

FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE BOARD

WORK SESSION

VOLUME II

James M. Fitzgerald
U.S. Courthouse and Federal Building
Denali Conference Room
Anchorage, Alaska
February 23, 2018
8:30 o'clock a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Anthony Christianson, Chairman
Charles Brower
Rhonda Pitka
Karen Mouritsen, Bureau of Land Management
Greg Siekanic, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Bert Frost, National Park Service
Lynn Polacca, Bureau of Indian Affairs
Wayne Owen, U.S. Forest Service

Ken Lord, Solicitor's Office

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

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2

3

(Anchorage, Alaska - 2/23/2018)

4

5

(On record)

6

7

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I'll call the
8 meeting to order this morning. One of our first orders
9 of business is we're going to have a short executive
10 session. And so we're waiting for Charlie to come in
11 so the Board is going to -- we will convene the meeting
12 now and ask that everyone clear the room for a few
13 minutes so we can have a short executive session.
14 Sorry for waiting until you were all comfortable.

15

16

(Laughter)

17

18

(Off record)

19

20

(Executive session)

21

22

(On record)

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, we're
back on, and welcome back to the meeting this morning.
And excuse us for the executive session, we just had a
personnel issue we wanted to discuss this morning and
so we will get back on and hopefully everybody's back
on line. I know we're recording here that the meeting
started at 9:00 a.m., this morning, and yesterday when
we left on the agenda we were on Number 6, policy
issues.

So with that I'd call up the potential
revisions to the Federal Subsistence Board policy.

Chris McKee.

MR. MCKEE: Good morning. Thank you,
Mr. Chair and members of the Board. Hopefully I won't
take up too much of your time this morning.

I just wanted to -- I think that the
closure policy is on Tab 4, page 1 of your binders, if
you just want to get a general overview of that. I'm
not going to necessarily address all of that policy, I
just want to kind of give an overview about some things
that have occurred in the program since that policy was
adopted.

1 So in August of 2007 the Federal
2 Subsistence Board clarified policies addressing Federal
3 closures to hunting, trapping and fishing on Federal
4 public lands and waters in Alaska. And in this policy
5 it set forth a process for periodic review of
6 regulatory closures, and, specifically required that
7 closures be reviewed at least every three years and the
8 policy has been implemented over the last decade as the
9 Federal Subsistence Management Program has continued to
10 develop. Due to programmatic changes there may now be a
11 need to revise the existing closure policy to reflect
12 these developments.

13
14 Specifically, in 2009 the Program
15 changed from an annual wildlife and fisheries
16 regulatory cycle to the current biennial cycle and as a
17 result of these changes many of the closures have been
18 reviewed during, quote/unquote off cycle years with
19 others being reviewed during the regulatory cycle,
20 resulting in a staggered review process. And, in
21 addition, some regulatory proposals have addressed
22 areas and species that involve existing closures, and
23 as a result these closures were reviewed as part of the
24 regular process further complicating the closure review
25 and regulatory process further.

26
27 The existing closure policy requires
28 that at least one-third of all closures be reviewed
29 each year as well.

30
31 As a result of the changes to the
32 regulatory process this has become impractical to
33 implement due to the biennial cycle and, as I said
34 before, rather complicated to track.

35
36 In addition, the closure policy states
37 that, quote, all future closures will be reviewed by
38 the Federal Subsistence Board but this has not what's
39 taken place from a practical standpoint. Again, while
40 the Board has reviewed regulatory proposals that called
41 for closures to be rescinded, review of other closures
42 has begun and ended with a review by the affected
43 Regional Advisory Councils.

44
45 So, in other words, we've taken closure
46 reviews to the Councils, given them an overview of the
47 biological situation and gotten their decision on how
48 they would like to see the closure proceed, either
49 status quo, which is to maintain the closure, rescind
50

1 the closure or some kind of a modification, somewhere
2 in between that. Now, I'm talking specifically of
3 wildlife closures, not fishery closures.

4
5 So with that in mind, the following --
6 I've got a couple of suggested changes, and it's
7 totally up to the Board's discretion to decide how you
8 want to move forward.

9
10 But the first suggestion would be to
11 have all the closures be reviewed every four years,
12 instead of every three years. So all completed closure
13 reviews will be presented to the affected Councils
14 during the Council meetings to coincide for the call
15 for proposals for that cycle. This change could be
16 recommended so that closure review analysis are brought
17 before the affected Councils at a time when they have
18 the opportunity to submit proposals if they feel that a
19 closure is no longer warranted. This also allows the
20 public to be updated on the status of closures at
21 Council meetings and also allows for publicly generated
22 proposals to open closures as well. Reviewing closures
23 every four years also provides a realistic amount of
24 time to pass to review data for any changes to
25 biological conditions for the species subject to the
26 closure.

27
28 So that's the first suggested option.
29 Do all the closures every four years.

30
31 The second suggestion would be to do
32 half of all the closure reviews every four years. So
33 this would ensure a more even work load and allow for
34 easier incorporation of additional closures in the
35 event that more are adopted by the Board in subsequent
36 regulatory cycles.

37
38 So I'll give you an example.

39
40 In the wildlife, well, we have, I'd
41 say, off the top of my head, we have about 30 closure
42 reviews -- 30 wildlife closures that we have on our
43 review cycle. So under this proposal my Staff would
44 start writing the actual closure reviews this year,
45 half of them, say if we have 30, they'll be doing 15
46 closure reviews, the actual writing, gathering of
47 analysis, going through the review process, present
48 them to the affected Councils in 2019 at the beginning
49 of the wildlife cycle, get their take on it, whether

50

1 they -- how they feel about it, continue the closure,
2 open the closure or some other option, and then we can
3 move forward with generating proposals, if they want to
4 open or modify the closure in some manner. So we would
5 present them in 2019, the first half, get whatever the
6 decision is. And then we'd do the second half at the
7 beginning of 2021 for the 15 through 30, and then we
8 come back to the first half in 2023. So the first
9 couple of cycles will be every two years but eventually
10 we'll do half of them every four years. And so that
11 way we'll also be doing closure reviews, for wild -- and,
12 this is, again, just for wildlife, but we'd be doing
13 closure reviews every wildlife cycle.

14
15 So as a result, right now, as an
16 example, they're so staggered, that at any one cycle we
17 generally have been doing, if I had to guess off the
18 top of my head, probably between five and eight or nine
19 closure reviews, any particular year, just because of
20 the way the closures have come up. And, again, when we
21 have proposals that call for proposals -- proposals
22 that call for rescinding closures it kind of resets the
23 clock on the review process and so they become
24 staggered.

25
26 If we did it this way, there will
27 always be closure reviews coming up every cycle for
28 fisheries and wildlife, the public would get an
29 opportunity to review those closures, not only at
30 Council meetings, but eventually at the Board meetings.

31
32 Because another suggestion to go along
33 with the original policy was that during the wildlife
34 and fisheries regulatory Federal Subsistence Board
35 meeting, so for wildlife it's going to be this April,
36 and for fisheries it's every January, during their
37 [sic] year. The Staff from OSM will present an
38 overview of all the closure reviews conducted during
39 that regulatory cycle, it'll allow the Board to be kept
40 up to date on the biological conditions in the areas of
41 closure and to allow the Board to ask questions of
42 Staff if they want -- if you so desire, and it would
43 also let you know, kind of give you an update about how
44 the affected Councils have come down on the closures as
45 well.

46
47 So I keep thinking of the NEPA process
48 because if -- my preferred alternative would be number
49 2, to do half of them every four years, just so we
50

1 always have wildlife closures coming up for review by
2 the Councils and then this overview by the Board during
3 the affected fisheries or wildlife cycles.

4
5 So that's kind of where we're at right
6 now. It's been very -- it's become rather staggered
7 just because, again, you know, when you have a cycle
8 that's every two years and closure reviews are to be
9 reviewed every three years, it just -- the numbers just
10 don't match up. And we also -- we may have done a
11 third of all closures at the beginning of this policy
12 but, again, we have not been consistently doing a third
13 of all the closures every three years, it just --
14 because of the way that the regulatory process has met
15 out.

16
17 So if we did do -- if we changed the
18 policy to kind of go towards what I'm talking about
19 now, we'd have a lot more closure reviews coming up on
20 a very regular basis. The Board would be able to see,
21 even if we didn't have a proposal, the Board would be
22 able to at least get an overview of what's going on
23 with the closures, get an update on the biological
24 conditions and, again, see how the Councils have come
25 down on the closure reviews and their rationale for
26 either maintaining them, rescinding them or some other
27 kind of modification.

28
29 So that's pretty much all I had and I'd
30 be happy to answer any questions that I can.

31
32 Thank you.

33
34 OPERATOR: Questions from the phone,
35 please press star one and record your name.

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

39
40 Karen.

41
42 MS. MOURITSEN: Yeah, thank you. I can
43 see how you're trying to make this into a more regular
44 cycle. I do see that.

45
46 I did have a question when I read this
47 on the number 2, it says half of all closure reviews
48 would be completed every four years, so I don't know I
49 guess I got confused. Is it a -- so is it an eight
50

1 year cycle or a four year cycle -- you're trying to get
2 to a four year cycle after you do some staggering to
3 work up into it, then.....

4
5 MR. MCKEE: Right. It's.....

6
7 MS. MOURITSEN:it'll be a four
8 year cycle?

