

FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE BOARD

WORK SESSION

GORDON WATSON CONFERENCE ROOM
U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

August 15, 2019
9:00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

Ken Lord, Solicitor's Office

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

1 P R O C E E D I N G S
2
3 (Anchorage, Alaska - 8/15/2019)
4
5 (On record)
6
7 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I'll call this
8 meeting to order and get started. Welcome everyone.
9
10 Tom. Roll call.
11
12 MR. DOOLITTLE: Welcome to this work
13 session of the Federal Subsistence Board this 15th day
14 of August in 2019, it's well attended.
15
16 I'll start out with Bureau of Land
17 Management, Chad Padgett.
18
19 MR. PADGETT: Present.
20
21 MR. DOOLITTLE: National Park Service,
22 Herbert Frost.
23
24 MR. FROST: Present.
25
26 MR. DOOLITTLE: U.S. Fish and Wildlife
27 Service, Greg Siekaniec.
28
29 MR. SIEKANIEC: Here. Thanks, Tom.
30
31 MR. DOOLITTLE: And Bureau of Indian
32 Affairs, Gene Peltola.
33
34 MR. PELTOLA: Eee.
35
36 MR. DOOLITTLE: Eee. U.S. Forest
37 Service, David Schmid.
38
39 MR. SCHMID: I'm here, thanks.
40
41 MR. DOOLITTLE: Public Member, Rhonda
42 Pitka.
43
44 MS. PITKA: Here.
45
46 MR. DOOLITTLE: Charlie Brower.
47
48 MR. BROWER: (In Inupiaq)
49
50

1 MR. DOOLITTLE: And Chairman Anthony
2 Christianson.
3
4 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I'm present.
5
6 MR. DOOLITTLE: Just to acknowledge,
7 Legal Counsel from the Office of the Solicitor, Ken
8 Lord.
9
10 MR. LORD: Here.
11
12 MR. DOOLITTLE: Michael Routhier.
13
14 MR. ROUTHIER: Here.
15
16 MR. DOOLITTLE: Anybody representing
17 Legal Counsel from the U.S. Forest Service.
18
19 (No comment)
20
21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Anybody on line
22 or in the audience that's representing the Senior
23 Advisor's Office in Alaska.
24
25 (No comment)
26
27 MR. DOOLITTLE: None heard. We have a
28 quorum. Oh, one last but not least, we might also like
29 to recognize Ben Mulligan and Mark Burch from Alaska
30 Department of Fish and Game as well and their
31 attendance at this meeting, as well as tribal
32 representatives and tribal leaders, you know, that I
33 see in the audience, especially I see representation
34 from the Ahtna region here today.
35
36 Thank you.
37
38 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So at this time
39 we're going to go ahead and open up the floor to review
40 and adopt the agenda.
41
42 MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair.
43
44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead.
45
46 MR. BROWER: Move to approve the
47 agenda.
48
49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Gene.
50

1 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair. First off
2 before we approve the agenda there's a couple of other
3 things I'd like to ask the Board if they're interested
4 in considering.

5
6 One, is at the last meeting in April, I
7 asked OSM to do a review for a potential off-site Board
8 meeting, I don't see that on the agenda.

9
10 Two, I'd like to have a review of the
11 existing OSM budget, which hasn't been done in a couple
12 years.

13
14 Those are the two items I'd be
15 interested in addressing.

16
17 And, three, an update on the process
18 for filling the ARD position full-time.

19
20 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So I have a
21 motion on the floor and then a recommendation but no
22 second.

23
24 MS. PITKA: I'll second.

25
26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So there's a
27 second. Now we have under discussion, Gene has
28 recommended potentially adding an off-site meeting,
29 budget and ARD update. I don't know if we can do that
30 under information exchange or do we just want to add an
31 item.

32
33 MR. PELTOLA: You know I'm not a
34 stickler of where it would occur as long as we could
35 address those issues, and present it to the Board.

36
37 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So why don't we
38 make that C, D and E on other business, if that's all
39 right with the Board.

40
41 (Board nods affirmatively)

42
43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any opposition
44 to adding those to the agenda.

45
46 (No opposition)

47
48 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No, seeing
49 none. All in favor of the motion to adopt the agenda

50

1 with the amendment and inclusion of those three items
2 signify by saying aye.

3
4 IN UNISON: Aye.

5
6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right.
7 Opposition same sign.

8
9 (No opposing votes)

10
11 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
12 motion carries unanimously.

13
14 Now, we'll open up the floor for
15 information exchange.

16
17 The good news is is everyone's getting
18 fish.

19
20 (Laughter)

21
22 MR. FROST: Just maybe some Staffing
23 updates. Many of you may have known that we hired
24 Joshua Ream as our new subsistence team lead for the
25 National Park Service and he also will be sitting on
26 the InterAgency Staff Committee for the National Park
27 Service.

28
29 Clarence Summer who has been acting in
30 that position and long time subsistence team member
31 will be retiring, is it August or September?

32
33 MR. REAM: September 1st.

