analysis this afternoon, or
13 this morning for Wildlife Proposal 16-48. The analysis
14 begins on Page 766 of your meeting book.

15

16 Wildlife Proposal 16-48 was submitted
17 by the Native Village of Kotzebue. The village
18 requests modification of the unit-specific provision
19 that currently defines how a hunter may use a
20 snowmachine to harvest caribou on Federal public lands
21 in Unit 23. Currently Federally-qualified subsistence
22 users may legally use a snowmachine in Unit 23 to
23 position a hunter to select and harvest a caribou.

24

25 The proponent asked the Federal
26 Subsistence Board to modify this provision to also
27 allow the use of a snowmachine to position a caribou,
28 wolf, or wolverine for harvest as long as the hunter
29 does not take the animal from a moving snowmachine.

30

31 Federal Proposal 16-48 would be
32 consistent with the State regulation adopted in 2014
33 that allows hunters in Units 22, 23 and 26A to use a
34 snowmachine to position a caribou, wolf or wolverine
35 for harvest. The Alaska Board of Game adopted this
36 regulation to allow the use of snowmachines to track
37 and pursue these animals without a prohibition against
38 driving, herding, harassing or molesting game.

39

40 The proponent states that the proposed
41 Federal regulatory change would provide consistency
42 across adjacent State and Federal management
43 boundaries, thereby avoiding confusion and
44 unintentional violations and would benefit law
45 enforcement by eliminating opposing rules.

46

47 The proponent also notes that the
48 proposed change would fix a longstanding conflict
49 between regulatory restrictions and local hunting
50 practices.

1 The proponent reports that pursuing and
2 harvesting caribou, wolves and wolverine in the manner
3 proposed is an integral part of local tradition for
4 many residents of the region and is the only practical
5 way to hunt these animals during winter in most of Unit
6 23.

7
8 Further, the proponent states that the
9 regulatory imposition of Western cultural values as a
10 substitute for traditional cultural values is at the
11 heart of the issue raised in the proposal.

12
13 Inupiaq hunters have a long history of
14 traveling far and positioning both hunters and animals
15 in order to successfully meet their subsistence needs.
16 Before snowmachines became common in the 1960s most
17 people of the area traveled on foot or by dog team to
18 hunt caribou in winter months. Sleds and snowmachines
19 are now used together and allow the transport of
20 hunters, gear, meat and hides. This customary and
21 traditionally hunting practice has been discussed at
22 length by subsistence users in previous Regional
23 Advisory Council and Federal Subsistence Board meetings
24 as well as in ethnographic accounts. Subsistence users
25 have noted that in the context of caribou hunting the
26 Inupiaq word, inillak means the hunter positions
27 himself close to where the caribou would pass or cross
28 depending on the way the wind is blowing. To the
29 Inupiaq, inillak is quite different from herding and it
30 is used specifically in caribou hunting. Inupiaq
31 hunters position both themselves and caribou during a
32 hunt. The Inupiaq word, unu means to cooperatively
33 push or move the caribou. Subsistence users have
34 reported that whether using dog team, snowmachine or
35 stalking on foot it is customary for a hunter to go on
36 one side of the herd and unu them towards the hunter
37 waiting on the other side so that they are able to
38 selectively and efficiently harvest the caribou that
39 they want. This remains a common practice in Unit 23
40 and the current preferred method of positioning both
41 hunters and animals in winter is by snowmachine.

42
43 Wolves and wolverine are also highly
44 valued subsistence resources in Unit 23. During winter
45 months they are hunted by snowmachine. Most wolves and
46 wolverine are shot in Unit 23 rather than trapped.
47 This method is preferred because much of the region is
48 open tundra and is conducive to tracking and ground
49 shooting using snowmachines and rifles.

50

1 It's important to note that conflicts
2 may exist between the proposed regulation and agency
3 specific regulations. Both the US Fish and Wildlife
4 Service and the National Park Service have regulations
5 in place prohibiting the use of snowmachines in a
6 manner that results in the herding, harassment, hazing,
7 or driving of wildlife. Adopting the proposed
8 regulatory change would not resolve the apparent
9 conflicts with agency specific regulations.

10
11 Because regulatory conflicts may exist
12 OSM Staff considered recommending that the Board defer
13 taking any action on the proposal until a later date.
14 However, this alternative was dismissed, because all
15 available evidence supports the customary and
16 traditional hunting practice proposed by the proponent.

17
18 The OSM conclusion is to support
19 Wildlife Proposal 16-48.

20
21 If the proposed regulatory change were
22 adopted Federal regulations would recognize the
23 customary and traditional practice of using
24 snowmachines to efficiently and effectively pursue and
25 harvest caribou, wolves and wolverine in Unit 23.

26
27 This regulatory change would also make
28 Federal hunting regulations consistent with State
29 regulations in Unit 23.

30
31 The proposed changes would have little
32 to no effect on current hunting behavior and no changes
33 in the population of status -- the population status of
34 caribou, wolves, or wolverine are anticipated.
35 Supporting the customary and traditional practices that
36 provide for continued subsistence opportunities would
37 benefit Federally-qualified subsistence users.

38
39 Thank you, Madame Chair.

40
41 I'm happy to answer any questions.

42
43 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
44 Are there any questions from the Board.

45
46 Mr. Frost.

47
48 MR. FROST: Yeah, has there been any
49 analysis done in terms, you know, the effects of the
50 animals that wouldn't be shot as a result of this

1 activity? So if you have a herd of caribou and they're
2 trying to position one or two animals, in order to take
3 those one or two animals, what's the affect of that
4 activity on all the other animals or a pack of wolves?

5
6 DR. HARDIN: Through the Chair. Thank
7 you, Mr. Frost.

8
9 The analysis that we looked at did not
10 specifically relate to the stresses -- I believe you're
11 talking about stresses placed on the animal in the
12 context of subsistence hunting, rather the reports that
13 we looked at really focused in on recreational uses and
14 sporthunting and the conclusions were mixed. In terms
15 of recreational uses of snowmachines. While increased
16 stress was noted there were also studies that indicated
17 that non-motorized stresses or non-motorized
18 disturbances increased stress even more than motorized,
19 and that's particularly because of the duration of the
20 disturbance was longer, obviously, than the time it
21 took to take -- to position and take an animal.

22
23 MR. FROST: But it doesn't matter
24 whether it's a recreational use or a subsistence use,
25 the effect is going to be the same I would assume.
26 That if there's going to be a pursuit of some sort and
27 the animals would be disturbed in some way. And I
28 guess the point is, you know, we had a very long
29 discussion yesterday with the concerns over the Western
30 Arctic Caribou Herd, which is the area we're talking
31 about and this seems like it's a -- this would be an
32 additional stress, potential stress on this activity on
33 the herd -- not the animals that would be taken but on
34 the rest of the animals, in terms of not only a
35 stressor but it's also going to disturb the behavior of
36 other animals, it could disturb the migration patterns.

37
38 Can I ask some more questions.

39
40 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Go ahead and
41 proceed.

42
43 MR. FROST: Was there any -- how many
44 -- well, let me ask you this. Has there been any
45 indication that subsistence users have not been able to
46 meet their needs as a result -- without being able to
47 do this activity?

48
49 DR. HARDIN: Through the Chair. If I
50 might back up and just respond to another one of your

1 comments.

2

3 In terms of the amount of stress placed
4 on the herd related to snowmachine use, and this also
5 speaks to your second question. This is the
6 traditional hunting practice. It's been in place since
7 the 1960s. So there are studies that -- there are
8 ethnographic accounts and studies that also indicate
9 that it's no more or less and some people theorize that
10 it's less stress than was placed on herds during --
11 with -- when folks were using dog teams. But in terms
12 of current studies we don't have any of those at this
13 point.

14

15 And as I mentioned, this practice has
16 been in use. So it's -- that's why our analysis
17 indicated that no anticipated changes are expected by
18 passing this regulation because this is the traditional
19 method of hunting caribou.

20

21 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
22 Frost. Another question.

23

24 MR. FROST: One more question.

25

26 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Uh-huh.

27

28 MR. FROST: So I'm curious as -- you
29 know we had a proposal on Tuesday, it was 16-07 where
30 that was in the Southeast region, allowing to take
31 beaver with a firearm with a trapping license. But
32 OSM's position was that because there was an NPS
33 specific regulation against that that the OSM would
34 support that with the stipulation that it would be
35 illegal or prohibited on Park Service lands. I'm just
36 wondering why a similar OSM position wouldn't be in
37 effect for the Fish and Wildlife Service and Park
38 Service when we have agency specific regulations in the
39 same area.

40

41 DR. HARDIN: Through the Chair. Thank
42 you, Mr. Frost.

43

44 Our analysis is based on the best
45 available evidence and all of our information shows
46 this is a traditional hunting practice. In addition,
47 subsistence users and Regional Advisory Council
48 representatives have noted on the record and off the
49 record that they do not consider this to be in
50 violation of agency specific regulations because they

1 don't consider this hunting practice to constitute
2 hazing or harassment.

3

4 MR. FROST: Just a followup.

5

6 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Mr. Frost.

7

8 MR. FROST: But I think -- I got to
9 pull my notes out here so bear with me. It's -- and I
10 don't disagree with what you said, that the locals
11 agree with that, but the agency specific regulation,
12 which I'm going to find here in just a minute,
13 hopefully.

14

15 DR. HARDIN: It's also in your books on
16 Page.....

17

18 MR. FROST: But it basically
19 specifically disallows any of this activity for
20 hunting. It basically talks about hunting and the
21 agency specific regulation. So, again, I guess my
22 question is why would OSM's analysis or the position
23 would not, you know, defer to the agency specific
24 regulations where you have in the past?

25

26 DR. HARDIN: Through the Chair.

27

28 I don't want to dispute Mr. Frost, but
29 I believe your regulations state that snowmachines and
30 motorized vehicles can be used in the context of
31 subsistence hunting in such a -- as long as they're
32 used in such a manner as to prevent the herding,
33 harassment, hazing or driving of wildlife for hunting
34 or other purposes.

35

36 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Mr. McKee.

37

38 MR. MCKEE: Yes, Chris McKee. Wildlife
39 Division Chief at OSM.

40

41 One possible reason for OSM's
42 modification of 16-07 is that currently there -- well,
43 until recently there was no hunting season for beaver
44 in unit addressed by the proposal whereas what we're
45 talking about here is not only has there been a season
46 but as Jennifer has already noted that this is already
47 an ongoing traditional practice. So there are
48 different considerations that play on 16-07 as opposed
49 to the proposal that the Board has before them right
50 now.

1 Thank you, Madame Chair.

2

3 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
4 We'll go back to you Mr. Frost.

5

6 MR. FROST: I'll just make a final
7 comment. I'll just say that, you know, this just puts
8 the Park Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service in a
9 very difficult situation. Again, I'll just say it
10 seems like the -- if there's agency specific
11 regulations that those need to be identified and
12 respected by, in the analysis, and there seems like
13 there's a little bit of a double -- a little bit of a
14 lack of consistency across the proposals.

15

16 So with that I'll leave it for now.

17

18 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: At this point
19 I'd like to ask Mr. Peltola to make a comment of
20 clarification.

21

22 MR. PELTOLA: Yes, thank you, Madame
23 Chair. Another consideration when OSM, as a division,
24 looked at this analysis was that there's similarities
25 with what is proposed between this proposal and current
26 practices which occur within the Federal program in GMU
27 18 with regard to caribou, by where which the Board
28 passed a similar regulation but stipulated in
29 subsequent years to allow the activity but the animal
30 could not be at or beyond a gallop.

31

32 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
33 Just pause for a minute and see if there's any other
34 questions with regard to what's been presented in the
35 Staff analysis from the Board.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Not seeing any
40 we're going to then move on to the summary of public
41 comment.

42

43 MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Madame
44 Chair. Zach Stevenson with Office of Subsistence
45 Management. Two public written comments were received
46 on Wildlife Proposal 16-48.

47

48 The first can be found on Page 783, 783
49 of your book. The author was Verne Cleveland, Sr.,
50 Chairman of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working

1 Group.

2

3

4 He states that he supports the -- the
5 working group supports Wildlife Proposal 16-48 and does
6 not believe that there would be adverse effects on the
7 species or population trend as a result. The change
8 would accommodate local hunting practices that have
9 been used since snowmachines first arrived in GMU 23
10 and accommodate the needs of subsistence users, who
11 otherwise face a high cost of living in Northwest
12 Alaska.

12

13

14 Secondly, Madame Chair, a comment was
15 received from Gates of the Arctic National Park
16 Subsistence Resource Commission provided in your
17 supplemental materials dated November 25, 2015 and
18 signed by Mr. Louie Commack, Chairman of the Gates of
19 the Arctic SRC as well as by Mr. Jack Reakoff, Vice-
20 Chair of the Gates of the Arctic SRC, who states their
21 support as written for Wildlife Proposal 16-48.