9
10 MR. MCKEE: Correct. It's -- it's
11 easier to understand in your mind than it is to
12 sometimes -- for me to actually say it. So, again,
13 I'll try to.....

14
15 MS. MOURITSEN: Okay. Okay.

16
17 MR. MCKEE:because I kind of went
18 over that rather quickly.

19
20 MS. MOURITSEN: Okay.

21
22 MR. MCKEE: So, again, let's just
23 assume that we have 30 -- for wildlife, we have about
24 30 wildlife closures, so beginning in 2019 when the
25 call for wildlife proposals go out, what the wildlife
26 Staff will do, we'll review 15 of those closure
27 reviews, half of them. They'll have the closure review
28 analysis ready to present to the affected Councils,
29 that's 2019.....

30
31 MS. MOURITSEN: Uh-huh.

32
33 MR. MCKEE:and whatever happens
34 with those is whatever happens, either.....

35
36 MS. MOURITSEN: Yeah.

37
38 MR. MCKEE:they're closed, open
39 or whatever. And then during the next wildlife cycle,
40 in 2021, we'll take the second half so.....

41
42 MS. MOURITSEN: Got it.

43
44 MR. MCKEE:and then after that,
45 2023.....

46
47 MS. MOURITSEN: Okay. Okay.

48
49 MR. MCKEE:we'll come back to the
50

1 first half that we did in 2019. So it eventually will
2 get to.....

3

4 MS. MOURITSEN: Okay.

5

6 MR. MCKEE:every four years. But
7 to start off with it'll be the first half one, start
8 off with, and then the second half two years after
9 that.

10

11 MS. MOURITSEN: Yeah.

12

13 MR. MCKEE: But once we're on the
14 second half it'll be back to every four years. It's
15 very wordy.

16

17 I apologize but there's no more brief
18 way to state it than the way I just explained it. So I
19 hope I clarified some things a little bit.

20

21 MS. MOURITSEN: I'm clear now.

22

23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And currently
24 we haven't really reviewed these closures so it would
25 bring something before us to keep us, you know, a
26 little more informed on what is actually out there and
27 not open, I guess, for the users.

28

29 MR. MCKEE: Correct. I mean we've --
30 we've -- again, the wildlife closure analysis, that
31 process has kind of ended with the Councils. Now, I
32 will say that the closure review analysis go through a
33 similar review process that regulatory proposals go
34 through. Field Staff review them, the ISC reviews
35 them, so in that sense the ISC and the Board's --
36 acting as the Board's support Staff have seen them, but
37 we haven't brought it before the Board at their
38 meeting. The closure reviews have been brought up at
39 Council meetings, and understandably, sometimes, if
40 we're having a Council meeting in Shungnak or some
41 other small -- small area, there's not going to be a
42 lot of public participation. The ability to bring them
43 up at the Board meeting so, you know, we have a good
44 attendance at the Board meetings, people will be able
45 to be aware of all the closures that are going on.
46 Because unless you, like, open up the reg book and look
47 through the regs to see which areas are closed, you're
48 probably not going to even really be aware of it.

49

50

1 So it's kind of something that's kind
2 of been going a little bit under the radar and I think
3 to be able to bring it up to review by the Board at a
4 public meeting will kind of, you know, kind of bring
5 that forward to the public so they're a little bit more
6 aware of it.

7
8 MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

9
10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead.

11
12 MR. BROWER: So all the closures in the
13 Park and the Refuges will be still on, they won't be
14 deleted, they will just stay in there as a record
15 saying there's no hunting unless provided by Park or
16 Refuge.....

17
18 MR. MCKEE: Well.....

19
20 MR. BROWER:because they won't be
21 studied by OSM in the future?

22
23 MR. MCKEE: I'm speaking only to the
24 closures that are in the Federal Subsistence
25 regulations. Yeah, this doesn't change any Park or
26 Refuge specific closures that are not related to the
27 Federal Subsistence regulations.

28
29 And I also should say that just because
30 OSM is reviewing these closures, the ability to anybody
31 in the public or a Council at any time to bring up a
32 proposal to open a closure is always available. This
33 is just kind of an internal OSM process to make sure
34 that these are being brought before the Councils, and
35 then, again, brought before the Board at the
36 appropriate fisheries or wildlife cycle but anybody can
37 bring up a -- can submit a proposal at any time.

38
39 MR. BROWER: Thank you.

40
41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Bert.

42
43 MR. FROST: So on that point, if people
44 bring things up out of cycle, how do you avoid getting
45 things out of cycle again, getting sort of everything
46 out of whack?

47
48 MR. MCKEE: Yeah, that's another
49 consideration. So we would get -- in the past when
50

1 we've gotten proposals to open up closures, it's always
2 kind of a reset the cycle. I'm not sure -- that
3 occurred before I got to the program, I'm not sure what
4 the reasoning for that was other than the fact that
5 we're bringing up this specific species and area and so
6 it gets reviewed as part of the regular review process.
7 I would be of the mind to not let that affect the
8 change in cycle. I mean it might end up being that we
9 get a proposal one year and if we just consistently
10 always review those proposals, depending on when they
11 come up, it won't make a difference whether it was
12 brought up through the proposal process, we would
13 continue to review them if we -- if we review them
14 regardless of whether they came up in a proposal or not
15 then we will continue to have this consistent review
16 process.

17
18 Otherwise, you're right, it could
19 easily get staggered again and become quite
20 complicated.

21
22 MR. FROST: So just a follow up. So a
23 specific closure could be reviewed sooner than four
24 years if it was brought up through the public process,
25 but you would sort of keep it on their -- I don't know
26 what -- it's not a biennial, whatever the four
27 year.....

28
29 MR. MCKEE: Quadrennial, I'm not sure
30 what the term is.

31
32 MR. FROST:yeah, the quad -- the
33 quadrennial review system, right.

34
35 MR. MCKEE: That would ensure the
36 public process still takes place but it wouldn't change
37 -- I wouldn't be of the mind to change our internal
38 process. We'd still continue to keep reviewing them.

39
40 MR. FROST: So some proposals could get
41 reviewed more than once every four years, they could
42 get -- they could conceivably be reviewed every year if
43 people continued to bring them up, right?

44
45 MR. MCKEE: In theory every wildlife
46 cycle -- in fact, I can give you a perfect example --
47 two examples. One, that you're going to bring up --
48 both of which you'll bring up at your April meeting.
49 The Unit 23 caribou closure, if the Board decides to
50

1 vote for some type of closure, that's going to be put
2 on -- that will be added to our closure review process
3 and so is Red Sheep, Cane Creek, that closure. But as
4 you know, Red Sheep, Cane Creek has been a subject
5 that's come up repeatedly during the wildlife cycle.
6 And I suspect that if Unit 23 is closed down to caribou
7 hunting that would come up on a regular basis, too,
8 just because of the nature of the closure.

9
10 So I would expect that some closures
11 will be fairly common in terms of how often they come
12 up for review, depending on how the Board comes down on
13 them. But it wouldn't change our internal process.

14
15 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair.

16
17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Wayne.

18
19 MR. OWEN: Maybe a naive question, but,
20 you know, your example highlighted it for me. This is
21 a good bureaucratic process but I'm not sure I see it
22 matching up with biology very well. So you gave some
23 great examples. In Southeast four years is too long to
24 wait for deer because deer populations, you know, you
25 never know where, up or down, depending on a lot of
26 other things.

27
28 I'd like to hear, you know, have Staff
29 talked about biological sort of way to do this, or, you
30 know, something like that, you know, I'm just.....

31
32 MR. MCKEE: Yeah. It.....

33
34 MR. OWEN:concerned about the
35 biology part.

36
37 MR. MCKEE:it's a good point. It
38 would be -- the problem with that is it's difficult to
39 have a biological standard for these closure reviews
40 because deer is different from muskox, it's different
41 from caribou, et cetera, et cetera.

42
43 It's a good point, however, I would say
44 that separate from the bureaucratic process that I've
45 been describing, if some biological condition comes up,
46 I'll use deer in Southeast as an example, a heavy snow
47 year, the population is hammered, that kind of stuff,
48 the ability for the public or an agency, or whoever to
49 submit a proposal to change regulations or a special

50

1 action for that matter is still available. I mean OSM,
2 as a practice, we don't submit proposals except for
3 kind of housekeeping things, unit descriptions, those
4 kind of things. We don't drive the proposal process.
5 So even if something drastic happened biologically, we
6 would still not be submitting any kind of proposal to
7 change anything, it would still be a public driven
8 process. And so if something like that happened with
9 deer and the Forest Service thought that it was --
10 there was a situation that needed the Board's attention
11 in the regulatory cycle, it would still be perfectly
12 acceptable and advisable for the Forest Service to
13 submit a proposal to change deer regulations.

14
15 I mean the bureaucratic process that
16 I'm describing is more -- is kind of a housekeeping
17 thing to make sure that we continue to review these
18 things so they just don't kind of flounder and nothing
19 happens with them, but it doesn't preclude the public
20 or other agencies from submitting proposals to change
21 regulations if so needed.

22
23 MR. OWEN: So, Mr. Chairman, I'm also
24 interested in the roll that of the in-season manager in
25 the things being described here, if I could hear from
26 Staff.

27
28 MR. MCKEE: Well, there are a variety
29 of delegation of authority letters for in-season
30 managers to, you know, close seasons or make sex
31 restrictions, closures to various users. There's -- I
32 can't remember off the top of my head how many
33 delegation of authority letters we have for wildlife
34 but there's quite a few of them. So.

35
36 MR. OWEN: So the change being proposed
37 here would not in any way affect the authority of the
38 in-season manager?

39
40 MR. MCKEE: No. We're not -- we're not
41 making any, again, if there was some change to the
42 scope of delegation, that was something that would be
43 done by this Board, it wouldn't be OSM that would do
44 it.

45
46 MR. OWEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank
47 you, Staff.

48
49 MR. DOOLITTLE: And just a point --
50

1 this is Tom Doolittle, Deputy Assistant Regional
2 Director for OSM. And just a point of clarification to
3 Chris, it's on the temporary emergency special actions,
4 since they're short-lived, this is only for the
5 permanent proposed regulations.

6
7 MR. MCKEE: Correct. I mean there's
8 still nothing to preclude people from putting in
9 special actions if the conditions warrant as well.

10
11 MR. SIEKANIEC: I think I'm pretty well
12 following this, but you said something earlier about
13 you thought this would help reduce Staff load, but it
14 looks like you're going to be -- or not Staff load, but
15 it would take some pressure off of some of the work
16 that was required but it feels like you're adding into
17 a cycle again some additional work and is that going to
18 cause an issue, I guess?

19
20 MR. MCKEE: It -- I'm really not --
21 we're really not adding any additional work because
22 we're already doing closure reviews and we're bringing
23 them before the Councils at the beginning of the
24 wildlife cycle, the call for proposals goes out in
25 January 2019. For instance, we would have, already, if
26 we don't change anything would be bringing up the
27 proposals that we reviewed three years previous. We
28 might have a few more proposals to do but from a
29 realistic standpoint it's really not any additional
30 burden on Staff. What really -- what really this will
31 do is bring it a little bit more forward in the public
32 process and more than will come up more often but it --
33 I mean, I have, you know, four biologists on my Staff,
34 I don't see it being a burden on them at all.

35
36 MR. SIEKANIEC: Okay. So it doesn't
37 jam it all into one.....

38
39 MR. MCKEE: No.

40
41 MR. SIEKANIEC:year in any.....

42
43 MR. MCKEE: No.

44
45 MR. SIEKANIEC:way that hurts it.
46 Excuse me. One more, Mr. Chair.

47
48 So you also described that in the past
49 we have not -- or the process hasn't worked the way
50

1 that, I guess, it was laid out in the policy, it
2 stopped kind of at the Regional Advisory Committee
3 level and.....

4
5 MR. MCKEE: Correct.

6
7 MR. SIEKANIEC:they have actually
8 instituted closures or openings, I guess I'm.....

9
10 MR. MCKEE: They have either -- so when
11 we do a closure review -- I should have -- I wish I had
12 an example of a closure review analysis for you to take
13 a look at it. Our conclusion at the RAC meetings are
14 -- there's three possible conclusions, either rescind
15 the closure, status quo, that is, keep the closure in
16 place or some kind of modification in between, that's
17 what we present to the Councils. In the past, the
18 Councils have either made a decision to do nothing and
19 maintain the status quo or put in a proposal to open up
20 a closure or something in between. I've never seen
21 something in between, I've never seen a modification of
22 that, but that's where it's ended, in the time I've
23 been with the program, since 2011. We haven't brought
24 them before the Board. And, of course, the Board has
25 never submitted proposals to open up closures.

26
27 MR. SIEKANIEC: Okay. Okay. That was
28 my next question. So no proposal has ever been made
29 that needed to come to the Board?

30
31 MR. MCKEE: I would have to look back
32 in the past to see that but off the top of my head, in
33 the time I've been here I can't think of something
34 where the Council has brought some proposal before the
35 Board for them -- a closure opening for them to do, but
36 that's still an option.

37
38 And, again, this would -- this would
39 allow more of them to come up on -- during a given
40 wildlife or -- and I'm also speaking of fisheries
41 closure reviews as well, I'm just speaking wildlife
42 because that's what I know, but that would allow more
43 of them to come up for a review in any given cycle and --
44 and then for us to be able to review them before the
45 Board at the cycle, it would be in a much more broad
46 public meeting, it would make them -- you know, those
47 closures kind of more aware to folks, rather than just
48 kind of existing in regula -- I mean they're there for
49 everybody to see in the regulation but I don't think a
50

1 lot of people go and look at the CFR. I mean I do but
2 I get paid to do it, so.

3

4

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Wayne.

5

6

7

MR. OWEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Point
of clarification. Did I hear -- I'm curious to how
many closures are there existing, I thought I heard you
say 30-something, but.....

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. MCKEE: Yeah, I would -- I have a --
I have my closure review table, an older version of
them that I have to kind of keep track of it, and I
would say off the -- off the top of my head I would say
-- and we -- and this is the wildlife side, I can't
speak to the fisheries side, I think we have somewhere
around 30 closures.

MS. HARDING: It's in your book.

MR. MCKEE: Oh, it is.

MS. HARDING: The tables in your book,
Section 4, page 7.

MR. MCKEE: But, again, they've come up
-- you know, we haven't always done a third of them
every year. I have a feeling that we might have done a
third of them at the beginning of this policy but,
again, that was years before I started, just because of
the way it -- the way the process has happened, we've
had some come up in proposals and that's restarted the
clock and it's just -- between that and, you know,
changing to a biennial cycle and doing reviews every
three years it's kind of led to this staggered process,
which has gotten quite messy so -- and, again, in other
cases that we've had I've had Staff start a review
analysis, complete it and then it just kind of lies
there in the files for a year before we can bring it to
the Councils unless there's some other new biological
information. So if we did it this way, Staff will be
finishing them and have the latest data and be
available for the Board in a more timely manner.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Bert.

MR. FROST: Thanks. So I got confused.
When you're talking about when you bring them to the
Councils, the RACs, they can't open or close, they can

1 just recommend to the Board, right, so when you say
2 that -- so you have a closure in place, it comes up for
3 review for some reason, they say we want to keep the
4 status quo, then that never moves forward to the Board;
5 is that correct?

6
7 MR. MCKEE: Now, that -- and, again,
8 that's -- I mean I see that as kind of the way -- it
9 keep -- yes, that's correct, and so nothing happens.

10
11 MR. FROST: So nothing happens.

12
13 MR. MCKEE: Yeah, and nobody's really
14 made aware of it unless they go to a Council meeting.
15 And so, again, even if the Board -- even if a Council
16 was to say, no, we don't want to change anything, under
17 -- what I'm asking the Board to change is that we would
18 still bring those closure reviews before the Board to
19 make you aware that they're there and.....

20
21 MR. FROST: So we.....

22
23 MR. MCKEE:that this is how the
24 Council's came down on them.

25
26 MR. FROST: So we could sort of --
27 what's the word I'm looking for, sort of reemphasize
28 it, we still think this closure is appropriate or -- or
29 not, whatever the.....

30
31 MR. MCKEE: Correct. And your
32 reasoning and rationale will be on the record and --
33 and the public will be made aware of it at the meeting
34 and, again, on -- on the record so.....

35
36 MR. FROST: Okay, thanks.

37
38 MR. MCKEE:I think it's -- and it
39 would be up to the Council -- the Councils would have
40 to submit a proposal. I mean we wouldn't -- we would
41 help them generate a proposal if they wanted to open --
42 or to make some change but it would still be generated
43 by the -- by the Councils themselves. Or if a member
44 of the public was at a RAC meeting and said, boy, I
45 think this should be open they can submit that as well.

46
47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any additional
48 questions.

49
50

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I think we
4 might need to make a motion if we're going to change
5 the policy here.

6

7 (Pause)

8

9 MR. MCKEE: Just really quickly. I
10 mean I see this -- based on what I put before you,
11 you'd have two options. You can either keep things the
12 way they are, you can have us review all of them every
13 four years, or do half of them every four years.

14

15 So just to review the options.

16

17 (Pause)

18

19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The floor is
20 open.

21

22 MS. MOURITSEN: Well, now -- now I need
23 to clarify. So the paper here where you had the
24 following suggested changes, number 1 is -- there's
25 number 1, which is review them all every four years and
26 number 2 is do half every four years on the two year
27 staggered cycle. That's two different options or
28 that's -- is number 2 a subset of number 1?

29

30 MR. MCKEE: No, they're two different
31 options.

32

33 MS. MOURITSEN: Oh.

34

35 MR. MCKEE: So we do all -- we bring --
36 and I'll give you a real world scenario.

37

38 Number 1, we would -- we'd -- the next
39 wildlife cycle in 2019 we would bring -- we would do
40 all the closure reviews, bring them all before the
41 affected Councils, and.....

42

43 MS. MOURITSEN: And.....

44

45 MR. MCKEE:and again we'd do it
46 again in 2023.

47

48 MS. MOURITSEN: Okay.

49

50

1 MR. MCKEE: Option 2, we do half of
2 them and, you know.

3
4 MS. MOURITSEN: And then number 3, on
5 your list, which is where you're talking about you or
6 your Staff would come and present them, that is
7 regardless of whether we decide to do all of them all
8 at once or on the two year staggered?

9
10 MR. MCKEE: Correct. I have that.....

11
12 MS. MOURITSEN: Okay. Okay.

13
14 MR. MCKEE:as kind of number 3.
15 It might be a little confus -- it looks as if -- it
16 reads as if I'm saying something -- oh, this is another
17 option.....

18
19 MS. MOURITSEN: Uh-huh.