21

22

23 Further providing the justification
24 that local users in the resident zone communities of
25 Gates of the Arctic presently hunt in this fashion.

25

26

Thank you.

27

28

29 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you for
30 that summary. Any comments or questions from the
31 Board.

31

32

(No comments)

33

34

35 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. We're
36 going to go ahead then and move to comments, testimony
37 from the floor. Lance Kramer, are you here.

37

38

(No comments)

39

40

41 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: We'll go ahead
42 and do a last call, is Mr. Lance Kramer here.

42

43

(No comments)

44

45

46 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. Not
47 seeing Mr. Kramer coming forward then we will, at this
48 time, go to the phone lines. Operator, if you could
49 check to see if there's anybody that would like to make
50 testimony at this time.

50

1 OPERATOR: Thank you. For any comments
2 on the phone lines, please press star one at this time.

3
4 MR. REAKOFF: Madame Chair, this is
5 Jack Reakoff.

6
7 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Go ahead, Mr.
8 Reakoff.

9
10 MR. REAKOFF: Since snowmachines -- the
11 innovation of snowmobiles people use them to pursue the
12 wolf, wolverine and caribou in open terrain. So when I
13 was a kid down in Galena, people in Huslia began
14 tracking wolves and wolverines for harvest and so this
15 is a longstanding, long before ANILCA, this is a
16 longstanding practice of utilizing snowmachines to
17 take, especially wolf, wolverine and caribou in the
18 open terrain. So the Gates of the Arctic Subsistence
19 Resource Commission was supportive of the proposal as
20 written.

21
22 Thank you, Madame Chair.

23
24 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
25 Reakoff. Are there any questions for Mr. Reakoff.

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Yes, Mr.
30 Stevenson.

31
32 MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Madame
33 Chair. I just wanted to point out that I received a
34 message from Mr. Kramer, that he had an unanticipated
35 hospital appointment today and did not -- he
36 anticipated being able to share his comments regarding
37 Proposal 16-48 and provided his materials to Mr.
38 Peltola, so I just wanted to make sure that was on the
39 record.

40
41 Thank you.

42
43 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you for
44 that.

45
46 Any other questions for Mr. Reakoff or
47 Mr. Stevenson.

48
49 Bert.

50

1 MR. FROST: So, Jack, I was just
2 wondering, do you know of any subsistence users that
3 may have been ticketed for doing this practice on
4 Federal lands in the past 10 years.

5
6 MR. REAKOFF: I know of nobody that's
7 gotten a ticket for harvesting caribou -- my first wife
8 had family members in the Noatak -- or correction,
9 Noorvik village and when we traveled by snowmobile in
10 the '80s to Selawik that was the common practice, was
11 the caribou were migrating across the flats going
12 towards the north in the spring and people were
13 pursuing those caribou and taking specific animals,
14 they're looking to take specific animals. And so it
15 was a very common practice back from the '60s when
16 snowmobiles -- I know of nobody that's ever been
17 ticketed although it's technically been illegal but
18 nobody's really enforced this regulation.

19
20 MR. FROST: Thank you.

21
22 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: I'll ask once
23 again, are there any further questions for Mr. Reakoff.

24
25
26 (No comments)

27
28 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: I'll ask the
29 Operator if you could check to see if there is anyone
30 else on the line who would like to make a testimony at
31 this time.

32
33 OPERATOR: Again, that's star one for
34 any comments.

35
36 (No comments)

37
38 OPERATOR: We have no further comments.

39
40 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you,
41 Operator. We'll now move on to the Regional Council
42 recommendation.

43
44 Mr. Shiedt.

45
46 MR. SHIEDT: Yes, thank you.

47
48 16-48 was supported by Northwest
49 Arctic, with their modification. I don't have my
50 glasses or notes so I'm going to ask Zach to read the

1 modification and I'll followup after that.

2

3 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you. Mr.
4 Stevenson would you like to read those comments.

5

6 MR. STEVENSON: The comment was raised
7 by Mr. Michael Kramer at the March 11th, 2016 All
8 Council meeting here at the Egan Center.

9

10 Mr. Kramer pointed out that the
11 language stated in the Register specifying concern for
12 harassment or hazing of caribou is indirect
13 contradiction with the customary and traditional
14 practices and values of the Inupiat people, the Inupiat
15 (indiscernible) and those values specify respect for
16 the land and that the practice of pursuing caribou is
17 designed to ensure the effective harvest necessary to
18 provide food for families in the Northwest Arctic and
19 wanted to get some speci -- he, Mr. Kramer, wanted some
20 specificity on what constitutes harassment or hazing.

21

22 (Whispering)

23

24 Thank you.

25

26 And that's also mentioned on Page 780,
27 the modification stating to add furbearers, moose,
28 sheep and bear. The proposal reflecting customary and
29 traditional way of harvesting resources.

30

31 (Whispering)

32

33 Thank you.

34

35 This action providing for legal means
36 of taking animals using a snowmachine which have
37 replaced dogs in recent time.

38

39 Further, this is how we take game, this
40 is in our culture. Further, we want to protect our
41 people who harvest resources in this way by preventing
42 citations and negative consequences.

43

44 The recommended modification is to
45 utilize snowmachines only with the intent to harvest
46 for subsistence purposes. There is no intention of
47 allowing the use of snowmachines for harassing,
48 herding, et cetera.

49

50 Deferment was suggested as an option by

1 Park Service representatives but the Council maintained
2 its position that action is needed now to protect the
3 users and their way of life. And, again, that's
4 featured on Page 708 of your book, regarding Wildlife
5 Proposal 16-48.

6

7 Thank you, Madame Chair.

8

9 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
10 Stevenson. Are there any questions from the Board or
11 comment.

12

13 (No comments)

14

15 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. At this
16 time we will move on to any summary of tribal -- just a
17 moment.

18

19 MS. HOWARD: Madame Chair. I believe
20 that Mr. Shiedt had further comments.

21

22 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
23 Mr. Shiedt.

24

25 MR. SHIEDT: Thanks. Yeah, thanks. I
26 want to speak a little bit on this proposal here.

27

28 I'll give you an example, far back as
29 58 years ago when I was 12, we did position caribou by
30 dog team, why we do this, even with snowmachine, when
31 the animals are running away, as caribou, furbearer,
32 fur as wolf or wolverine, when they're running if
33 you're shooting at caribou you will shoot them at the
34 butt and this is meat we do not ruin so we position
35 ourselves to the side to shoot the caribou or wolverine
36 or wolf so we won't either ruin the meat or the fur.
37 Because if you shoot a wolf and a wolverine from the
38 side you're ruining the fur to begin with. And we've
39 been doing this, and we don't harass just to chase the
40 animals with a snowmachine.

41

42 It's a lot easier now to chase and
43 position caribou with a snowmachine compared to dog
44 team, because some dogs they don't like to listen, at
45 least a snowmachine you could drive the way you want to
46 do it.

47

48 And for your information we've been
49 doing this for a long time. I remember my grandfather,
50 he's the one that helped me to train my dogs to chase

1 and position caribou when I was 12 years old, 58 years
2 ago, and I still -- and I find it, as of today, with a
3 snowmachine, it's a lot easier and the meat is not so
4 much -- intention to put it that way because we chase
5 it a lot less when we used to do it by foot, it used to
6 take longer. We'd chase it for I don't know how many
7 hours and we used to chase it by foot and I've done
8 that, too, before. But I tell you one thing, this
9 proposal there it'll help a lot of people because
10 there's so many wolves in our area that I, myself, seen
11 in one herd of wolves as much as 60, I didn't chase
12 them, I mean there's too many for me in case they go
13 after me.

14

15 I will support it. We don't want to
16 ruin the caribou, the fur, by shooting on the butt, we
17 rather shoot it on the side or on the head, that way we
18 will have good fur for our ruff and we will have good
19 meat to eat and we won't ruin the caribou.

20

21 And we -- I never did see, as much as I
22 hunt, I never seen a snowmachine just for the pleasure
23 of chasing these animals, I never did see anyone do it
24 for pleasure, if it did happen, I never did see it for
25 your information.

26

27 And, thanks, I don't have my notes, I
28 thought I was done and they're in my bag.

29

30 So, thank you, any questions.

31

32 Thanks.

33

34 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
35 Shiedt. Are there any questions.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. We have
40 two more RACs to hear from North Slope and Western
41 Interior.

42

43 If North Slope would like to go first.

44

45 MS. PATTON: Madame Chair and members
46 of the Board. Chair Harry Brower, Jr., and our Vice
47 Chair Rosemary Ahtuanguaruak were not able to be here
48 today and so I will be reading their comments on this
49 proposal into the record for them.

50

1 For the record, Eva Patton, Council
2 Coordinator.

3
4 The North Slope Subsistence Regional
5 Advisory Council supports WP16-48. Testimony from the
6 Council supported the analysis that the use of
7 snowmachines to position animals was a customary and
8 traditional practice. The Council discussed that for
9 many subsistence hunts different animals, you're moving
10 all the time and in order to pursue the animal.

11
12 The Council also noted that moving to
13 position allowed for a closer clean shot and is more
14 humane than trapping. The Council concluded that these
15 are traditional practices using modern technology and
16 that Federal regulations are just now catching up to
17 recognize these traditional methods.

18
19 And that comment was from their fall
20 2015 meeting in Anaktuvuk Pass, and that's found on
21 Page 780.

22
23 Additionally, at the All Council
24 meeting the North Slope and Northwest Arctic Councils
25 met in a joint session on the record with Mr. Bert
26 Frost to discuss some of the specifics of the proposal
27 and their comments on the record from March 11th during
28 that joint meeting:

29
30 The North Slope Council members also
31 noted that their subsistence practices were in
32 existence long before agencies became.....

33
34 (Whispering)

35
36 Okay, thank you. My apologizes that
37 was apparently a discussion generally on the use of
38 snowmachines in the regulations but not this proposal
39 specifically.

40
41 We did have a couple of Council members
42 who were trying to call in to be able to speak to this
43 proposal, it sounded like they weren't able to be on
44 the teleconference at this time.

45
46 (No comments)

47
48 MS. PATTON: That concludes the North
49 Slope Subsistence Regional Advisory Council from the
50 fall 2015 meeting.

1 Thank you.
2
3 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Ms.
4 Patton.
5
6 Are there any questions with regard to
7 comments shared by Ms. Patton from the North Slope
8 region.
9
10 (No comments)
11
12 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. Not
13 seeing any, then we'll go to the Western Interior.
14
15 MR. REAKOFF: Madame Chair. The
16 Western Interior Regional Advisory Council didn't take
17 this proposal up, Gates of the Arctic Subsistence
18 Resource Commission did.
19
20 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
21 Reakoff.
22
23 I would just pause for a minute and see
24 if there's any other questions from the Board for any
25 of the Council reports.
26
27 (No comments)
28
29 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. So
30 let's now move on to any summary of comments from
31 Tribal, or Alaska Native Corporation.
32
33 Mr. Lind.
34
35 MR. LIND: Madame Chair. Board
36 members.
37
38 There was a consultation taken on
39 September 16th where the NANA Corporation called in and
40 specifically wanted an updated review of Proposal 16-48
41 and the statements made by Mr. Nelson was they were in
42 support, NANA Corporation was in support of the
43 proposal. It was mentioned that this was a traditional
44 way of harvesting. Mr. Nelson was also in full support
45 of the traditional harvest practices.
46
47 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
48 Lind.
49
50 Any questions from the Board.

1 (No comments)

2

3 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. Let's
4 go ahead then and move on to Alaska Department of Fish
5 and Game comments.

6

7 MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Madame Chair.

8

9 The Department supports this proposal.
10 It would align State and Federal regulations.

11

12 As it's been noted it authorizes a
13 method that's been a longstanding practice in various
14 parts of the state including Unit 23. And it reduces
15 that conflict, it simplifies the practice for
16 subsistence users and law enforcement in that regard.
17 It makes for a more expedient harvest of subsistence
18 resources, which we believe would be beneficial to the
19 resource users.

20

21 So, again, we have no reason to oppose
22 this proposal. We think it should be supported, that's
23 what the Board of Game directed us -- we, as a
24 Department, are generally neutral on method and means,
25 we care more about dead animals. There's certainly
26 some level of influence on animal behavior, obviously,
27 associated with these things, but animals become
28 habituated, the practice of hunting in general causes a
29 disturbance to animal populations and that's
30 unavoidable, even if we simplify regulations to the
31 extent that animals can't be -- well, there's pretty
32 much no way to avoid influencing animal behavior,
33 again, when you either use a firearm or spear or bow
34 and arrow or other things, I mean that's going to
35 occur.