20
21 MR. MCKEE:but really what I'm
22 doing is reemphasizing what the original policy what we
23 said we'd be doing anyway. It just -- it was -- it was
24 a little more vague, it said it would be reviewed by
25 the Board and there was really no indication further
26 what that meant. So number 3 is really.....

27
28 MS. MOURITSEN: Uh-huh.

29
30 MR. MCKEE:just reemphasizing the
31 fact that we would still bring them before the Board
32 what -- whatever closure reviews.....

33
34 MS. MOURITSEN: Yeah.

35
36 MR. MCKEE:we did at the
37 appropriate regulatory cycle for either fisheries or
38 wildlife and it's more just to infor -- information so
39 you know where the area was, what species and how the
40 Councils came down on it and it would give the
41 opportunity for the Board to -- to give their input on
42 that closure for that species and area.

43
44 MS. MOURITSEN: Mr. Chairman. I would
45 make a motion that we adopt this policy change to
46 review these closures on a four year cycle and that we
47 adopt -- we do it, you know, on a staggered four year
48 cycle, so -- so that's number -- which is option number
49 2 on the paper.

50

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion on the
2 floor to support the recommendation by Staff to stagger
3 the closures on a two year basis.

4
5 MR. BROWER: Second.

6
7 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The motion's
8 been seconded.

9
10 Any discussion.

11
12 (No comments)

13
14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any opposition
15 to the motion.

16
17 (No comments)

18
19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
20 motion carries.

21
22 With that we're moving on to number 7,
23 2017 Regional Council appointment vetting and charter
24 revisions so we'll call up Carl Johnson at this time.

25
26 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
27 Members of the Board. And thank you for this
28 opportunity. My name's Carl Johnson. I'm the Council
29 Coordination Division Chief for the Office of
30 Subsistence Management. And what I'll be discussing is
31 in Section 5 of your materials.

32
33 Both of these subjects are very
34 different so I'm going to cover each of them
35 separately, give the Board opportunities to question
36 and discuss each one but they both start with the
37 charters so that's where I'll start, is with the
38 charter revisions.

39
40 Now, the Federal Advisory Committee Act
41 requires that all Federal Advisory Committees renew
42 their charters every two years. So for this program,
43 that means the Regional Advisory Councils, are renewing
44 their charters every two years on the odd number years.
45 So we just had new charters signed and adopted by the
46 Secretary on December 2017.

47
48 Now, the most relevant part of the
49 charter revision is in paragraph four, description of
50

1 duties found in the charter. Now, prior to this new
2 charter revision, the description of duties were based
3 exclusively on language found in Section .805 of ANILCA
4 and then also in the Secretarial regulations, paragraph
5 .11 for DOI regulations, that's 50 CFR 100, for
6 Agriculture regulations, that's 36 CFR 242. And
7 paragraphs A through E were the language that was
8 derived from .805 and paragraphs F through H are from
9 those secretarial regulations.

10

11 A new addition that was made this year
12 begins with Paragraph I. Paragraph I relates to two
13 Secretarial orders issued by the Secretary last year
14 pertaining to enhancing opportunities for recreational
15 activities on Federal public lands, and then Paragraph
16 J relates to a series of Executive Orders going back to
17 the Clinton Administration related to essentially
18 efficiency. Government efficiency and, you know, work
19 force distribution, organizational efficiency.

20

21 And so the reason why your InterAgency
22 Staff Committee wanted this to be brought to your
23 attention is the addition of these new provisions are
24 not derived from the authority for this Board or the
25 Regional Advisory Councils but from external
26 authorities. And there is some caveat language at the
27 beginning of paragraph four, you'll note that it says,
28 Council duties and responsibilities, where applicable,
29 are as follows. So the, where applicable, is new
30 language inserted in reference to these new provisions,
31 Paragraph I and Paragraph J.

32

33 And I will just stop at that. I'm sure
34 the Board has a variety of questions and I'll let the
35 questions kind of lead the discussion further on this
36 particular point.

37

38 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
39 Carl. Any questions for Carl in regards to the
40 charter.

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And I think he
45 noted that there was an addition, I.

46

47 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, so Paragraph I and
48 J are the two new paragraphs that are part of the
49 Regional Advisory Council charters and I was informed

50

1 by my contacts in D.C., that this is not going to be
2 unique to the Regional Advisory Councils, this language
3 is going to be inserted into all Department of Interior
4 FACA committees. So any other Alaska FACA committees,
5 for example, BLM has some, Park Service Subsistence
6 Resource Commissions, this language will also be
7 inserted into their charters when they are next
8 renewed.

9

10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg.

11

12 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
13 Carl, could -- have you given any thought to so what
14 does this mean in regards to the subsistence program
15 when we suddenly start talking about outdoor
16 recreation, hunting, fishing, recreational shooting, I
17 mean that's not normally a subsistence perspective that
18 this Board sort of deals with or applies. Is that what
19 you're trying to get at when you said as applicable?
20 Is that what you're -- the language you're using that
21 would allow us to have the opportunity to stand up and
22 say we have nothing to report on some of these, our
23 activities did not generate these types of
24 opportunities, am I anywhere close to thinking about
25 this right?

26

27 MR. JOHNSON: Through the Chair. Thank
28 you, Mr. Siekaniec. I think it's worth noting that's
29 -- that's a very valid point. Both of these
30 Secretarial Orders, there is a provision where the
31 orders cite the statutory authority behind the orders.
32 I think it's worth noting that neither of these
33 Secretarial Orders cite the Alaska National Interest
34 Lands Conservation Act as authority relating to their
35 activities. So given that we are a law based,
36 regulatory based program, the activities that the
37 Regional Advisory Councils should be following would be
38 those that are in the law that created them, which is
39 ANILCA. I'm not certain it would be even appropriate
40 for the Regional Advisory Councils to engage in
41 anything related to Paragraphs I or J. I think that's
42 where the, where applicable, language is and that is
43 that's an instruction from, and, again, I can only
44 guess, because the explanations have been very vague on
45 the insertion, but that is -- would be then for the
46 FACA committees themselves to determine whether or not
47 that language is applicable to their authorized duties
48 and responsibilities.

49

50

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Rhonda.

2

3 MS. PITKA: So then the Regional
4 Advisory Councils will not have to do infrastructure or
5 energy transmission? That is -- okay.

6

7 MR. JOHNSON: Through the Chair. Ms.
8 Pitka. Yes, I think since Regional Advisory Councils
9 were created by Congress, and, thus far, Congress has
10 not yet given them directive to engage in those
11 activities, that would be, I think, a correct
12 assessment.

13

14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other
15 questions for Carl.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Statements.

20

21 Bert.

22

23 MR. FROST: Yeah, I got a question for
24 Ken.

25

26 (Laughter)

27

28 MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Solicitor.

29

30 (Laughter)

31

32 MR. LORD: I was trying to stay under
33 the radar here today.

34

35 MR. FROST: I mean, you know, I don't
36 know how these charters were created originally but I'm
37 just wondering, things come and go -- well, I think you
38 said charters remain pretty static, but I assume things
39 have come and gone over the years and I guess does this
40 -- does this -- I guess in terms of a legal precedence,
41 what sort of just sort of this being mandated to put
42 into the charter, does that put the -- is there any
43 risk there, is there any legal worries?

44

45 MR. LORD: Bert, thanks for asking
46 that. No, I -- Carl sent this to me when it first came
47 out and we reviewed it pretty carefully. It doesn't
48 change anything -- as far as I can tell, it doesn't
49 change how the Councils do business, it doesn't -- it's

50

1 really just not applicable to this program. And like
2 Carl said, it's going into all the FACA charters
3 nationwide, we don't have any say in it, so, no, I'm
4 not concerned about it at all.

5
6 There are -- okay, but you asked --
7 part of your question was about changes to the
8 charters. Only on very rare occasions have we changed
9 charters, such as when we increased membership in the
10 charters -- or in the RACs to include sport and
11 commercial users, but it's not common that we change
12 them from one cycle to the next.

13
14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg.

15
16 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
17 So, Ken, on that statement with -- I'm still trying to
18 get myself back in when it comes time to report on an
19 annual basis on activities, are we going to intend to
20 report not applicable because of our affiliation --
21 legal obligation under ANILCA, or are we going to look
22 through these and say, oh, well, we did do some things
23 that created greater collaboration with states, tribes,
24 and/or territories because of our activities with the,
25 you know, InterTribal Fish Commission, or the Yukon
26 Panel or the, you know, Ninilchik Traditional Council;
27 how do you -- yes, maybe, or do we just stay silent and
28 say this really is not applicable because we operate
29 under ANILCA.

30
31 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, I'd like to
32 take a first stab at that.

33
34 A lot of those activities the Regional
35 Advisory Councils already engage in, are a part of
36 their existing mandate under Section .805. Section
37 .805 has some pretty broad language about the Councils
38 being a public forum for discussion of subsistence
39 issues, they give recommendations on management plans
40 and as part of their regular process where they engage
41 in discussion on regulatory proposals. They invite
42 discussion with tribal governments, Alaska Native
43 entities, and also State and Federal agencies. So
44 their current mandate includes those activities.

45
46 So I would not say that reporting them
47 would have anything related to the new language but
48 their existing mandate.

49
50

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Bert.

2
3 MR. FROST: Have the RACs seen this
4 and have the RACs, what are the RACs perspectives on
5 this, I guess would be -- I'd be interested to hear?

6
7 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. Through the
8 Chair. Thank you, Mr. Frost. There was one North
9 Slope -- yes, all the RACs are seeing this. We always
10 include the charter in the Regional Advisory Council
11 meeting books, so it's always there for the public to
12 see what the Council's mandate is. I will note that
13 there was -- at the North Slope Regional Advisory
14 Council, one Council member on the record threatened to
15 resign over this language because he thought it was
16 inappropriate for the missions of the Council. But
17 other than that I haven't heard any specific response
18 or reaction.

19
20 MS. PITKA: So the consequence of not
21 having this language included in the charters, that's
22 been mandated, is that the Regional Advisory Councils
23 would not be chartered, right, they would cease to
24 exist; is that right?

25
26 MR. JOHNSON: Well, technically --
27 through the Chair. The Federal Advisory Committee Act
28 would prohibit them from operating without a renewed
29 charter. So that wasn't really something that was ever
30 under consideration.

31
32 Certainly we would have -- had we were
33 given more time to respond to it, would have perhaps
34 tried to discuss with personnel at the appropriate
35 level, as to whether or not it was appropriate for our
36 charters, but we found out that the language -- like
37 within a week or so before the charters were to be
38 issued. So that's -- I think probably possibly some of
39 the main challenges, despite the where applicable
40 language, in this new charter provisions, is, some
41 confusion with the Councils over whether or not their
42 obligations will include these, but also the public
43 itself also wondering then whether or not these are
44 things that should be discussed at the Council
45 meetings. So my suggestion would just be that as a
46 program we consistently message to the Councils the
47 role of this new language in their operations.

48
49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, Lynn and

50

1 then Greg.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. POLACCA: I guess more clarification then, you know, I guess with this where applicable for the I and J, is that going to be a decision that's going to be left up to each individual RAC to make that or is there going to be any kind of guidance going down from here, is that needed, from the Board?

MR. JOHNSON: Through the Chair. Thank you, that is an excellent question. I would not leave that up to the individual Regional Advisory Councils. I think it should be a consistent message and I think the best place for that message would be to come from the Federal Subsistence Board. Since the Regional Advisory Councils report to the Board, it should be the Board communicating to the Councils what their duties and responsibilities are.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So now I think we're getting to where I've been trying to get at, you answer a couple of questions ago, the Regional Advisory committees already report, do they report under what you could read in here and say yes the Regional Advisory committee supported something that allowed or promoted a greater collaboration with states already, or I think Lynn got to the point, or do we need to provide them with that type of guidance so that we can report back under some of these. Because, you know, I know this Secretary, he's going to want to see us reporting back relative to this new language in the charter.

MR. JOHNSON: Through the Chair. Again, I think the problem -- I think the program and the Board has to decide whether or not this language is applicable to the Regional Advisory Councils. Because, again, the way it was described to me by the folks in D.C., is the where applicable language is what determines based on the, whether it's a discretionary or statutory mandate of the applicable FACA committee, whether or not they will be participating in those new provisions and what they require. So I don't think that the existing legal authority that guides the Regional Advisory Councils from either Secretarial regulations or ANILCA provide direction for them to

1 participate in Paragraphs I and J, and, therefore,
2 would not be applicable for this discretionary language
3 that was added at Paragraph 4.

4
5 MS. MOURITSEN: I guess I -- Mr.
6 Chairman. I guess I have maybe a -- a little more
7 nuance to view of how we ought to address this because
8 these things are very important to our Secretary and
9 our Administration and there's aspects within these
10 Secretarial orders that are applicable and I know, what
11 I've learned so far, this Board, and this OSM and the
12 RACs and everyone are doing, so I think we should
13 message -- we need to be very careful about our
14 message, but it should be something along the lines of
15 we have this mission that's described before this in
16 this charter and that there are -- message that there
17 are some aspects of these Secretarial orders that are
18 consistent with our mission and we're going to -- to
19 the extent they're consistent certainly try to do these
20 things, like increasing outreach to tribal governments.
21 But I don't think we -- I think we should think very
22 carefully before we just say, sorry, Mr. Secretary,
23 we're going to ignore these certain sections.

24
25 I'm not saying do things that aren't
26 within our authority, of course, I don't want us to do
27 that, but that's my observation.

28
29 MR. DOOLITTLE: I'm Tom Doolittle,
30 Deputy Assistant Regional Director for OSM. Thank you,
31 Mr. Chair.

32
33 Ken, if you could weigh in, it just
34 seems that the lens of ANILCA is the applicability for
35 what the program operations go under. ANILCA wasn't
36 specifically mentioned relative to the Secretarial
37 order, but that seems like what we could do, under that
38 lens, where applicable, may be a direction of
39 consideration.

40
41 And that's kind of a question to you,
42 also, Ken.

43
44 MR. LORD: Yeah. Well, yeah -- sure.
45 The RACs functions are driven by that lens. But I hear
46 what Greg and Karen are saying, in that, when we do
47 have situations where something might fit into one of
48 these categories, maybe -- I don't know, Carol, if
49 you've thought about how we would report back, but I
50

1 wonder if that could just be paragraph in the annual
2 reports from the, you know, from the Councils to the
3 Secretary -- or to the Board and the Secretaries about,
4 you know, anything they might have done that sort of
5 fits these categories.

6
7 MR. JOHNSON: Through the Chair. I
8 think given the current reporting systems that are in
9 place, the location -- the place that would make the
10 most sense to make this report back would actually be
11 in the FACA database. The FACA database, which is
12 administered by GSA has certain fields where the
13 Councils describe activities at their meetings, what
14 kind of recommendations they've made to their agency
15 that they report to. So it would make sense to enter a
16 field into the FACA database that says, please state
17 activities that were in support of Secretarial Order,
18 Paragraph I, and then please state activities that
19 relate to Paragraph J of these various executive orders
20 and then so there could be places where under Paragraph
21 I, just based on the Title VIII mandates where we say,
22 you know, the RAC -- the Council engaged in these
23 activities that are supportive of Secretarial orders
24 and then most likely I can't really conceive of any
25 under Paragraph J and then there you would just enter
26 in that field, not applicable.

27
28 But that would make the sense.

29
30 But I have no idea if that is what
31 they're planning on doing. I certainly have not been
32 given any directive from D.C., as to how to report
33 back.

34
35 I wouldn't think the annual reports
36 would be a good way of communicating that information
37 because the annual reports stop with the Federal
38 Subsistence Board. They don't go to the Secretary.
39 The Secretary has delegated to receive those reports to
40 the Board on the Secretary's behalf.

41
42 MS. MOURITSEN: Thank you. Mr.
43 Chairman. Or the Board, I have a question, does the
44 Board, itself, ever do some kind of summary report of
45 all the great things the Board and this Program has
46 done over a certain period of time and, if so, some of
47 this could be discussed -- all the good things are done
48 through these RACs could be discussed, including some
49 of the things that might be also applicable under these

50

1 orders.

2

3 I don't know if there's some kind of
4 annual or a periodic report.

5

6 Well, I was wondering, is there
7 something that even goes wider than a FACA database,
8 something that goes to the public that, you know, just
9 the interested public could see all the great and
10 interesting things this program does.

11

12 Maybe we should have something like
13 that.

14

15 MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, I think one
16 thing, too, as far as annual reporting from the RACs
17 are a good -- are a venue that are provided to the
18 Board from each RAC. And so in the annual reporting
19 structure, is reminding of what aspects the RACs may
20 address and that annual report may be a relevant way of
21 getting that information to the Board and something
22 that is also a piece of public information, as a matter
23 of public record.

24

25 MS. PITKA: As far as I know the
26 Regional Advisory Councils structure their own reports
27 because it's the direct link to the Board. It's the
28 direct link that doesn't go through regulation or
29 proposal, so that's the way that they're able to
30 communicate those things that aren't in those other two
31 venues to the Board.

32

33 And I do know that this Program has
34 quite the public relations campaign so a lot of this
35 stuff does go out to the public.

36

37 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg.

38

39 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
40 So I'm just kind of looking at this and I get down to
41 the end of J, and it's statement is at the conclusion
42 of each meeting or shortly thereafter provide a
43 detailed recommendation meeting report, including
44 meeting minutes to the designated Federal Officer. Are
45 -- again, I'm a little reluctant to use the, yeah,
46 that's not applicable, knowing this Administration and
47 this Secretary and their keen interest on, you know,
48 they gave us guidance like this because they expect us
49 to be looking at it and figuring out a way how we

50

1 interact with them in some manner.

2

3 You know that seems to be getting
4 pretty pointed.

5

6 MR. JOHNSON: Through the Chair. So
7 that actually relates to there was a -- well, I'll back
8 up just for a second. So one of the things we do
9 internally, at OSM, is at the conclusion of each
10 meeting, the leadership team representative creates a
11 summary report of the Council meeting activities. And
12 it's circulated within OSM and then also to the
13 InterAgency Staff Committee, to just kind of give a
14 highlight of what action items were taken. So this is
15 a practice we've already had internally for some time.

16

17 Now, before the institution of this new
18 charter, and as part of this FACA review process the
19 DOI underwent last year, they provided us a new form
20 that's called a FACA meeting summary and it has
21 specific fields of information they want provided to
22 them and then the DFO, Designated Federal Official,
23 which in our program, is the Council coordinators, then
24 had to transmit that to D.C., within 30 days. Now, at
25 the time we were told that this was just a one time
26 thing, we're doing this because we're finishing up this
27 FACA review. When I saw this new language you just
28 cited in the new charters, when they came out, I
29 contacted my contacts at D.C., and I said, so this
30 report that's referenced at the end of Paragraph J, is
31 this new FACA meeting summary form you gave us and she
32 said yes. So essentially all it is -- and the ironic
33 thing is it's information that's already reported via
34 the FACA database, but the answer was well, they just
35 wanted it in an easier accessible form. So we have
36 this new FACA meeting summary form that essentially
37 captures in a different format information we have
38 already collected internally.