36

37 And, in reality, the majority of animal
38 disturbance occurs more naturally. The wolves disturb
39 other wolves more often than hunters are going to
40 certainly disturb the wolves. A lot of snowmachine
41 traffic in these areas, animals become habituated to
42 these things and our studies have shown that heart
43 rates and other things aren't influenced. It may
44 influence their current behavior, they may stand up,
45 they may stop feeding, raise their head in levels of
46 awareness of certain activities, but all these things
47 occur again, more frequently on a natural basis for
48 caribou, wolves and bears are going to disturb them
49 more frequently than hunters for wolves. Again, other
50 wolves -- wolverine kind of do their own thing, you

1 know, they're kind of a different critter, low density
2 and don't seem to be disturbed by much generally. But,
3 again, any activity to try to capture and harvest a
4 wolverine, even, would have some level of influence on
5 the population, or on that animal.

6
7 The important thing to note, though, is
8 in all these cases we do not believe that it'll have a
9 population level effect in terms of reproductive
10 capacity of these populations. It doesn't effect the
11 sustainability of the harvest, again, all these
12 populations in this area, we do not have population
13 level concerns for their harvest.

14
15 So, again, there's little support for
16 the idea that regulations shouldn't be aligned,
17 simplify things for resource users and law enforcement
18 and to allow the practices that have been traditionally
19 used.

20
21 Thank you.

22
23 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
24 Butler. Any questions from the Board for Mr. Butler.

25
26 Mr. Frost.

27
28 MR. FROST: Could you talk a little bit
29 how the State currently enforces this, I mean how do
30 you determine when one is positioning a person for this
31 type of activity as opposed to a harassment or
32 something like that?

33
34 MR. BUTLER: Well, obviously if
35 someone's engaged in the practice of hunting, if our
36 law enforcement officers were to encounter someone in
37 that situation, if they see animals being moved,
38 they're going to likely pay attention to what occurs
39 after, are they attempting to take or is it just a
40 simple passing of the snowmachine by a herd of caribou
41 or what have you, that may influence their activities.
42 It's possible that the person's even unaware of that.

43
44 Again, as Stosh Hoffman, our Board
45 member noted, he frequently, in Bethel -- from Bethel,
46 he always travels with a firearm on his snowmachine and
47 that was one of his questions, at the recent Board of
48 Game meeting, is how do law enforcement officers
49 distinguish between even other activities. And what
50 the State's upheld is that, again, to the extent that

1 been mentioned by the Northwest Arctic RAC, the Board
2 could defer action on this proposal to a time prior to
3 the next wildlife regulatory cycle, thereby putting a
4 distinct timeframe on it as opposed to leaving it open.

5
6 A second option the Board could
7 consider is modifying the proposal to include only BLM
8 managed lands in Unit 23. Unlike National Park Service
9 and Fish and Wildlife Service regulations, BLM agency
10 specific regulation is not necessarily incompatible
11 with the intent of the original proposal as written.
12 This option could serve as an interim measure to allow
13 time to address the conflict with NPS and Fish and
14 Wildlife Service regulations.

15
16 So when looking at the Unit 23 map,
17 which you can find on Page 106 of your wildlife -- the
18 2014/2016 Wildlife Regulations, the scattered footprint
19 of BLM managed lands, their shared boundaries with the
20 ANCSA Corporate lands, State managed lands and
21 proximity to a number of villages would make it
22 preferable for Federally-qualified subsistence users by
23 providing a more seamless management and regulatory
24 structure and avoiding jurisdictional issues over this
25 particular harvest method.

26
27 The Board's challenge here is to
28 balance subsistence users desire for efficient
29 harvesting methods with the current conservation
30 concerns over the Western Arctic Caribou Herd and the
31 potential for harassment for non-targeted caribou by
32 employing this practice. Whichever option the Board
33 chooses, outreach will be necessary to ensure that all
34 users are aware of what the State and Federal
35 regulations are regarding the use of snowmachines for
36 positioning animals.

37
38 Thank you.

39
40 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Ms.
41 Howard. Any questions from the Board on the
42 InterAgency Staff Committee comments and
43 recommendations.

44
45 (No comments)

46
47 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, not
48 seeing any. We'll go ahead then and move forward to
49 the Board discussion with the Council Chairs and with
50 the State Liaison.

1 Mr. Frost.

2

3 MR. FROST: For the record I'd like to
4 just make a statement that, you know, I spent a lot of
5 time, I went up to Buckland and talked with the RAC for
6 two and a half days, personally went up, I came back to
7 the All RAC meeting in March and briefed both the
8 Northwest Arctic RAC and the North Slope RAC, you know,
9 I would really like to figure out a way to be able to
10 support this proposal but as it's written right now I
11 just don't see how I can support it.

12

13 With the understanding that I would
14 want to continue to engage in conversations with the
15 RAC to figure out if we could come up with language,
16 subsequent language that we could agree with to allow
17 the activity as described by the RACs without being in
18 violation of the agency specific regulation, which is
19 as it's written now. And that's my conflict right now.

20

21 I understand the tradition. I
22 understand the reasons. But with an agency specific
23 reg that we feel prohibits this activity, I have a hard
24 -- I just don't know how I'm going to be able to
25 support that.

26

27 I also think that if this -- if the
28 proposal is passed as written, that it would be a
29 disservice to the users, because it is going to -- it
30 won't simplify things, it will complicate things.
31 Because what will happen is now what you'll have is
32 everywhere but Fish and Wildlife Service and Park
33 Service lands you'll be able to do this so it's as --
34 as Ms. Howard just said in her report, it's going to
35 complicate things, it's not going to make things
36 simpler. So I think it's just important that we -- and
37 I would suggest that we would need to put a note in the
38 Federal Reg book stating that this activity is still
39 prohibited on Park Service and Fish and Wildlife
40 Service land.

41

42 So I just wanted to get that on the
43 record and just need to make sure that we understand,
44 going in eyes wide open, what the potential conflicts
45 could arise as a result of this proposal moving
46 forward, as currently written.

47

48 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
49 Frost. Other comments. Ms. Clark.

50

1 MS. CLARK: Not to belabor the point
2 but the Fish and Wildlife Service is in the same
3 situation as the Park Service. Just as Mr. Frost
4 shared his perspective, while I understand that this is
5 a longstanding customary and traditional practice, it
6 simply is just in -- it doesn't align with our agency
7 regulations.

8
9 And there was some comment that Federal
10 regs are just now catching up with the practice, and
11 that may very well be true, and that's something that
12 the Fish and Wildlife Service is willing to look at
13 options -- actually is looking at options for how do we
14 do this in a better way, how do we find the right way
15 to do it and not conflict with what our current
16 regulations require.

17
18 So as everyone knows that can be a long
19 process but, again, the Service would commit to
20 figuring out how could we do that in the best way.

21
22 So in the same way that the Park
23 Service -- in the same situation as the Park Service, I
24 don't believe that I'm in a position to be able to
25 support this as written.

26
27 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Ms.
28 Clark. Other comments or questions, discussion from
29 the Board with either Council Chairs, the State.

30
31 (No comments)

32
33 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Any other
34 comments at this point.

35
36 (No comments)

37
38 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: I do have one
39 question and maybe it is for you Mr. Cribley, but just
40 try to get an understanding of the percentage of lands
41 that are in BLM management in this area.

42
43 MR. CRIBLEY: I think it was -- looking
44 at the book it's about like 17 percent of the lands are
45 Bureau of Land Management lands.

46
47 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
48 Any other discussion before we move on.

49
50 Yes, Mr. Shiedt.

1 MR. SHIEDT: Yeah, on my testimony
2 earlier, my fault, I overlooked. I should have said
3 the difference between positioning a wolf, a wolverine
4 being shot with a rifle versus trapping, and this is
5 sickening and I'll tell you one thing, after I seen
6 this I never trap again, where a wolverine and a
7 wolf, when we trap them chew his own foot off to escape
8 so when we position ourselves with a snowmachine, we
9 shoot the animal. I mean it's sickening but it's the
10 truth. I've seen more than one and I heard a lot of
11 stories like that, that wolves and wolverine will
12 actually bite their foot off just to escape and it's
13 less -- it's better to shoot with a rifle than trapping
14 and I'll tell you that right now. And I hated to say
15 it but I've seen it and I grew up with a trapping
16 family, we had over 3,000 traps and I even disregarded
17 to inherit it, and I didn't, I just destroyed them
18 because my personal feeling is -- versus positioning an
19 animal with a snowmachine versus trapping, it bothers
20 me even as of today.

21
22 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
23 Shiedt, for the comment.

24
25 Okay, any other discussion.

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: All right,
30 then we'll move forward with the Board action.

31
32 MR. CRIBLEY: Madame Chair, I'd like to
33 make a motion.

34
35 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Go ahead, Mr.
36 Cribley.

37
38 MR. CRIBLEY: I would like to move to
39 adopt WP16-48 and if given a second, I would like to
40 offer modification to the proposal to address the
41 conflicting agency specific regulations.

42
43 MR. C. BROWER: Second.

44
45 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: We've got a
46 second on that from Mr. Brower, thank you.

47
48 Go ahead, Mr. Cribley.

49
50 MR. CRIBLEY: Okay. I move that WP16-

1 48 be modified so that if passed, the allowance to use
2 snowmachines to position a caribou, wolf or wolverine
3 for harvest apply only to those Federal lands in Unit
4 23 managed by the Bureau of Land Management.
5 Federally-managed lands in Unit 23 managed by the
6 National Park Service and the US Fish and Wildlife
7 Service would be excluded from this proposal. And if I
8 have a second, I'll provide my justification.

9

10 MR. LOUDERMILK: Second.

11

12 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: We have a
13 second from Mr. Loudermilk.

14

15 Go ahead and proceed.

16

17 MR. CRIBLEY: The use of snowmachines
18 to position an animal for harvesting is presently
19 allowed on State managed lands in Unit 23 and has been
20 recognized as a customary harvest method. State
21 management authority includes private lands in the
22 unit. The NPS and the National -- the Fish and
23 Wildlife Service both have identical agency specific
24 regulations that do not allow for this practice on
25 lands they currently manage, as shown on Page 771 of
26 the proposal book, the BLM's regulatory language does
27 not specifically prohibit the driving of wildlife for
28 hunting. The proposal could, therefore, be adopted, as
29 written for BLM managed lands and not be in direct
30 conflict with our own existing regulations.

31

32 This would help create a more seamless
33 regulatory structure for those portions of Unit 23
34 where BLM lands adjoining State and private lands
35 occur. Subsistence hunters could be more confident of
36 where this hunting practice is allowed. When one looks
37 at the State hunting regulations BLM managed lands are
38 not even distinguished from State and private lands.

39

40 Thank you.

41

42 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
43 Cribley.

44

45 So we have an amendment before us, it
46 has been seconded, rationale provided, any further
47 discussion.

48

49 (No comments)

50

1 MR. C. BROWER: Question.
2
3 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: The question's
4 been called. All in favor of the amendments as
5 proposed say aye.
6
7 IN UNISON: Aye.
8
9 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Are there any
10 nays.
11
12 (No opposing votes)
13
14 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Not hearing
15 any, the amendment passes unanimously.
16
17 So now we need to go back to the
18 original motion. Call for the question.
19
20 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Question.
21
22 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Question has
23 been called. All in favor say aye.
24
25 IN UNISON: Aye.
26
27 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Passes
28 unanimously.
29
30 Thank you.
31
32 All right, thank you. We have still a
33 couple of more -- two more proposals from Northwest
34 Arctic and would like to move through those before we
35 break for lunch. The first of those -- the next up is
36 WP16-51 and that is found on Page 814 of the Board
37 book. And when the Staff is ready to move forward on
38 that we'll get going.
39
40 Thank you.
41
42 MS. WORKER: Thank you, Madame Chair.
43 This is Suzanne Worker and I'll be presenting the
44 analysis for WP16-51 which was submitted by the
45 Northwest Arctic Subsistence Regional Advisory Council.
46
47 The proponent requests opening a
48 portion of Unit 23 north and west of the Kobuk River
49 drainage to the harvest of one bull muskox. Currently
50 this area is open to harvest only under the State's

1 Tier II permitting system and there is also a Federal
2 hunt on Cape Krusenstern National Monument.

3
4 This Tier II hunt was established in
5 2000 and there have been no changes in State or Federal
6 regulations since then.

7
8 The Cape Thompson Muskox Herd, which
9 was introduced in the 1970s appears to be expanding
10 beyond the historical core range and so as a result of
11 these changes and animal distributions and subsequent
12 changes in survey methodologies it's a little bit
13 difficult to ascertain the population trend at this
14 point, however, the local managers do believe that this
15 population is relatively stable.

16
17 The Tier II hunt has a harvest quota of
18 six bulls and in recent years four to five bulls have
19 been harvested each year under the State regulation.
20 There is virtually no harvest under the Federally-
21 managed Cape Krusenstern regulation, although this --
22 there is a two bull quota for this regulation.

23
24 If this proposal is adopted it would
25 establish a Federal season and harvest limit for muskox
26 in Unit 23. Harvest levels would continue to be
27 managed based on the most recent biological data so
28 this proposal doesn't present a conservation concern.
29 It would, however, likely result in a more equitable
30 distribution of permits since the Tier II system favors
31 previously successful hunters over those who do not
32 apply to hunt or actually get out and hunt
33 consistently.

34
35 As a result the OSM conclusion is to
36 support this proposal with modification to specify that
37 the harvest would be by State or Federal permit and to
38 delegate authority to National Park Service to close
39 the season and determine annual harvest quotas and the
40 number of permits to be issued.

41
42 Thank you, Madame Chair.

43
44 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Ms.
45 Worker.

46
47 Are there any questions from the Board
48 on the Staff analysis.

49
50 (No comments)

1 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, not
2 seeing any. We will move on to a summary of public
3 comments.

4
5 MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Madame
6 Chair. Zach Stevenson with OSM.

7
8 No written public comments were
9 received regarding Wildlife Proposal 16-51.

10
11 Thank you.

12
13 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you. So
14 we don't have any requests for public testimony from
15 the floor. Let me just check and make sure there's no
16 one.

17
18 (No comments)

19
20 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, not
21 seeing anybody we'll go to the phone lines then to see
22 if there's anybody who would like to make testimony at
23 this time.

24
25 OPERATOR: Thank you. And on the phone
26 lines, if you do have a comment please press star one
27 at this time.

28
29 (No comments)

30
31 OPERATOR: We have no comments.

32
33 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you,
34 Operator. We'll move on then to the Regional Council
35 recommendation.

36
37 Mr. Shiedt.

38
39 MR. SHIEDT: Yeah, Northwest Arctic
40 Regional Advisory Council supported this.

41
42 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
43 Shiedt.

44
45 Is there any questions of the RAC
46 Chair.

47
48 (No comments)

49
50 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. So

1 let's go ahead then and move on to any summary of
2 Tribal, or Alaska Native Corporation comments.

3

4 Mr. Lind.

5

6 MR. LIND: Madame Chair. There are no
7 Tribal or Corporate comments.

8

9 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
10 Next we'll move to ADF&G, any State comments.

11

12 MR. BUTLER: Madame Chair. We were
13 originally opposed to this program but we'll change our
14 position to neutral. We agree with the OSM analysis,
15 there are differences in how we issue Tier II permits
16 compared to how Federal agencies are able to. So this
17 may provide more utility in some cases for the hunting
18 opportunity. We just request that the State and
19 Federal governments work together to adjust quotas
20 annually and address any conservation concerns that may
21 arise.

22

23 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
24 Butler. From the Board, any comments for the State or
25 questions.

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. So
30 we'll next move to the InterAgency Staff Committee
31 comments. Ms. Howard.

32

33 MS. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair.

34

35 The InterAgency Staff Committee
36 comments are the standard comments for this proposal.

37

38 Thank you.

39

40 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
41 Next up is Board discussion with Council Chair Shiedt
42 or the State Liaison. Any discussion at this point.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: So then we
47 will move on to Board action.

48

49 MR. FROST: I'd like to make a motion.

50

1 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Go ahead, Mr.
2 Frost.

3
4 MR. FROST: I move that we adopt WP16-
5 51 as modified by OSM on Page 820 of the Board book.
6 After a second I will speak to my motion.

7
8 MR. C. BROWER: Second.

9
10 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: We have a
11 second from Mr. Brower.

12
13 MR. FROST: This motion supports the
14 Council recommendation to adopt the OSM modification
15 and would provide additional harvest opportunities for
16 Federally-qualified subsistence users in Unit 23.

17
18 The current levels of harvest are
19 believed to be sustainable and the harvest quota will
20 be managed based on the most recent biological data so
21 adoption of this action should not present any
22 conservation concerns.

23
24 Allowing harvest by either State or
25 Federal permit will provide additional opportunities
26 for Federally-qualified subsistence users since Federal
27 permits have fewer restrictions than the State Tier II
28 permits. This approach would likely result in a more
29 equitable distribution of permits in the region since
30 only Federally-qualified subsistence users would be
31 eligible as opposed to all State residents who may be
32 eligible to apply under the Tier II system.

33
34 It also paralyzes -- paralyzes.....

35
36 (Laughter)

37
38 MR. FROST:it also parallels --
39 excuse me.

40
41 (Laughter)

42
43 MR. FROST: Excuse me, it's time for
44 lunch.

45
46 (Laughter)

47
48 MR. FROST: It also parallels current
49 muskox regulations in Unit 22 and 23 on the Seward
50 Peninsula. The delegation of authority to the

1 Superintendent of the Western Arctic National ParkLands
2 will serve to clarify regulations and allow flexibility
3 to monitor quotas and harvest for in-season hunt
4 management.

5
6 Thank you.

7
8 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
9 Frost.

10
11 So you've heard the amendment, any
12 further discussion from the Board.

13
14 (No comments)

15
16 MR. CRIBLEY: Call for question.

17
18 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Question's
19 been called. All in favor as amended, say aye.

20
21 IN UNISON: Aye.

22
23 MR. FROST: So as modified by OSM.

24
25 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: As modified,
26 thank you. So all in favor as modified by OSM say aye.

27
28 IN UNISON: Aye.

29
30 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Any nays.

31
32 (No opposing votes)

33
34 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Passes
35 unanimously. Okay, we have one more before lunch, I
36 think we can do that.

37
38 So let's move on to WP16-53 and 54,
39 that's on Page 826 of the Board book and when the Staff
40 is ready go ahead and begin your remarks.

41
42 MS. MAAS: All right, thank you, Madame
43 Chair. Members of the Board. My name is Lisa Maas and
44 I'm a wildlife biologist in the Office of Subsistence
45 Management.

46
47 I'll be presenting a summary of the
48 analysis for Wildlife Proposal 16-53 and 16-54, which
49 begins on Page 826 of your meeting book.

50

1 Wildlife Proposal 16-53 submitted by
2 the National Park Service requests that harvest quotas
3 for sheep in the Baird and DeLong Mountain Hunt areas
4 be announced by the Superintendent of the Western
5 Arctic National ParkLands and that the Federal
6 subsistence season in these hunt areas be closed.

7
8 Wildlife Proposal 16-54 also submitted
9 by the National Park Service requests that the Unit 23
10 remainder or Schwatka Mountains hunt area for sheep be
11 divided into two hunt areas. Those portions within and
12 outside of Gates of the Arctic National Park and
13 Preserve and that there be no open season for the hunt
14 outside of the Park.

15
16 The proponent states these changes are
17 necessary due to conservation concerns and to aid in
18 the recovery of the declining sheep population.

19
20 The proponent also states that the
21 change in hunt areas will improve management by
22 addressing biological and jurisdictional issues.

23
24 This proposal is a follow up to
25 Wildlife Special Action 15-07 and also relates to
26 Wildlife Proposal 16-66 concerning sheep in Unit 26A,
27 which is on the consensus agenda as modified by OSM.

28
29 There are three distinct sheep
30 populations in Unit 23, DeLong Mountains, Baird
31 Mountains and Schwatka Mountains. If you refer to the
32 proposed sheep hunt areas map on Page 834, the
33 different hunt areas reflect the different sheep
34 populations. Unit 23 represents the northwestern
35 margin of the range for dall sheep resulting in low
36 density populations that are particularly susceptible
37 to severe weather events. Since 2011 the Baird
38 Mountain sheep population has declined 60 percent, and
39 the DeLong Mountain sheep population has declined 80
40 percent. Similarly, the lamb to ewe ratio for both
41 populations has declined 90 percent since 2011 meaning
42 there has been very, very low recruitment in the past
43 several years. Recent 2015 surveys in the Schwatka
44 Mountains indicate this sheep population is not
45 experiencing declines and has good recruitment.

46
47 From 2004 to 2014 the sheep harvest
48 from Unit 23 and Unit 26A average 23 sheep per year.
49 Ambler, Kobuk and Shungnak are the only communities
50 eligible to hunt sheep within Gates of the Arctic

1 National Park and their harvest is very low. The
2 current decline is likely greater than the decline in
3 the 1990s which prompted a seven year closure of both
4 Federal and State sheep hunt areas in Unit 23. In 2014
5 Federal and State sheep hunts in Unit 23 were closed
6 via special action and emergency order, respectively,
7 due to conservation concerns. In March of this year
8 the Alaska Board of Game closed the State season. In
9 July of this year the Federal Subsistence Board closed
10 the 2015/16 Federal season via Special Action 15-07.

11
12 Adoption of this proposal would
13 decrease harvest opportunity for Federally-qualified
14 subsistence users and would enhance the recovery of the
15 sheep population. The recent drastic declines in
16 recruitment and total population indicate any harvest
17 could worsen the decline and hamper recovery. Closure
18 of the Federal hunt in the Baird and DeLong Mountains
19 is necessary to ensure the continued viability of these
20 sheep populations. However, maintaining an open season
21 within Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve
22 is supported due to the adequate status of the Schwatka
23 Mountain sheep population and the low harvest in this
24 area.

25
26 The OSM conclusion is to support WP16-
27 53/54 with modification to establish a may be announced
28 season and to issue a delegation of authority letter to
29 the Superintendent of the Western Arctic National
30 ParkLands to set quotas and to open or close the
31 season. And this is in order to provide for maximum
32 management flexibility and quick response to changes in
33 the sheep population.

34
35 Thank you, Madame Chair.

36
37 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Ms.
38 Maas. Are there any questions on the Staff analysis
39 from the Board.

40
41 (No comments)

42
43 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. Let's
44 move on to summary of public comment to the Regional
45 Council Coordinator.

46
47 MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Madame
48 Chair. I will refer you to Page 844 of your books in
49 which the Northwest Arctic Subsistence Regional
50 Advisory Council supports WP16.....

1 (Whispering)
2
3 Pardon me.
4
5 (Whispering)
6
7 My apologizes Madame Chair.
8
9 There was no written comment regarding
10 the proposal, however, the Gates of the Arctic National
11 Park Subsistence Resource Commission does provide a
12 support for the OSM's modification.
13
14 Thank you.
15
16 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
17 Stevenson. Are there any questions from the Board.
18
19 (No comments)
20
21 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. I'll
22 give you just a minute.
23
24 (Pause)
25
26 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Just checking,
27 Mr. Stevenson, were there any further comments that you
28 wanted to make.
29
30 MR. STEVENSON: No, Madame Chair.
31
32 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, great,
33 thank you.
34
35 MR. STEVENSON: Thank you.
36
37 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. Let's
38 move to the floor, we don't have any requests submitted
39 for public testimony, just making sure there's no one
40 out there that wants to give testimony.
41
42 (No comments)
43
44 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Not seeing
45 that. We'll go to the phone lines then to see if
46 there's anybody on the phone that would like to make
47 public comment, testimony at this time.
48
49 OPERATOR: Thank you. And on the phone
50 lines, if you do have a comment please press star one

1 at this time.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 OPERATOR: We have no comments.

6

7 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you,
8 Operator. Then we will go to our Regional Council
9 recommendation, Mr. Shiedt.

10

11 MR. SHIEDT: Yes, at our meeting we
12 support this with the modification. But after we had a
13 meeting -- could I put a note that after our meeting we
14 were told that the sheep in Unit 23 crashed and we were
15 trying to say that but at the time we thought we'd be
16 able to -- they wanted to have a hunt, and yet they
17 crashed there's no sheep completely to able to -- they
18 won't open the sheep hunt for Unit 23 for years to
19 come, I'll tell you that right now. As a guy that grew
20 up around Unit 23 and the Noatak where we harvest -- we
21 used to harvest a lot of sheep at one time but there's
22 no more and they opened it due to the weather and other
23 conditions are -- our sheep crashed in Unit 23.

24

25 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
26 Shiedt. Are there any questions from the Board of Mr.
27 Shiedt.

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: So we will
32 move on to the North Slope then for any comment.

33

34 MS. PATTON: Madame Chair and members
35 of the Board.

36

37 There's a written statement for
38 Northwest Arctic as well, Enoch, doesn't have his
39 glasses so Zach was going to read their written comment
40 which you'll find on Page 844 and continues on to Page
41 845 so we'll allow Northwest Arctic's comment to be
42 presented.

43

44 Thank you.

45

46 MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Eva.

47

48 Madame Chair. As Eva stated the
49 statement from Northwest Arctic is on Page 844 of your
50 books.

1 The Northwest Arctic RAC supports
2 Wildlife Proposal 16-53/54 with modification to close
3 the sheep season in all of Unit 23 including Gates of
4 the Arctic National Park and Preserve. Page 844 and
5 845 go into detail with specific language on the unit
6 with a statement reading:

7
8 That the entire range needs to be
9 protected and harvest should stop completely until the
10 numbers recover and a sustainable and harvestable
11 population is achieved. When those levels are
12 achieved, Federally-eligible subsistence harvesters
13 should be allowed to hunt before any other user groups.