39

40 The other thing I'll note in this
41 language that you cited, that contradicts our standard
42 practice, it's not the Regional Advisory Councils that
43 provide the meeting minutes to the DFO, contrary to
44 this language, actually it's the DFO that creates the
45 meeting minutes. So I just want to clarify that
46 contrary to this Charter directive, that's actually one
47 of the Staff functions of the DFO, and one of their
48 responsibilities in maintaining an administrative
49 record under FACA is to create those meeting minutes.

50

1 So the charter is kind of conflicting a little bit, or
2 confusing a little bit that part of FACA mandates for
3 DFO.

4
5 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Wayne.

6
7 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair. I'm a little
8 confused at this point. Are we going to come to a
9 decision and a vote on this or is this an information.

10
11 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Information.

12
13 MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair. Well, I
14 have a question, so we're a FACA Council.

15
16 MR. LORD: No.

17
18 MR. SIEKANIEC: We're not?

19
20 MR. LORD: We're not.

21
22 MR. SIEKANIEC: So the appointments of
23 our public members don't create a FACA?

24
25 MR. LORD: Correct.

26
27 MR. SIEKANIEC: Okay, good.

28
29 MR. LORD: They're hired as
30 special.....

31
32 REPORTER: Turn your mic on Ken.

33
34 MS. PITKA: Your mic.

35
36 MR. LORD: Our public members are hired
37 as special government employees.

38
39 MR. SIEKANIEC: Very good.

40
41 MR. LORD: And that solves that
42 problem.

43
44 MS. PITKA: We're appointed. We're
45 appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, with
46 concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture.

47
48 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Bert.

49
50

1 MR. FROST: But going to Karen and
2 Greg's point, doesn't matter who creates the report, if
3 it's the one new pager or what, we should make a point
4 that if things are talked about in the RAC meeting that
5 fulfill actions that are in these issues we ought to
6 highlight those for our benefit and for the benefit of
7 the department so they understand how our work
8 interacts with their priorities. I would suggest.

9
10 MR. SIEKANIEC: Uh-huh.

11
12 MR. FROST: And maybe we need, as a
13 Board, need to give direction to the RAC coordinators
14 or however we do that, that needs to begin as a result
15 of the insertion of this language in the new charters.

16
17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: My idea that
18 would be, if we don't close anything. I don't know
19 what activity the RAC would take that would fit into
20 that but if we keep that opportunity open I guess
21 that's an activity by the RAC that keeps it available?

22
23 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. And Mr.
24 Siekaniec, I think in order to satisfy the Secretary's
25 goals on adding this charter language, again, like I
26 suggested earlier, in this new FACA meeting summary, we
27 can just say, you know, the Council engaged in the
28 following activities that benefit Secretary Order 3347
29 and 3356: Boom, and then just list those activities.

30
31 Again, I really -- I can't conceive of
32 what normal RAC activities would benefit Paragraph J
33 because it's not the role of the Regional Advisory
34 Councils to make staffing recommendations, to tell OSM
35 how to cut costs. In fact, the Councils want us to
36 spend more money, not less, but we could do that.

37
38 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Karen.

39
40 MS. MOURITSEN: I'm probably beating a
41 dead horse here, but to keep beating it, I think that
42 what the RACs are doing do satisfy this. They're
43 talking about the most efficient and effective way to
44 regulate subsistence hunting or subsistence fishing,
45 and they're talking about somebody has a proposal,
46 they'll do it a different way, a better way, they talk
47 about it, that's what this -- the order is telling us
48 to do, find a better -- talk about if there is a better
49 way to do your regulations. And if you look at it like

50

1 that, they're already doing it, and more power to them.

2

3

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg.

4

5

6 MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair. So the
7 question, I think, is fair, do we, as a Board, give
8 guidance to Tom here and say we expect to see, you
9 know, in your report that you described, Carl, you
10 know, an opportunity to make sure that they note, where
11 appropriate, how they're meeting these two paragraphs
12 that have been inserted.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, that
sounds reasonable, so I think that's just direction to
Staff at this point to make sure we meet the obligation
in the charter to report out those activities that are
relevant to I and J, period.

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

Thank you, guys.

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. JOHNSON: And, thank you. And,
again, really a big part of this -- I think it was
important that we have a consistent directive from the
Board on the Councils on this issue, however they
wanted to go.

So this brings us to the second points,
which was the vetting of nominees that were presented
by the Board last year as part of the 2017 cycle and it
kind of relates to a point that Ms. Pitka was just
saying about how she's appointed.

Now, I'm going to bring you back to the
charters again, and the provision of the charter
related to membership. Now, towards the end there's
language in the Council's charter that says a vacancy
on the Council will be filled in the same manner in
which the original appointment was made. Which then
kind of ties us into your regulations a little bit
again. The Secretary has delegated to the Federal
Subsistence Board to make nominations to the Secretary.
There are requirements in the regulations that say you
have to be knowledgeable of, you know, subsistence
resources and uses in the region and the Board has
adopted five points -- five different criteria that the
Board uses to evaluate whether or not somebody is
qualified under that Secretarial regulatory directive.

They are knowledgeable of fish and

1 wildlife resources in their region.

2

3 They're knowledgeable both of
4 subsistence uses and commercial sport uses. And this
5 is regardless of whether they are a subsistence or a
6 commercial sport use applicant.

7

8 They express good communication skills
9 and good leadership.

10

11 And the Board, using those criteria,
12 makes its recommendations to the Secretary and then
13 consistent with what Ms. Pitka just said, the
14 regulations also state that the Secretary of the
15 Interior will make appointments with the concurrence of
16 the Secretary of Agriculture. And for that program,
17 that latter authority has been delegated to the
18 Regional Forester, who, each year, prior to
19 transmitting our nominations packet to D.C., for
20 consideration, it is sent to the Regional Forester and
21 we get a written concurrence from the Regional Forester
22 on that package.

23

24 Now, from then, aside from those five
25 criteria that the Board deems important for
26 qualifications, the Secretary of Interior, through his
27 White House liaison, does vetting, and they look at,
28 you know, backgrounds and other factors that are
29 related to that person and see if they're appropriate
30 for appointment to a Council, you know, with their name
31 on a Secretarial appointment letter.

32

33 Now, prior to 2017, during a five year
34 period, we only lost one incumbent to that vetting
35 process, and that was in 2014, one of the names that
36 was forwarded to the Secretary for appointment, who was
37 an incumbent, was -- failed the vetting process and was
38 not reappointed. So during a five year period we had
39 one incumbent lost to vetting.

40

41 In 2017 we had six incumbents who were
42 not reappointed due to the vetting results. Four in
43 the Yukon Delta Council, and 2 in the Northwest Arctic
44 Council.

45

46 Now, unfortunately the way the vetting
47 process works, as you all understand, we are never
48 explained as to why somebody is not reappointed through
49 the vetting process. And we really don't have any

50

1 means of kind of cross-referencing that ourselves, you
2 know, looking into databases and see what might show
3 up.

4
5 So, again, your InterAgency Staff
6 Committee wanted you to be aware of this. Don't know
7 what there is to do about it, but just to bring it to
8 your attention.

9
10 I'll answer any questions if the Board
11 has any.

12
13 MR. BROWER: Just a question. So when
14 there's evaluation, do they do a background check on
15 these nominees and stuff, that's why some of them don't
16 get reappointed for one reason or another?

17
18 MR. JOHNSON: That is correct. Through
19 the Chair. Mr. Brower. Yes. And we do let nominees
20 or applicants know that this is part of the process.
21 We do have a two page info flier that combines a
22 description of both the responsibilities and duties of
23 Regional Advisory Councils and all evaluation process,
24 the nominations panels, the ISC, the Board, going to
25 D.C., and the D.C., will do background checks. We also
26 let them know it's a confidential process so that, you
27 know, nobody will know that they're applying or nobody
28 will know why, you know, they didn't get appointed.

29
30 So people do know that and that is
31 definitely a part of the process.

32
33 MR. BROWER: Thank you.

34
35 MR. FROST: So those -- did you have
36 alternatives in the background, so are those positions
37 vacant or what's going to happen with those positions
38 that didn't get reappointed.

39
40 MR. JOHNSON: That's an excellent
41 question. Through the Chair. Mr. Frost.

42
43 So we always try to send -- we call
44 them alternates, although they're not appointed as
45 alternates, but they're alternates for purposes of
46 vetting. So if we have four vacancies and six highly
47 qualified applicants, we'll submit four names as the
48 primaries and then two names as alternates in the hopes
49 that if somebody on the primary list fails vetting

50

1 process, at least one of those two or both of them in
2 the alternate list will make it. However, in both
3 cases, for both of these Councils there was an
4 insufficient number of alternates to make any of the
5 vacancies. So currently we have two vacancies on the
6 Northwest Arctic Council and five vacancies on the 13
7 member YK Delta Council. One of those vacancies is
8 related to a Council member who just recently moved out
9 of region, but four of them are related to the vetting.
10 Because we had only a sufficient number of seats -- a
11 number of applicants for the number of seats, and part
12 of that is also the result of Mr. Roczicka dying last
13 year, his seat was an additional vacancy, we didn't
14 have enough applications beyond that to fill those
15 seats.