14
15 And the final paragraph reads:

16
17 Rapidly occurring extreme weather
18 changes, hunting pressure and predators have put the
19 stock at a critical level. Also even though the Park
20 Service has announced plans for annual population
21 counts, these counts are contingent on weather
22 conditions and availability of funding. Accurate
23 counts are necessary and conservative efforts must be
24 made to protect the future stock of this resource and
25 for the continuation of subsistence use.

26
27 Thank you, Madame Chair.

28
29 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
30 Stevenson. Any questions of Mr. Stevenson from the
31 Board.

32
33 (No comments)

34
35 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. We will
36 then move on to summary of comments from the Tribes, or
37 Alaska Native Corporations to the Native Liaison.

38
39 Orville.

40
41 MR. LIND: Madame Chair.

42
43 MR. MCKEE: Just a minute, hate to
44 interrupt but we have the North Slope -- the North
45 Slope has a position.

46
47 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, thank
48 you. Can you just hold for a minute, Orville, we will
49 go to the North Slope and hear your comments.

50

1 Thank you.

2

3 MS. PATTON: Thank you, Madame Chair.
4 Members of the Council. For the record, Eva Patton,
5 Council Coordinator and, again, I will be reading the
6 North Slope RAC position since our Chair and Vice Chair
7 are not able to be here today.

8

9 The North Slope Subsistence Regional
10 Advisory Council supports WP16-53/54 as modified by
11 OSM. The Council supports WP16-53/54 with the caveat
12 that the Council gets a regular report from the Western
13 Arctic ParkLands on the status of the sheep populations
14 and communications with affected communities. Closure
15 of this region affects Point Hope, which is within the
16 North Slope RAC region. The Council noted that Point
17 Hope has expressed concern and they are often left out
18 of communications on subsistence management affecting
19 Unit 23. The Council would like to hear about the Park
20 Service plans for outreach to Point Hope and other
21 affected communities on the status of the sheep
22 population, updates on the current subsistence closure
23 or possible subsistence hunt opportunities.

24

25 The Council supports the proposal with
26 modification by OSM to open a may be announced season
27 so that if, in the future, the sheep population
28 indicates a subsistence hunt can be supported, that it
29 can be opened or closed and harvest limits set with
30 more flexibility than the full Federal Subsistence
31 regulatory process.

32

33 And that concludes their comments.

34

35 Thank you.

36

37 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Ms.
38 Patton. Any questions from the Board.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, we will
43 now go on to you Orville for summary of comments from
44 the Tribes, or Alaska Native Corporations.

45

46 MR. LIND: Thank you, Madame Chair.

47

48 On September 16th we conducted a
49 consultation and joined us was Mr. Jeff Nelson with the
50 NANA Regional Corporation sitting in for Mr. Lance

1 Kramer. He was in support of WP16-53/54.

2

3 Also at the session was Mr. Ken
4 Adkisson, who stated that after surveys showed a
5 substantial decline in the Unit 23 sheep where some
6 areas reflected up to 70 percent decline. He also
7 stated that very poor recruitment and low numbers of
8 mature rams and full curl rams proved that the sheep
9 population is in poor shape.

10

11 And the NANA Corporation is in support.

12

13 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
14 Lind. Any questions from the Board.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, at this
19 time we will then move on to the State for comments.

20

21 Mr. Butler.

22

23 MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Madame Chair.
24 We support the proposal and we don't object to the OSM
25 modification. We agree with their analysis and think
26 it's appropriate for this population.

27

28 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
29 Butler. Any questions from the Board.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. We'll
34 go to the InterAgency Staff Committee comments. Ms.
35 Howard.

36

37 MS. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair.

38

39 In addition to the standard comments,
40 the InterAgency Staff Committee noted that with the
41 decline in the sheep populations, in addition to the
42 low numbers of large rams and apparent low recruitment
43 rate suggests that sustained harvest could prolong or
44 worsen the current declines and hamper recovery.

45

46 Establishing a may be announced Federal
47 sheep season in Unit 23 that excludes lands within
48 Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve, is
49 necessary to assure the continued viability of the
50 sheep population as mandated under Section 18 [sic] of

1 ANILCA. Delegating the authority to the Western Arctic
2 National ParkLands Superintendent to open and close the
3 season and set annual harvest quotas and limits will
4 provide management flexibility to protect the Unit 23
5 sheep population and provide subsistence hunting
6 opportunities when sheep population numbers recover
7 sufficiently to support a harvest.

8

9 Establishing the new hunt area
10 descriptors for the Schwatka Mountains within the
11 current Unit 23 remainder will define those lands
12 inside Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve
13 from those lands outside of the Park and Preserve to
14 help clarify management responsibilities. And they
15 will reflect differences in hunter access and potential
16 hunting pressure on the sheep populations.

17

18 Residing in the Gates of the Arctic
19 National Park and Preserve Resident Zone Communities of
20 Ambler, Kobuk and Shungnak are the only people eligible
21 to hunt sheep in the Park under Federal subsistence
22 regulations. This small pool of perspective hunters
23 and the difficulty of accessing sheep hunting areas in
24 the Park greatly reduces potential hunting pressure on
25 sheep inside of the Park and Preserve.

26

27 That concludes the ISC comments on this
28 proposal.

29

30 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Ms.
31 Howard. Are there any questions of the InterAgency
32 Staff Committee by the Board.

33

34 (No comments)

35

36 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Not seeing
37 any. We will move on to any Board discussion with
38 Council Chairs or the State.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Seeing none,
43 we are ready then for Board action.

44

45 MR. FROST: I'd like to make a motion.

46

47 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Go ahead, Mr.
48 Frost.

49

50 MR. FROST: I move that we adopt WP16-

1 53/54 with the OSM modification presented on Page 841
2 consistent with the North Slope Council's
3 recommendation. After a second I will speak to my
4 motion.

5
6 MR. C. BROWER: Second.

7
8 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: We have a
9 second from Mr. Brower.

10
11 MR. FROST: So I could basically just
12 reiterate what the ISC comments were but I will spare
13 us all and just say that we concur with the ISC
14 analysis. And that for those reasons, you know, I'll
15 be voting to support my motion.

16
17 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: So we're ready
18 to call for the question.

19
20 MR. CRIBLEY: Question.

21
22 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: The question's
23 been called. All in favor say aye.

24
25 IN UNISON: Aye.

26
27 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Any nays.

28
29 (No opposing votes)

30
31 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: So it's
32 unanimous.

33
34 (Board nods affirmatively)

35
36 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, thank
37 you. I say it's probably a good time to stop and break
38 for lunch. We still have one more proposal on the non-
39 consensus agenda which we will take up after lunch and
40 that will be from the Eastern Interior. We will break
41 until.....

42
43 MR. C. BROWER: 3:00.

44
45 (Laughter)

46
47 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Yeah.

48
49 (Laughter)

50

1 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: We will break
2 until 1:30 so that's about an hour and 25 minutes. So
3 be back, please, on time. And don't forget, Board
4 members, and Council Chairs, to vote for the cover of
5 the upcoming regulatory book.

6
7 Thank you.

8
9 (Off record)

10
11 (On record)

12
13 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: I'd like to
14 call this meeting back to order. And just for reminder
15 to folks, we're going to start in just a minute with
16 public comment on non-agenda items followed by public
17 comment on the consensus agenda items. Then we'll move
18 forward, we have one proposal on the non-consensus
19 agenda from the Eastern Interior. Following that we'll
20 take up the adoption of the consensus agenda and then
21 we have a number of business items.

22
23 So we'll proceed in that order.

24
25 So at this time I would like to move
26 then to the public comments on non-agenda items and
27 first up is Mr. John Sky Starkey. And we'd just ask
28 that folks keep their remarks to about five minutes.

29
30 Thank you.

31
32 MR. STARKEY: Thank you, Madame Chair.
33 To my right is Anna Creary and she's been my co-
34 Counsel, just to reveal everything, we're representing
35 Ninilchik in a lawsuit that had to do with last year's
36 fishery, gillnet fishery and closure, but I'm not here
37 to talk about that.

38
39 I'm here to actually ask -- thank you
40 for letting us take this time to talk to you and to ask
41 the Board, and to bring to the Board's attention, and
42 I'm sure that you haven't had time to maybe see it, but
43 not fully study it, on April 12th, Ninilchik
44 Traditional Council wrote the Board Chair, CC'd BIA and
45 others, OSM, Crystal Leonetti, Julie Kitka from AFN,
46 Michael Johnson, and the Chair of the Southcentral RAC,
47 Greg, with a letter that has a request for
48 consultation, tribal consultation that was in response
49 to a letter that Jeffrey Anderson, the fishery manager
50 for the Kenai wrote to the Ninilchik Tribal Council

1 asking for their recommendation on doing consultation
2 this year for implementing the gillnet fishery on the
3 Kenai and Kasilof and for developing some kind of
4 fishery management plan to help guide management of
5 Kenai Peninsula salmon fisheries this year. And
6 Ninilchik wrote back to the Board in response to that
7 letter asking for those consultations to occur, but
8 asking that they occur with the Bureau of Indian
9 Affairs, the Office of Subsistence Management, Fish and
10 Wildlife Service and the Ninilchik Tribal Council
11 regarding the development of the operational plan to
12 avoid problems last year where they took over six weeks
13 to develop for the Kasilof and there was no response
14 that happened on the Kenai and that that table of -- in
15 consultation will result in perhaps a more balanced
16 table to determine the merits of the gillnet plan.
17 Understanding the regulation requires the final
18 approval, and that to be through the Fish and Wildlife
19 Service and the permit to be issued through them.

20

21 The letter also seeks consultation on a
22 very important issue, and, that is, how the Kenai
23 fisheries will be managed this year and it's
24 particularly important, and, again, that would involve
25 the Board, BIA, OSM and the Southcentral Regional
26 Advisory Council in that consultation with the Fish and
27 Wildlife Service and the Tribe.

28

29 The reason for that is it appears that
30 there will be some need to develop a management plan
31 this year because of the State has already, as of
32 February, done their preseason forecast and issued
33 emergency closures for the Kenai. This is the exact
34 same pattern that happened last year. And rather than
35 wait for it to be characterized as an emergency, which
36 we don't think it is an emergency since we already know
37 right now what the preseason forecast and everything
38 is, that through consultation, a management plan be
39 developed, and so that everybody will understand what
40 the standards are going to be, when it's going to be
41 closed, why, how it will be opened and these kind of
42 things to avoid the kind of situation that happened
43 last year. So the letter explains all of this, that
44 it's not an emergency, what Ninilchik would like to
45 see, a result out of the consultation.

46

47 And what we would ask is that, again,
48 it was directed to the Board, to help pull this
49 consultation together, so what we would ask is that the
50 Board actually agree that this consultation is a good

1 idea and direct Staff to pull these consultations
2 together as soon as possible. We think it's really
3 important that it happen soon. Again, it took awhile
4 to develop the management plans, and my friends from
5 around Alaska tell me that everything -- the birds are
6 coming two weeks early, the rivers are breaking up
7 early and that we could see early runs, so we think
8 it's really important that this happen in an expedited
9 way. Ninilchik is ready at the earliest possible time
10 when they hear the consultations are going to occur, to
11 provide their draft management plans for the gillnet
12 fisheries. And as I said the State -- the State's
13 orders are out, we know what the State's plans are, we
14 know the forecast.

15

16 So we just ask that the consultations
17 be -- the Board agree they should happen, agree these
18 parties should get together and make this happen at the
19 earliest possible opportunity.

20

21 Thank you very much, Madame Chair.

22

23 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
24 Starkey. Let me just pause for a minute and see if
25 there's any questions from the Board.

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Not seeing
30 any, thank you for your letter and for your request and
31 we will take that up and formally respond in letter to
32 you.

33

34 MR. STARKEY: Thank you, very much.

35

36 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: You're
37 welcome.

38

39 So let me just make sure, is there
40 anybody else from the public that would like to comment
41 on non-agenda items at this time.

42

43 OPERATOR: Please press star one.

44

45 (No comments)

46

47 OPERATOR: No comments at this time.

48

49 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you,
50 Operator.

1 At this time we'll move to public
2 comments on the consensus agenda items. We did receive
3 one request from Mr. Bob Neeley and I understand that
4 he's not able to be here now but has left comment to be
5 shared with the Board. If you want to go ahead and
6 read that, Mr. Lind, thank you.

7
8 MR. LIND: Thank you, Madame Chair.
9 Board members.