16
17 MR. FROST: So do those get reappointed
18 in the next cycle or do they stay vacant for a period
19 of two or three years until the -- I mean how does -- I
20 mean so is it the next year that they get -- do they
21 come up for reappointment in the next year because
22 they're vacant or do they have to wait for three years
23 when their cycle comes up again.

24
25 MR. JOHNSON: Good question, again.
26 Through the Chair. Mr. Frost.

27
28 So that brings us back to that charter
29 language, vacancies will be filled in the same manner
30 in which an appointment is made. So in this case, the
31 next available appointment process will fill that
32 vacancy with, among the available pool of applicants.
33 So in this case, we have I think it's eight or nine
34 seats that we have to fill for the YK Delta Council,
35 that's a combination of these vacant seats plus those
36 other terms that were expiring in 2018. Right now I
37 think we have 15 applicants so hopefully there'll be
38 enough to get us there, but we still run into the
39 problem of even though we may have 15 applicants for
40 that Council, the ISC and the Board, through its own
41 internal process might deem some of them not qualified.
42 Because under your criteria, if an applicant is not
43 qualified in any one of the five categories they're not
44 qualified, period.

45
46 And I think that's a wise choice. I
47 think it's good to have vacant seats rather than
48 unqualified applicants in the seats.

49
50

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any more
2 discussion or questions for Carl.

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Carl
7 for your presentation.

8
9 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Carl.

10
11 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

12
13 MS. PITKA: I'm sorry, Carl, I just had
14 a quick question. So does this affect operation of the
15 Regional Advisory Councils by bringing the number from
16 13 down to 8, does it affect the geographic diversity
17 of that Council, and will it affect their ability to
18 conduct business, like voting, like having a quorum?

19
20 MR. JOHNSON: Through the Chair.
21 Again, excellent questions, Ms. Pitka. So to your
22 latter question, it doesn't affect quorum. Quorum is
23 based on the number of actually appointed seats, not
24 the number of seats available. So in this case, you
25 know, the YK Delta Council can operate with a five
26 member quorum because they currently have eight
27 members.

28
29 But to your other point, it does cause
30 a loss for the ability of that Council to represent its
31 region, particularly a region like the YK Delta that
32 has over 50 villages in it, and to only have eight
33 people representing 50 villages is problematic. But,
34 you know, it's just something they'll -- I'm sure they
35 will, you know, do their best to think thoughtfully
36 when they're reviewing fisheries proposals this fall
37 and, you know, come up with a good recommendation as
38 they can, but it does affect their ability to really
39 represent the region.

40
41 MS. PITKA: Thank you for that answer.

42
43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
44 Carl.

45
46 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

47
48 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Next we have
49 tribal engagement presentation by Orville Lind.

50

1 MR. LIND: Good morning. Orville Lind.
2 Native Liaison for the Office of Subsistence
3 Management.

4
5 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Good morning.

6
7 MR. LIND: I wanted to share with you
8 folks a little bit of background on the very first
9 tribal engagement session which was held in Juneau last
10 October.

11
12 Prior to that, in August, Melinda
13 Hernandez, who used to work for OSM, contacted me and
14 made a suggestion that there's got to be a way to
15 increase the awareness of the Native liaison position
16 and the Federal Subsistence Program. And with the
17 assistance of Mr. Whitford and DeAnna Perry, who's the
18 coordinator for Southeast, Melinda, who's the Tribal
19 Programs Relation Manager out of Juneau and myself, in
20 October, 30th, we come together -- the day before the
21 Regional Advisory Council down in Juneau with the
22 tribal engagement session. And the whole purpose for
23 this session was to engage the tribes and to become
24 more aware of our government to government consultation
25 processes and then policies with the Federal
26 Subsistence Board.

27
28 When we started to put this together
29 the idea was to invite several tribes from the
30 Southeast area and also from Southcentral area -- me,
31 being from the Alaska Peninsula, and not made it to
32 Southeast very often I thought this would be a good
33 start for myself, as my position, as the Native Liaison
34 to work with the tribes that I'm really unfamiliar with
35 down there in Southeast. So I was pretty excited about
36 this whole concept of actually putting on a PowerPoint
37 of the Native Liaison position with OSM.

38
39 So our audience actually, besides the
40 tribes in Southcentral and Southeast we had Mr. Wayne,
41 of course, present there and Mr. Whitford. We had
42 numerous tribes from Ketchikan, Metlakatla. We had a
43 couple of corporate members in attendance, along with
44 Cordova over the internet -- or I'm sorry the VTC
45 program. We all got to talk with them on the network.

46
47 So some of the topics we talked about,
48 again, with introducing to some of the tribes at first
49 hand the tribal consultation protocol and our

50

1 implementation guidelines, which at that time were
2 pretty much unfamiliar with. As my job as the Native
3 Liaison I'm the primary contact, as you know, for all
4 229 Federal recognized tribes. There are 567 Federal
5 recognized tribes in the nation. So most of them are
6 here in Alaska.

7
8 We also wanted to talk about, you know,
9 opportunities and processes for the tribes to be aware
10 that they can request consultations at any time on
11 anything they wanted to talk about.

12
13 We wanted to make sure that they
14 understood that as government agencies we have an
15 obligation to hear their voice through Executive Order
16 13175.

17
18 Other things we wanted to share were
19 just a quick background of the Regional Advisory
20 Councils and why and how they were initiated.

21
22 We wanted to talk a little bit about --
23 to them about the Federal Subsistence Program and how
24 -- I'll give a little background history of when 1993,
25 when the Regional Advisory Councils were organized --
26 the Program has come a long way and I think that was
27 one of the highlights is that now the tribes are
28 becoming aware of their voices can be heard and through
29 this Federal Subsistence Program, they can learn how
30 the process works and get more involved.

31
32 We also talked a little bit about the
33 cultural education harvest permits that some of them
34 weren't aware of.

35
36 Also some of the hot topics again was
37 the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program stuff.

38
39 In our presentations we also invited
40 the Southeast Regional Advisory Council Chair and Vice
41 Chair, who were in attendance and -- and I think this
42 -- this whole process, this whole session is really a
43 model session to, again, repeat in other regions and I
44 think that's our goal, it's certainly my goal as a
45 Native Liaison is to go to different regions and do the
46 same presentation and try to engage the tribes in
47 becoming aware of what's out there.

48
49 We did have some feedback from the
50

1 tribes and I want to share them with you right now.

2

3 First of all, I think the biggest topic
4 was Regional Advisory Councils, and, again in several
5 regions, the 10 regions we work with, are really
6 stepping up to engage our youth, our school students,
7 high school students, but not only them, the other
8 young adults, 20s and 30s have been -- that have been
9 out of school.

10

11 Another request by some of the tribes
12 were to do more outreach. And OSM does, I think, a
13 wonderful job, certainly a better job than we had been
14 in the last 10 years, in the area of outreach. Right
15 now we're working, with my position, we work with the
16 Regional Advisory Council coordinators, which are doing
17 an outstanding job in assisting myself or me with them
18 in getting the news or releases that need to go out to
19 the tribes and the corporations.

20

21 We also stepped up the program in
22 communicating and working with the Refuge Information
23 Technician Programs, which is really starting to prove
24 very valuable and productive.

25

26 Some of the tribes were asking about
27 the timeframe of when to do tribal consultations. We
28 have guidelines to go by. Those guidelines, as you
29 know, it's a living document, it can be changed with
30 the request from tribes.

31

32 Also they wanted to know about what
33 type of employment opportunities, you know, besides
34 being a member of the Regional Advisory Council, what
35 does the Federal Subsistence Program have to offer as
36 far as internships, partnerships and what -- and what's
37 out there.

38

39 We also talked about individuals within
40 the tribes themselves. This was brought up by a tribal
41 leader and I thought it was an excellent idea, that
42 these tribes before consultation are set within the
43 tribe to be their primary official speaker and have the
44 knowledge what really they need to bring out at the
45 Regional Advisory Council meetings.

46

47 And, again, along with holding sort of
48 a little mock programs within the schools, within the
49 high school.

50

1 We have been talking with the blessing
2 of the ARD and the Deputy and some of the Regional
3 Advisory Council coordinators that I wasn't aware of
4 the Polycom program that are now set up in the high
5 schools all over the state. Mr. Doolittle, through
6 conversing with him, had got me really excited about a
7 new way to outreach, we can step up within OSM, for
8 whether it's Council coordination, whether it's my
9 position as a Native Liaison talking with tribal
10 members, tribal leaders, corporate leaders, even before
11 our Regional Advisory Council meeting. So that idea of
12 actually engaging the tribes even when we're not in
13 their region or not at the Regional Advisory Council,
14 we can still communicate with them through the VTC or
15 the Polygram program out there.

16
17 Our communication efforts are
18 increasing and we're getting much better at it.

19
20 One other thing that were -- a couple
21 of other things that were brought up.

22
23 Again, we wanted to tell them about the
24 RAC processes are very important and they're an open
25 forum where people should be really comfortable in
26 talking about their subsistence issues, you know, and,
27 again, we need to tie in their local knowledge, TEK,
28 part of it.

29
30 We still hear that we definitely need
31 better maps, of course, bigger maps than what we have.