10
11 Mr. Neeley gave this yesterday, Gulkana
12 Indian AHTNA Caribou Tribe. And he says that I am Bob
13 Neeley with my family, Roselyn Neeley, wife and,
14 Jamilyn, daughter, we are from the Caribou Tribe, AHTNA
15 Indian Athbascons. We want the Paxson Federal
16 subsistence area open for hunting, this land is sacred
17 hunting grounds for thousands of years for the AHTNA
18 Indians. My father and mother have always hunted in
19 the Paxson area and my grandfather and their
20 grandfathers and grandmothers. We know where the
21 caribou run and the moose that live in this area.

22
23 Bob Neeley.

24
25 That's it.

26
27 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
28 Lind. Any questions or comments from the Board.

29
30 (No comments)

31
32 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, at this
33 time we'll just check on the phone line, please, to see
34 if there is any public members that would like to make
35 comments on the consensus agenda items.

36
37 OPERATOR: Again, please press star one
38 if you have a comment.

39
40 (No comments)

41
42 OPERATOR: There are no comments at
43 this time.

44
45 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you,
46 Operator.

47
48 So we will now move on, we have just
49 the final item on the non-consensus set of proposals.
50 This is from the Eastern Interior. This is WP16-58

1 starting on Page 850 of the Board book, and when the
2 Staff is ready you can go ahead and begin with your
3 Staff analysis.

4

5 MS. MAAS: Thank you, Madame Chair.
6 Members of the Board. For the record my name is Lisa
7 Maas and I am a wildlife biologist in the Office of
8 Subsistence Management. I'll be presenting a summary
9 of the analysis for Wildlife Proposal 16-58, which
10 begins on Page 850 of the meeting book.

11

12 Wildlife Proposal 16-58 submitted by
13 the Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council requests
14 that the wolverine trapping season in Unit 25C be
15 extended 31 days from November 1st to February 28th to
16 November 1st to March 31st.

17

18 The proponent states that extending the
19 wolverine trapping season in Unit 25C would increase
20 opportunity for Federally-qualified subsistence users
21 and would reduce regulatory complexity by aligning Unit
22 25C season dates with the rest of Unit 25. A related
23 proposal is WP16-57, which requests extending the lynx
24 trapping season in Unit 25 and is supported on the
25 consensus agenda.

26

27 If both this proposal and WP16-57 are
28 adopted, the Federal subsistence lynx and wolverine
29 trapping seasons in all of Unit 25 would be aligned.

30

31 Wolverines have very large home ranges
32 and low reproductive rates causing them to naturally
33 occur in low densities. Studies indicate that
34 wolverine populations are very susceptible to trapping
35 pressure and that trap populations are maintained by
36 immigration from untrapped areas. According to trapper
37 questionnaires wolverines are scarce but stable in Unit
38 25C.

39

40 Harvest in Unit 25C is very low
41 averaging three per year since 1990 as males range more
42 widely than females, they're more likely to be trapped.
43 If more females are consistently trapped than males
44 overharvesting may be occurring. Thus, the State
45 management goal for the Fairbanks area is for the three
46 year mean wolverine harvest to be greater than 50
47 percent male.

48

49 This goal has been met in all years for
50 the Fairbanks area as a whole. However, since 1990

1 this goal has only been met in 16 out of 23 years for
2 Unit 25C suggesting overharvesting may be occurring in
3 this unit and that the Unit 25C wolverine population
4 may be maintained by immigrating animals. Due to the
5 very low sample size and annual variations no
6 definitive conclusion about overharvesting in Unit 25C
7 can be made. However, the reason that the Unit 25C
8 wolverine trapping season has historically been a month
9 shorter than the remainder of Unit 25 is because of
10 higher trapping pressure in Unit 25C due to its
11 proximity to Fairbanks and road accessibility.

12
13 Adopting this proposal would increase
14 trapping opportunity for Federally-qualified
15 subsistence users and would reduce Federal regulatory
16 complexity but would result in misalignment of State
17 and Federal regulations for Unit 25C. Given low
18 reproductive rates, inherently low population
19 densities, susceptibility to trapping pressure, the
20 proximity to Fairbanks and road accessibility as well
21 as the possibility that overharvesting may already be
22 occurring, the Unit 25C wolverine population warrants
23 conservative management. However, as the season
24 extension would only be open to Federally-qualified
25 subsistence users, any increase in harvest is expected
26 to be very small. Additionally, if the lynx season is
27 extended in Unit 25, by adopting WP16-57, while the
28 Unit 25C wolverine season is not extended, incidental
29 take may occur. Reporting legal harvest is much
30 preferable to failure to report incidental take and
31 will allow any increase in harvest to be evaluated.

32
33 The OSM conclusion is to support WP16-
34 58.

35
36 Thank you, Madame Chair.

37
38 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Ms.
39 Maas. Let me just see if there are any questions on
40 the Staff analysis from the Board.

41
42 (No comments)

43
44 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, not
45 seeing any. We'll move on to the summary of public
46 comments from the Regional Council Coordinator.

47
48 MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Madame Chair.
49 Members of the Board. For the record my name is Katya
50 Wessels and I'm the Subsistence Council Coordinator for

1 the Eastern Interior Region. And there is no written
2 public comments on the proposal, WP16-58.

3

4 Thank you.

5

6 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.

7 We'll go to the phone line then and see if there's any
8 further public testimony on WP16-58.

9

10 OPERATOR: Thank you. And, once,
11 again, press star one if you have a comment.

12

13 (No comments)

14

15 OPERATOR: There are no comments at
16 this time.

17

18 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you,
19 Operator.

20

21 We will go to the Regional Council
22 recommendations from the Chair or designee.

23

24 MS. ENTSMINGER: Thank you, Madame
25 Chair. This is an Eastern Interior proposal, it was
26 put in also with that lynx extension, which was also
27 passed with the -- or will be if it passes on the
28 consent agenda.

29

30 The Eastern Interior people from Fort
31 Yukon were very interested in putting this in. The
32 Council didn't feel there is a conservation concern for
33 wolverine because the trapping effort is in decline but
34 the extended season would support those subsistence
35 hunters who do make the effort. The Council is
36 concerned about the possibility of incidental harvest
37 if Proposal 57 passes, that it would have incidental
38 take.

39

40 I'm reading ahead of myself here,
41 sorry.

42

43 I just don't want people getting in
44 trouble if they're accidentally catching a wolverine in
45 a lynx set. And it would be best to have both
46 supported for the less complexity to the user.

47

48 They also felt that the extension of
49 the season for one month would not pose an issue for
50 the species as trapping pressure probably wouldn't

1 increase substantially as a result.

2

3 So we support the proposal.

4

5 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Ms.
6 Entsminger. Just check with the Board if there are any
7 questions for Sue.

8

9 (No comments)

10

11 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you. So
12 we will go to, hear if there are any summary of
13 comments from the Tribal, or Alaska Native
14 Corporations, to Mr. Lind.

15

16 MR. LIND: Madame Chair. There are no
17 Tribal or Corporate comments.

18

19 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
20 And then to Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

21

22 MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Madame Chair.

23

24 The Department agrees with the OSM
25 analysis, however, we oppose the proposal. We're
26 concerned that access along the road system in 25C may
27 increase harvest to, you know, what may be an
28 unsustainable level. So that's our primary concern
29 associated with this, is just the accessibility of this
30 for people harvesting wolverine in this area.

31

32 Thank you.

33

34 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
35 Butler. To the Board, any questions for the State.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
40 We'll now move to the InterAgency Staff Committee
41 comments. Ms. Howard.

42

43 MS. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair.

44

45 The InterAgency Staff Committee
46 comments are the standard comments for this proposal.

47

48 Thank you.

49

50 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you. At

1 this time it's open for Board discussion with the
2 Council Chair and the State.

3

4

5 (No comments)

6

7 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Any questions
8 or comments from the Board.

9

10 (No comments)

11

12 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. Not
13 seeing any then we'll move to Board action, please.

14

15 MR. CRIBLEY: Call for question.

16

17 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: The question's
18 been called.....

19

20 (Laughter)

21

22 MR. FROST: Do we have a motion?

23

24 (Laughter)

25

26 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Yeah, I guess
27 we have to go with a motion first, don't we.

28

29 (Laughter)

30

31 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Let's try that
32 again, Bud.

33

34 (Laughter)

35

36 MR. CRIBLEY: Let's try it differently
37 and see what happens, no, I apologize.

38

39 (Laughter)

40

41 MR. CRIBLEY: I'm not reading my script
42 well, I guess.

43

44 So I guess I would like to make a
45 motion to move to adopt WP16-58 as submitted by the
46 Eastern Interior Subsistence Regional Advisory Council,
47 and with a second I'll provide a justification.

48

49 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Second.

50

1 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: So we have a
2 second, go ahead, Bud.

3
4 MR. CRIBLEY: Adoption of this proposal
5 along with WP16-57 currently on the consensus agenda
6 will simplify Federal subsistence trapping regulations
7 by having consistent Federal season dates for lynx and
8 wolverine in all of Unit 25. While the season
9 extension may result in a slight increase in wolverine
10 harvested under Federal regulations the only ones able
11 to take advantage of the extended season will be
12 limited to a number of Federally-qualified trappers.
13 Aligned seasons may also improve reporting of what
14 previously would have been considered incidental take
15 and likely have gone unreported.

16
17 Thank you.

18
19 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
20 Cribley. Let me just see from the Board if there are
21 any questions at this point or discussion.

22
23 (No comments)

24
25 MR. C. BROWER: Question.

26
27 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Question's
28 been called. All in favor say aye.

29
30 IN UNISON: Aye.

31
32 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Any nays.

33
34 (No opposing votes)

35
36 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: It passes
37 unanimously.

38
39 Thank you.

40
41 (Pause)

42
43 MR. CRIBLEY: Madame Chairman. Could I
44 make a statement, seeings how we're on Unit 23.

45
46 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Go ahead, Bud.

47
48 MR. CRIBLEY: And this is a little bit,
49 it's additional information, it doesn't have to do with
50 any regulation changes or anything. But what it does

1 have to do with is a significant change in subsistence
2 opportunities in the Black River drainage, on those BLM
3 lands between the Yukon Charley Rivers National
4 Preserve and the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

5
6 Recently, the Bureau of Land Management
7 received a letter from the State of Alaska lifting
8 their selections on about 700,000 acres of BLM lands in
9 the Black River drainage area. With the lifting of
10 those selections those lands are automatically opened
11 to subsistence activities which they had been closed to
12 because of those selections. But really hadn't made --
13 really not said anything to anybody about that
14 previously, we'll probably be coming out with a
15 notification to the public but it's a significant
16 change and an increase in subsistence opportunities in
17 that area for the villages downstream.

18
19 So just want folks on the record to be
20 aware of that.

21
22 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
23 Cribley.

24
25 So we are going to go ahead in just a
26 minute here and move to the adoption of the consensus
27 agenda. We're going to ask for Chris McKee from the
28 Staff to come up to present, just briefly, the
29 consensus agenda as there were a number of updates made
30 just at the beginning of the Board meeting, so that
31 we're all clear on what we're voting on.

32
33 Thank you.

34
35 And, Chris, when you're ready you can
36 go ahead and just begin.

37
38 MR. MCKEE: Thank you, Madame Chair.
39 I'll just quickly read the proposals that are on the
40 consensus agenda. And you wanted me to just kind of
41 read what the proposal is and the unit that they apply
42 to and the position, or is that -- would that be
43 sufficient?

44
45 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: That will be
46 sufficient, thanks.

47
48 MR. MCKEE: Okay.

49
50 Madame Chair.

1 Proposal 16-02 is asking to extend
2 season dates for deer in Unit 1C and the recommendation
3 is to oppose.

4
5 Proposal WP16-03 is asking to revise
6 designated hunter possession limit for goats in Units 1
7 through 5 and the recommendation is to oppose.

8
9 WP16-04 is asking for a change in the
10 harvest limits by removing the term, antlered, for
11 moose, in Units 1C and 5B, the recommendation is to
12 support.

13
14 WP16-05 is asking for a change of
15 delegation of authority for deer in Unit 2 and the
16 recommendation is to support.

17
18 WP16-06 is looking to define the
19 boundaries of the Nunatak Bench hunting area in Unit 5,
20 the recommendation is to support.

21
22 WP16-08 is asking to revise the
23 reporting requirements for the take of female deer in
24 Unit 2, with a recommendation to support.

25
26 WP16-12 is asking to revise the harvest
27 limit for deer in Unit 6, the recommendation is to
28 support.

29
30 WP16-14 is asking for a season
31 extension for goats in Unit 6D, with a recommendation
32 to support.

33
34 WP16-15 is asking for an increase in
35 the harvest quota for caribou in Unit 7, with a
36 recommendation to oppose.

37
38 WP16-16 is requesting closure of
39 Federal public lands within the Paxson closed area to
40 hunting of big game species, Unit 13, the
41 recommendation is to oppose.

42
43 WP16-17 is asking for removal of
44 restrictions to hunting within the TransAlaska Pipeline
45 right-of-way for caribou in Unit 13, the recommendation
46 is to support.

47
48 WP16-18 is asking to allow hunting over
49 bait and establishing a new brown bear season in Units
50 11 and 12, and the recommendation is to support.

1 WP16-23 is requesting an increase in
2 the number of available harvest permits for brown bears
3 in Unit 9B, the recommendation is to support.

4
5 WP16-24 is requesting closure of
6 Federal public lands to non-Federally-qualified
7 subsistence users for moose in Units 9B, 9C and 9C
8 remainder, with a recommendation to oppose.

9
10 WP16-27/28 is asking to revise moose
11 season dates and permit restrictions for moose in Unit
12 17A, with a recommendation to support WP16-27 with
13 modification and no action on WP16-28.

14
15 WP16-29/30 is requesting an extension
16 of caribou seasons in Units 9B, 17A, 17B and 17C, with
17 a recommendation to support 16-29 with modification and
18 no action on 16-30.

19
20 WP16-33 is requesting revising the
21 customary and traditional use determination for caribou
22 and moose in Unit 18, with a recommendation to support.

23
24 WP16-34 is requesting closure to non-
25 Federally-qualified subsistence users for all big game
26 species in portions of Unit 18, with a recommendation
27 to oppose.

28
29 WP16-36 is requesting the revision of
30 the unit boundary descriptors for Units 18,19, 21 and
31 21E, with a recommendation to support.

32
33 WP16-38 is requesting removal of the
34 one half mile closure along the Innoko and Yukon Rivers
35 during the winter season for moose in Unit 21E, with a
36 recommendation to oppose.

37
38 WP16-39 is requesting a revision of the
39 hunt area descriptor for moose in Unit 21B, with a
40 recommendation to support with modification.

41
42 WP16-43 is requesting a revision of the
43 hunt area descriptor and establish a closure for
44 caribou in Units 18 and 22A, with a recommendation to
45 oppose.

46
47 WP16-47 requested creating an
48 antlerless moose season in Unit 22E, with a
49 recommendation to oppose.

50

1 WP16-50 is requesting changes in the
2 resident zone community eligibility for muskox in Unit
3 23, with a recommendation to support with modification.

4
5 WP16-55 is requesting extension of the
6 coyote trapping season in Unit 25, with a
7 recommendation to support.

8
9 WP16-56 is requesting revision of the
10 harvest limits and beaver hunting seasons in Units 25A,
11 25B and 25D, with a recommendation to support.

12
13 WP16-57 is requesting extension of the
14 lynx trapping season in Unit 25, with a recommendation
15 to support.

16
17 WP16-60 is requesting rescission of the
18 closure for caribou in Unit 12, with a recommendation
19 to support with modification.

20
21 WP16-65 is requesting creation of a
22 delegated authority for moose in Units 26B remainder,
23 and 26C, with a recommendation to support with
24 modification.

25
26 WP16-66 is requesting creation of
27 delegation of authority to close sheep harvest season
28 in Unit 26A and the recommendation is to support with
29 modification.

30
31 WP16-67 is requesting a change in the
32 trapping dates and methods and means for beaver in
33 Units 12 and 20E, with a recommendation to support.

34
35 WP16-68 is requesting a revision of
36 harvest limits and extension of the trapping season for
37 lynx in Units 12 and 20E, with a recommendation to
38 support.

39
40 WP16-69 is requesting an extension of
41 the moose season in Unit 20E remainder, with a
42 recommendation to support.

43
44 WP16-70 is requesting rescission of the
45 regulation to allow hunting of brown bears over bait in
46 Unit 25D, with a recommendation to oppose.

47
48 And that is the consensus agenda items.

49
50 Madame Chair.

1 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Madame Chair.
2
3 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Yes, Mr.
4 Christianson.
5
6 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Is this the time we
7 would entertain a motion to accept the consensus agenda
8 as presented by the Staff?
9
10 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Let me just
11 check first, hold that for one minute.....
12
13 (Laughter)
14
15 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON:and just
16 make sure that there aren't any other questions on the
17 consensus agenda from Board members.
18
19 MR. CRIBLEY: Question.
20
21 (Laughter)
22
23 MS. CLARK: Well, actually I do have
24 just kind of a comment for the record.
25
26 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay.
27
28 MS. CLARK: Sorry, Bud.
29
30 (Laughter)
31
32 MS. CLARK: I'd like to say for the
33 record that the Service, including the National
34 Wildlife Refuge system has no concerns with the two
35 brown bear baiting proposals, WP16-18 and WP16-70 on
36 this consensus agenda that affect Arctic, Yukon Flats
37 and Tetlin National Wildlife Refuges. This is
38 consistent with our statements and a great example
39 demonstrating that the statewide proposed rule does not
40 conflict with Federal subsistence regulations.
41
42 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Ms.
43 Clark. Any other comments.
44
45 Mr. Christianson.
46
47 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Now I'd like to make
48 a motion that we accept the consensus agenda as
49 presented by the OSM Staff.
50

1 MR. C. BROWER: Second.
2
3 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Mr. Brower has
4 seconded.
5
6 Call for the question.
7
8 MR. CRIBLEY: Call for the question.
9
10 (Laughter)
11
12 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: The question's
13 been called. All in favor say aye.
14
15 IN UNISON: Aye.
16
17 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Passes
18 unanimously.
19
20 Okay. We've got a number of business
21 items to take up now. The first up will be discussion
22 and a decision on the summer 2016 work session.
23
24 So we have a suggestion for July as the
25 month that we're looking at for the work session, that
26 would be here in Anchorage. I already know I've got a
27 conflict the second week, so I'd suggest the third week
28 and see how that's going to work for the Board.
29
30 Mr. Christianson.
31
32 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, I would have a
33 conflict with the third week.
34
35 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON:
36
37 MR. LOUDERMILK: I would also have a
38 conflict.
39
40 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: So let me take
41 a proposal, what would work for folks.
42
43 MR. C. BROWER: Work with the Staff.
44
45 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Well, the last week
46 would work for me.
47
48 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. I'm
49 going to ask and just see how the last week looks for
50 folks.

1 MS. CLARK: The last week would
2 probably be tough for me.
3
4 MR. FROST: It'd be hard for me, too.
5
6 MR. CRIBLEY: I would make that work.
7
8 (Laughter)
9
10 MR. LOUDERMILK: I would make that
11 work, too.
12
13 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, or your
14 alternate. So we'll go with the last week and I guess
15 Staff will set the specific dates for that. But go
16 ahead and mark the last week of July for a work session
17 for the Board.
18
19 So the next item is the winter 2017
20 public meeting. So typically that meeting is held in
21 January and the week that is being proposed by the
22 Director of OSM is the week of the 16th of January.
23
24 (Pause)
25
26 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: So we're going
27 to propose either the week of the 9th or the 23rd.
28
29 MR. LOUDERMILK: I move for the 9th.
30
31 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: How does that
32 work for folks?
33
34 (Board nods affirmatively)
35
36 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, we'll go
37 with the week of the 9th. Thank you.
38
39 Well, that was easy.
40
41 So we'll move on to other business
42 items. And let me just check with Deborah Coble to see
43 if we're ready to announce -- oh, you're going to do
44 that, okay. So the item that we're on right now is to
45 announce -- we're on Item No. 8, other business, but to
46 announce the winner of the artwork for the cover of the
47 regulatory book and I think Amee is going to share that
48 with us.
49
50 Thank you, Amee.

1 MS. HOWARD: Thank you everyone.
2 Again, Ameer Howard, I'm the Policy Coordinator at OSM.

3
4 And so thank you for turning in your
5 ballots and we do have the winners identified, first,
6 second and third. So first place goes to Iayna
7 Basargin, does anyone know how to say that because I'm
8 sure I'm killing it, anyway, it was No. 13, and
9 Deborah's going to bring those in to show. The second
10 place went to Wilfred Autin, which was No. 4. And
11 third place went to Sidney Kineen, which was No. 8.

12
13 So we'll bring those in and have them
14 available so everyone can see, first, second and third,
15 so thank you.

16
17 (Whispering)

18
19 MS. HOWARD: One last thing, Madame
20 Chair, if you don't mind, Basargin is what Katya
21 Wessels corrected me. And I also wanted to point out
22 when you came back from lunch you all had some sweet
23 treats at your stations so if I could get Katya to
24 stand back up.....

25
26 (Laughter)

27
28 (Applause)

29
30 MS. HOWARD: Katya is one of our new
31 Council Coordinators, she's new to the OSM team and she
32 brought those in and thought it would be a great treat
33 for everyone so thank you for acknowledging her.

34
35 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you,
36 Ameer and thank you Katya.

37
38 Okay, the next item on our other
39 business, this is, again, Item No. 8 is the RFR updates
40 and I believe Stewart is going to discuss this with us.

41
42 MR. COGSWELL: Madame Chair. Members
43 of the Board. My name is Stewart Cogswell. I'm the
44 acting Deputy Assistant Regional Director for the
45 Office of Subsistence Management. And I'm here to
46 provide an update on the request for reconsideration on
47 the Kenai, Kasilof and Makhnati claims and I'm just
48 going to read this summary for you today.

49
50 A total of 740 letters were submitted

1 to OSM in response to Board decisions on Fisheries
2 Proposal 15-10, 15-11 and 15-17. Nine letters have
3 been pulled from the analysis, eight of them were
4 duplicates sent by the same person from the same
5 address and one was not a claim, it was a forwarded
6 newspaper editorial without request. All of the
7 remaining 731 letters requested reconsideration of the
8 Board's decision of FP15-10 which proposed that a
9 community set gillnet salmon fishery be established on
10 the Kenai River and that the Board delegate to the in-
11 season manager the authority to approve an operating
12 plan for that gillnet.

13
14 479 letters also requested
15 reconsideration of the Board's decision on FP15-11,
16 which proposed that a community set gillnet salmon
17 fishery be established on the Kasilof River and that
18 the Board delegate to the in-season manager the
19 authority to approve an operating plan for that
20 gillnet.

21
22 One letter also included a request for
23 reconsideration of the Board's decision on FP15-17,
24 which proposed that the Federal public waters in the
25 Makhnati Island area near Sitka be closed to the
26 harvest of herring and herring spawn except by
27 Federally-qualified subsistence users.

28
29 So we have a preliminary identification
30 of claims.

31
32 Each of the 731 letters was closely
33 reviewed to identify potential claims. A preliminary
34 list of claims has been developed. 44 potential claims
35 have been identified. This includes 39 potential
36 claims associated with FP15-10, which establishes a
37 community set gillnet salmon fishery on the Kenai
38 River; 22 potential claims associated with FP15-11,
39 which establishes a community set gillnet fishery on
40 the Kasilof River; and three potential claims
41 associated with FP15-17, which would close Federal
42 waters in the Makhnati Island area near Sitka to the
43 harvest of herring and herring spawn, except by
44 Federally-qualified users.

45
46 The final number of claims will likely
47 change.

48
49 The 44 potential claims have not yet
50 been addressed to determine if they align with at least

1 one of the three criteria for reconsidering a Board
2 decision and are valid.

3

4 So we have a few next steps and I'll
5 share those with you.

6

7 A final list of claims that meet the
8 RFR criteria as outlined in the Federal regulations
9 will be developed for each of the three Board
10 decisions. Three separate threshold analysis will be
11 conducted for the claims pertaining to the Kenai River,
12 Kasilof River and the Makhnati Island proposals.
13 Completed threshold analysis will be presented to the
14 Board so it can determine which RFRs or claims meet or
15 don't meet the threshold criteria for reconsideration.

16

17 If any of the claims are determined to
18 meet the threshold, a full analysis will be completed.

19

20 And just as an update, where we're at
21 with the Makhnati Island threshold analysis, the first
22 draft has been completed and it's being reviewed right
23 now.

24

25 So that is all I have for your update
26 on the RFR process for those three fisheries proposals.

27

28 Thank you.

29

30 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
31 Let me just check with the Board to see if there are
32 any questions with what's been shared.

33

34 Mr. Frost.

35

36 MR. FROST: Is there any estimated
37 timeline when all the analysis will be done?

38

39 MR. COGSWELL: Through the Chair. Mr.
40 Frost. I will defer to the ARD of OSM for an answer to
41 that.

42

43 (Laughter)

44

45 MR. PELTOLA: Madame Chair. Gene
46 Peltola, Jr., ARD of Office of Subsistence Management.

47

48 If you recall at our April meeting last
49 year, there is a definite desire on specifically two of
50 the three RFRs to try to get something by the January

1 meeting. We could definitely not make that deadline.
2 We attempted -- you know, then there was a desire to
3 make this meeting in April and we said we'd use that as
4 a goal. Right now we're looking at -- one of the three
5 will definitely have the threshold completed to present
6 to the Board at the July work session. We're still
7 targeting having the other two completed, at least, the
8 threshold analysis for presentation at the July work
9 session of the Board.