32
33 And, again, it was also brought up that
34 the local people are very visual learners out there as
35 you know, and so if we can provide maps on the screen,
36 bigger maps when we talk about an issue that's
37 involving Unit 23 and different parts of it and what
38 not, I think we could save a lot of meaningless talk,
39 shorten the meetings maybe, who knows.

40
41 MR. SIEKANIEC: Are you talking about
42 us?

43
44 (Laughter)

45
46 MS. PITKA: He didn't say any names.

47
48 (Laughter)

49
50

1 MR. LIND: And the last, but not least,
2 we are talking now with the Council coordination to
3 actually do a tribal engagement session in Western
4 Interior and also with Bristol Bay. And it's getting
5 closer to where we're going to do a test with Bristol
6 Bay and to get with students there and do a mock
7 Regional Advisory Council and have them actually do
8 some proposals possibly and talk with OSM Staff while
9 they're doing that.

10
11 So with that I thought it was a very
12 good -- very good session. I think we're on the right
13 track and organizing more future tribal engagements in
14 different regions of the state. I think it's going to
15 be beneficial to everyone, the local people, local
16 providers, hunters, fishers and especially OSM and the
17 Federal Subsistence Board.

18
19 And with that I will entertain any
20 questions from the Board.

21
22 Thank you.

23
24 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
25 Orville for your presentation. And I know tribal
26 governments really appreciate that consultation process
27 and how open it's been to get feedback into things that
28 pertain to them in the region and the take of fish and
29 wildlife and also the inclusion of students, you know,
30 with this new found issue of vetting people, you know,
31 I think the next generation of young leaders are going
32 to be where we're going to have to draw from because it
33 seems like, you know, we have the same people going for
34 these positions and it might be time to create that
35 next pool and I think, you know, reaching out through
36 these technologies to access those students is a really
37 good idea and especially setting up mocks, it's
38 situations and scenarios. I know in our school
39 district we're trying to bring in actual living
40 activities that affect our lives in the state and so
41 our students are coming out of our system not so much
42 college ready but life ready and I think you're on the
43 right path, so I appreciate that work.

44
45 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair. I would like to,
46 at this point, express the personal gratitude of the
47 Regional Forester Pendleton and myself for the
48 engagement that happened in Southeast as well as the
49 thanks of the Forest Service and the Tongass National
50

1 Forest.

2

3

4 This was an excellent opportunity, an
5 excellent example, actually, of bridging the great
6 divide between the bureaucracy of what we do and the
7 actuality of what we do. And so that was -- it was
8 fantastic. And, Orville, if anything, undersold the
9 accomplishments of that meeting. We understand that
10 it's expensive to do these and it takes a lot of Staff
11 time, for that we are grateful for that investment, and
12 for the rest of the members of the Board, if you have
13 an opportunity to bring one of these engagements to
14 your region, do it.

14

15

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16

17

18

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other
questions for Orville.

19

20

Lynn.

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

MR. POLACCA: Through the Chair. I
guess just wanted to maybe see if we can possibly think
about, as you go through this whole entire scenario of
the mock scenario for the youth and all that, if you
can kind of maybe get a report ready for us and all
that, that way we can actually see how that's actually
working out as all that. Because as Tony mentioned it
is something that, you know, is going to be of concern,
you know, who's going to be actually taking on those
responsibilities, you know, within the next several
years into the future, you know.

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

MR. LIND: Through the Chair. Thank
you, Lynn. Absolutely. I feel one of the best
learning curves is feedback and followup. And I would
definitely be excited about giving a report on our
Bristol Bay tribal engagement or Western Interior
tribal engagement session. So, yes, you can expect it.

41

42

43

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Orville. Definitely appreciate your work.

44

45

MR. LIND: Qyuana. Thank you.

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: With that we
have future meeting dates. I think this is just so we
can inform everybody here that April 10th through 13th
is the Federal Subsistence wildlife regulatory public

1 meeting.

2

3 July 18th to be announced, the Federal
4 Subsistence Board work session.

5

6 And January 2019 will be the next fish
7 and shellfish regulatory meeting.

8

9 And.....

10

11 OPERATOR: We have a question from the
12 phone.

13

14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: A question from
15 the phone?

16

17 OPERATOR: Yes. From Melinda Burke,
18 your line is open, please go ahead with your question
19 or comment.

20

21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead,
22 Melinda, you have the floor.

23

24 MS. BURKE: Hi. Thank you so much. I
25 just wanted to throw in one other little thing about
26 that session. Gunalcheesh. A huge thanks to my
27 agency, to Orville, and to the Office of Subsistence
28 Management Program for supporting that effort.

29

30 I just wanted to make one little note
31 of as far as costs go for putting on something like
32 this. It was extremely inexpensive to have this
33 session. I think a couple of reasons it worked out
34 very well was bringing in Orville just a day or a half
35 a day early and holding it the day before the RAC
36 meeting started and utilizing that technology that we
37 did, I think, of course cost is always a concern when
38 you try to do any extra efforts in outreach or
39 communication, but we -- I think there's a lot of
40 methodologies we can utilize to make these sessions
41 affordable, doable and engage with the tribes as
42 possible.

43

44 So I just wanted to express my thanks
45 as well.

46

47 Gunalcheesh to everyone for your
48 support.

49

50

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for
2 that Melinda. Appreciate it.

3
4 Jennifer.

5
6 MS. HARDING: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
7 Members of the Board. I did want to talk to you all
8 about future meeting dates if possible. As Tony
9 already -- Mr. Christianson already noted, the next
10 regulatory meeting is a public meeting and it will be
11 held at the Egan Center here in Anchorage April 10th
12 through 13th. Just about six weeks from now, I guess,
13 eight weeks.

14
15 And then typically, if necessary, you
16 have a work session in July. And so I wanted to find
17 out if it would be possible for you to pencil in to
18 your calendars some potential dates, if that meeting
19 was necessary, recognizing how full your schedules are
20 and how quickly they fill up. So we wanted to find out
21 if it would be possible to mark out a couple of days
22 the week of July 9th for a possible work session.

23
24 And I've already seen one thumb's down.

25
26 So how about the week of July 16th.

27
28 I see one thumb's up, two thumb's up.

29
30 Okay.

31
32 All right.

33
34 (Laughter)

35
36 MS. HARDING: And we understand that
37 July is quite difficult for folks.

38
39 How about the -- well, the week -- the
40 first week obviously won't work because there's a
41 holiday there. So, Mr. Frost, how does your calendar
42 look in July.

43
44 MR. FROST: Except that one week I'm
45 fine.

46
47 MR. HARDING: Okay.

48
49 MR. FROST: The week of the 16th.

50

1 MS. PITKA: So the week of the 16th is
2 what works.....
3
4 MR. FROST: Does not work.
5
6 MS. HARDING: Does not work.
7
8 MR. FROST: Any other week works.
9
10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The week of the
11 23rd wouldn't work for me.
12
13 MS. HARDING: Okay.
14
15 MR. OWEN: The week of the 8th of July,
16 I did my thumb down, the Forest Service has its
17 Regional Leadership Team Meeting that week in Cordova
18 and, both, the Regional Forester and I will be
19 attending that.
20
21 MR. SIEKANIEC: And the week of the
22 16th it does not work for me in the latter half of the
23 week.
24
25 MS. HARDING: Okay. So I will get back
26 with you all on the work session. However, as you all
27 know, because we discussed at length on Wednesday, our
28 regulatory cycles are tied very closely to the public
29 meeting that you have to make decisions on regulatory
30 proposals and the Regional Advisory Council meetings.
31 So after April, the next regulatory meeting will be
32 July of 2019 -- I'm sorry, January of 2019 to discuss
33 fish and shellfish regulations, and so I would like to
34 throw out a couple of weeks in that month so that we
35 can set our timeline for proposal analysis.
36
37 So the first week I have is January
38 28th and that would be of 2019.
39
40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: There's nothing
41 on my calendar that far out.
42
43 (Laughter)
44
45 MS. HARDING: That's right.
46
47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Anywhere closer
48 to the end of the month is usually good though because
49 that's usually when people are going -- holiday travel
50

1 is pretty calm and.....

2

3

MS. PITKA: January 28th.

4

5

6

MS. HARDING: The week of January 28th
and then I can start working on a venue.

7

8

Thank you very much.

9

10

11

12

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And so we'll
just work on doodle a poll or whatever we do for the
July meeting.

13

14

15

16

17

MS. HARDING: Yes. And we may have to
push that to August -- no, we will do a doodle poll and
we'll find some appropriate dates that work for
everyone.

18

19

20

21

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Maybe it's the
front half of that week and everybody's available and
we come in on Sunday.

22

23

24

25

MS. HARDING: Yeah. Depending on what
transpires between now and then you may only need one
to two days.

26

27

28

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay.

29

30

31

MS. HARDING: Thank you, Mr. Chair and
the Board.

32

33

34

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Jennifer for that.

35

36

37

Any other business the Board would like
to attend to.

38

39

(No comments)

40

41

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, I
entertain a motion.

42

43

44

MR. BROWER: So moved.

45

46

47

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: To adjourn. A
motion's been made to adjourn.

48

49

50

MR. FROST: Second.

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

THAT the foregoing, Pages ___ through ___ contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE BOARD MEETING, WORK SESSION, VOLUME II taken electronically by our firm on the 23rd day of February 2018 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 26th day of February 2018.

Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 09/16/18