10
11 The challenge has been with the two --
12 with the two Southcentral Rivers, Kenai and Kasilof, is
13 that the pure volume of requests we have received.
14 That continues to be a -- I wouldn't say, hinderance,
15 but a challenge in order to come up with a timely
16 response.

17
18 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
19 Peltola. Any other questions.

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, thank
24 you, Stewart.

25
26 I'd like to invite Trevor Fox up for
27 our next item, which is the US Fish and Wildlife
28 Service letter regarding the US Fish and Wildlife
29 Service letter regarding the Kuskokwim Partnership
30 update.

31
32 MR. FOX: Thank you, Madame Chair.
33 Members of the Board. Good afternoon.

34
35 In your supplemental package, you have
36 a letter dated March 31st, 2016, this is a joint letter
37 from the Kuskokwim River InterTribal Fish Commission
38 and the US Fish and Wildlife Service to the Board. And
39 today I just wanted to provide a little general
40 information and context for the letter as this was just
41 sent out.

42
43 The letter requests the Board to
44 consider some options on how it considers requests and
45 recommendations related to the partnership project, or
46 what's been referred to as the Demonstration Project.
47 This is not an action item today, it's something that
48 the Board will deal with in future meetings, and at
49 those future meetings we'll have a more in-depth
50 discussion of this whole process, and that discussion

1 will include conversations with the Board, the
2 InterTribal Fish Commission, the affected RACs, which
3 would be the Western Interior and the Yukon Kuskokwim
4 Delta Regional Advisory Councils and the State as well.

5
6 But to give just a little bit of
7 background on what this partnership project is, the
8 Demonstration Project, it started with an announcement
9 in October 2014 from the Deputy Secretary of the
10 Interior Mike Connor, and this was at AFN, announcing
11 plans to develop a demonstration project that could be
12 implemented administratively that would bring local
13 people and subsistence users more into the
14 decisionmaking process for resource management, and,
15 specifically, on the Kuskokwim River.

16
17 So the goals were to allow subsistence
18 users a mechanism to have more meaningful input into
19 the decisionmaking processes, which would include in-
20 season management and provide an opportunity to advance
21 issues that are critical to subsistence users. And
22 this has been an ongoing process since the announcement
23 and it's been a multi-entity effort over the past year,
24 including representatives of the Service, partners with
25 the InterTribal Fish Commission, the Association of
26 Village Council Presidents and the Tanana Chiefs
27 Conference all working together to address potential
28 ways to deal with management issues on the Kuskokwim
29 River.

30
31 And we've gone through a number of
32 different ways to potentially implement this
33 Demonstration Project and ended up selecting this two-
34 part structure.

35
36 One part of that would consist of a
37 joint subcommittee between the Western Interior and the
38 Yukon Kuskokwim Delta Councils and that subcommittee
39 would then make recommendations to the two Councils on
40 strategies for in-season management under other fishery
41 management actions and then the Councils could then
42 decide if they'd make those recommendations to the
43 Board.

44
45 The second part of the project is a
46 memorandum of understanding that's been developed
47 between the US Fish and Wildlife Service and the
48 InterTribal Fish Commission. And it provides
49 opportunity to consult during in-season management,
50 including special actions that are issued via

1 delegation of authority to the Refuge manager and would
2 formalize and build upon successful steps taken during
3 last year's fishery season.

4
5 So that gives a little bit of an
6 update. We still have a few steps to take.

7
8 As I've said we've developed the MOU,
9 we still have a few more signatures we're trying to
10 collect on that before it's officially finalized. As
11 far as the joint subcommittee that was presented to the
12 affected Councils last year, and they were supportive
13 of the process contingent upon signing of the MOU. So
14 we'll be taking that back to the Councils in the fall
15 to see if they finalize that process and then that'll
16 lead to further discussions with the Board for official
17 approval of that joint subcommittee.

18
19 So that's basically where we are.

20
21 Like I said, this will be coming up in
22 future meetings but we just wanted to give a little bit
23 of context for this letter that you were just
24 submitted.

25
26 Thank you.

27
28 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
29 Fox. Are there any questions for Trevor from Board
30 members.

31
32 Yes.

33
34 MR. LORD: I don't have a question but
35 I just wanted to let the Board know that this was a
36 tremendous effort by Trevor and Stewart, they put a lot
37 of work into this and there was a lot of negotiation
38 involved and not all of it was very easy and they did a
39 terrific job.

40
41 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you for
42 that comment. And thank you, Trevor, thank you Stewart
43 for your work.

44
45 I think that's it -- no, one other
46 comment. Gene.

47
48 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Madame Chair.

49
50 Although the Board received an update

1 with regard to the letter and the MOU there will be, at
2 subsequent meetings, action items requested of the
3 process upon the Board, but within some of the
4 documents that have currently been agreed upon, one
5 particular item I'd like to bring to note is a more
6 expedient process, so to speak, with regard to special
7 action requests for in-season management.

8
9 Although it was not specifically
10 requested to be an action item of the Board here at
11 this presentation, it's something that OSM, based on
12 the last couple years of experience with regard to
13 special actions, had been working on trying to develop
14 a process which would be more expedient to fit into the
15 decisionmaking requirements of the fishery season on
16 the Kuskokwim, so that's ongoing.

17
18 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
19 Peltola. Any other comments or questions.

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you,
24 Trevor.

25
26 So we've got one final item I'd like
27 Ameer Howard to please come forward and this is an
28 update on the State of Alaska letter regarding our MOU.

29
30 MS. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair.
31 Federal Board members. Council Chairs.

32
33 In your supplemental materials you
34 should have a copy of the letter dated April 6th, 2016
35 from the State of Alaska. The letter is to Gene
36 Peltola, the Assistant Regional Director at OSM. And
37 the letter is in response of sorts to our letter in our
38 response to their them on March 1st, and this is a long
39 line of correspondences that you're all aware of going
40 back and forth to reinvigorate the efforts on the MOU.

41
42 In the letter Gene and the Program were
43 congratulated for the recent All Regional Advisory
44 Council meeting. It was a tremendous opportunity for
45 members of the RAC, the State and the Federal Staff
46 alike, and so our colleagues from the State recognized
47 that and gave us some kudos so we appreciate that
48 acknowledgement.

49
50 The purpose of the letter was twofold.

1 One it's to notify you, the Board, that reports were
2 made of both Boards of Fisheries and Game to -- and --
3 of our reinvigorated efforts and to contemplate future
4 scheduling for those efforts. Also at those meetings
5 -- let's see the Board was in full support at the Board
6 of Fisheries meeting and committed the Federal/State
7 Subsistence Committee to the effort. The committee is
8 chaired by Orville Huntington and includes members John
9 Jensen and Sue Jefferies. And then, similarly, on
10 March 17th the Board of Game heard the same report
11 during its work session and assigned Ted Spraker and
12 Theresa Sager-Alba; is that right?

13

14 MS. KLEIN: (Nods affirmatively)

15

16 MS. HOWARD: Okay. To assist with the
17 MOU process.

18

19 So the Staff recommendation is that the
20 Board identify OSM kind of to take a lead but also the
21 thought is that we would also want representatives from
22 two or maybe three of the other agencies to also commit
23 to working with this group that's' already been
24 identified as the State to move these efforts forward.

25

26 And so that is why we marked it as an
27 action item to see if we can get on the record, that
28 commitment, and who will be moving forward in this
29 effort.

30

31 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Ms.
32 Howard. Let me first just check with the Board members
33 to see if there's any comment or questions.

34

35 Mr. Christianson.

36

37 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Madame Chair. I was
38 just thinking for process we might want to make a
39 motion to the effect that the OSM maybe take the lead
40 on this, per Staff recommendation and then also
41 consider who we appoint or who wants to join the effort
42 to update the MOU, here at the table. I think the
43 agencies that work most closely with the State probably
44 would be sufficient.

45

46 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr.
47 Christianson. So we have a motion on the table.

48

49 MR. C. BROWER: Second.

50

1 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: And we've got
2 a second on that. All in favor say aye.

3
4 IN UNISON: Aye.

5
6 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay, so we'll
7 move forward with that. Let me just check, I did want
8 to give the State an opportunity, if you had any
9 remarks or comments with regard to the joint effort on
10 the MOU.

11
12 MS. KLEIN: Thank you, Madame Chair. I
13 don't have any additional comments at this time but I'm
14 happy to answer any questions if anyone has them.

15
16 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.
17 Any questions from any Board members.

18
19 (No comments)

20
21 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. So we
22 did have a motion and an approval on that. So we'll
23 move forward with the coordinated updates.

24
25 MS. HOWARD: Just for clarification,
26 Madame Chair, do we want to identify the agencies that
27 would like to step forward and be part of the effort
28 here or should that be done the road.

29
30 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: I think it
31 would be helpful, Ms. Howard, to have the Staff solicit
32 interest with the Board members for potential folks
33 from various Staffs to be identified.

34
35 MS. HOWARD: All right, thank you,
36 Madame Chair.

37
38 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you.

39
40 (Pause)

41
42 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Okay. At this
43 point I think we are done with our formal business.
44 Let me just pause here for a minute and see if there's
45 anything else from the Board that we need to discuss
46 before we close the meeting.

47
48 So I just want to give a shout out of
49 thanks to all of the Staff, to the Regional Advisory
50 Council Chairs or their representatives who have come

1 to Anchorage this week for this meeting. To the Board
2 members for all of the efforts and work and to the
3 State for your being here and making such valuable
4 contributions as we've moved through the proposals.

5
6 Thank you very much.

7
8 I'd also like to acknowledge Heather
9 Boshier who's been with us -- I think most folks
10 probably knew that she is a student in Jan Straley's
11 class and hopefully this has been a good experience for
12 you, Heather, so thank you for being here.

13
14 I think at this time I'm going to turn
15 it over to Michael for a question.

16
17 MR. BANGS: Thank you, Madame Chair. I
18 just had a quick comment. I would like to ask the
19 Board to request from the State, that if they have
20 their comments on proposals finalized before the book
21 is printed that they could be included in the book.
22 And the reason that I ask this is that I think it would
23 help us to understand if there is an opposition or
24 something to a proposal, that it might help us begin
25 the process of compromise or whatever. I think it might
26 speed the process up and I think it would be helpful
27 for everyone on both sides.

28
29 Thank you.

30
31 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you for
32 your comment and suggestion Mr. Bangs. I think that is
33 a good suggestion and would encourage the State to
34 submit those comments so they could be included for
35 full consideration.

36
37 So I would like to get a motion from
38 the Board then to -- we have one more comment, Ms.
39 Entsminger.

40
41 MS. ENTSMINGER: Thank you, I
42 appreciate it. I just had something I need to know
43 before I leave from this meeting. The letter that
44 Lester read to you, it wasn't clear to me the path that
45 was being taken on that. I know that several of us
46 adopted, the RACs adopted just a brief, it says, to
47 develop a joint statement for the Federal Board, for
48 the Board to take our position forward to the Fish and
49 Wildlife Service and, you know, with this thing coming
50 down quickly, I just wondered what the path was.

1 Because it was brought to my attention that the Board
2 did something on the behalf of the users, the RACs,
3 when it came to the fisheries so it seems like we
4 should be able to do the same with the wildlife. In
5 the past, it was something to do with going to the -- I
6 have it here but I can't remember -- but it's been done
7 in the past going to the -- the fisheries on the
8 bycatch of the Yukon.

9

10 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you for
11 that suggestion, Ms. Entsminger. I'm going to have Mr.
12 Peltola respond to your inquiry.

13

14 MR. PELTOLA: Okay. Sue the joint
15 position of the multiple RAC members was presented to
16 the Board in a written format, based on the direction
17 of the correspondence policy, the Board did receive it,
18 the Board will come up with a position, forward that on
19 to OSM to finalize and put it into written format and
20 in response back to the concerned RACs.

21

22 MS. ENTSMINGER: Okay, I appreciate
23 that, thank you.

24

25 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you, Ms.
26 Entsminger.

27

28 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Motion to adjourn.

29

30 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: You've heard
31 the motion.

32

33 MR. FROST: Second.

34

35 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: All in favor.

36

37 IN UNISON: Aye.

38

39 ACTING CHAIR PENDLETON: Thank you,
40 all.

41

42 (Off record)

43

44 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

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

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 pages numbered 244 through 366 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE BOARD MEETING, VOLUME III taken electronically by our firm on the 14th day of April 2016, 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 23rd day of April 2016.

Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 09/16/18