34
35 MR. FROST: September 1st, so very
36 shortly. That will be a great loss for the Park
37 Service. Clarence has probably worked here at the Park
38 Service for 40 years, a long time. He was a ranger
39 down in Yakutat for many years and has been in the
40 Regional Office and sort of a jack of all trades, but
41 he's been in the Subsistence Program for a long time
42 and his -- we will miss him. I'm sure we'll have some
43 sort of a get-together for him and we'll let folks know
44 when that is.

45
46 And then last, but not least, this will
47 probably be my last Board meeting. I've been asked to
48 move to Omaha, Nebraska to take over the Regional
49 Director position there in the Midwest. So I don't

50

1 have an exact date of when I'm leaving yet but I'll be
2 leaving here as soon as I can sell my house. So this
3 has been a great opportunity to be a member of the
4 Board and to interact with all of you folks and all of
5 the public and the Staff, appreciate it. It's been a
6 great learning experience for me. Probably one of the
7 more interesting parts of my job.

8

9

(Laughter)

10

11

MR. FROST: And so, anyway, I just
12 wanted to say thanks and wish you all the best.

13

14

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Well, thank
15 you, Bert. Appreciate you and your Staff, it's been
16 good, so the best to you in Omaha.

17

18

MR. FROST: Come visit.

19

20

(Laughter)

21

22

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Not in the
23 summer.

24

25

(Laughter)

26

27

MR. PADGETT: Mr. Chair. Yeah, I'd
28 like to also acknowledge in the same vein that we're
29 going to be having a loss in our office at BLM with Dan
30 Sharp, who's also going to be retiring in November; is
31 that right?

32

33

MR. SHARP: November 1st.

34

35

MR. PADGETT: November 1st. So it's
36 going to leave a big hole in our office as well and
37 he's been around a long time doing this. So he's been
38 trying to wrangle me since I came on board and I'm
39 going to definitely miss his advice and service. But,
40 Dan, thank you for everything that you've been doing
41 and we'll miss you.

42

43

MR. SHARP: Thank you.

44

45

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg.

46

47

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
48 I think, you know, as long as we're recognizing that,
49 you know, change is happening, is ever present here in
50

1 the system, Jennifer Hardin is obviously on her way out
2 the door as well, as is Tom Evans, I believe is
3 retiring. So, you know, there's pretty extensive
4 change happening here amongst the Board as well with
5 Bert leaving and then certainly very important key
6 positions within both OSM as well as other agencies.
7 So thank you for all the work that everybody has put
8 in, you know, it's a tremendous amount of effort that
9 goes into, you know, the OSM Program, both from the
10 Staff itself within there, but also the InterAgency
11 relationships and things that need to make this a
12 successful and functioning Board.

13
14 So just a moment to say thank you and
15 best to everybody who's on the move here, and there
16 seems to be a fair amount of it. So, thank you.

17
18 MR. SCHMID: Don't have any OSM
19 members. We've had a couple of folks detailing in but
20 today our new Forest Supervisor here on the Chugach
21 shows up, his name is Jeff Schram, and he replaces
22 Terry Marceron, and looking forward to working with
23 Jeff and introducing him to all of the uniqueness of
24 Alaska and some of the projects we work with.

25
26 In addition to that I was back in
27 Washington, D.C., last week and we got a green light to
28 release the new Chugach Forest Plan, and so that will
29 be coming out here in the next month or so and does
30 reflect a lot of the changes, especially around
31 subsistence uses in Southcentral Alaska here within the
32 Chugach. So looking forward to finalizing, that's been
33 a seven year effort to get that plan forward.

34
35 So that's all I have to share,
36 Chairman.

37
38 MR. DOOLITTLE: I just have one item to
39 add. One, is I'd like to appreciate the cooperation of
40 two Board members, Greg Siekaniec and David Schmid,
41 Supervisor from the Forest Service, Wayne Owen for
42 putting together an InterAgency Agreement to bring Tom
43 Whitford over as an acting Assistant Regional Director
44 for -- Deputy Assistant Regional Director for OSM. And
45 having that additional assistance and InterAgency
46 cooperation has been greatly appreciated, not just by
47 myself, but from our whole Staff. We've also worked on
48 to bring in Council Coordination on a detail from
49 Yazoo, Teddy Roosevelt and Holt Collier National

50

1 Wildlife Refuge, the project leader from there, Steve
2 Fadden. And so he's been helping out Katya in Council
3 Coordination, and the supervision of that particular
4 program as well.

5
6 And just before the lunch hour, OSM
7 does want to acknowledge, you know, the people that are
8 leaving us on the ISC, our leadership team and as well
9 as our esteemed Board member, Bert Frost. So there
10 will be a little break before the noon hour, so I hope
11 everybody can stay.

12
13 Thank you.

14
15 MR. LORD: One more to add to the pile.
16 Many of you, over the years have probably worked with
17 Dean Dunsmore for the Department of Justice, he's
18 represented this program in numerous litigation through
19 the '90s and in the 2000s, including the Katie John
20 litigation and after 48 years of Federal service he's
21 announced his retirement for the end of September.

22
23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Anybody else.

24
25 Rhonda.

26
27 MS. PITKA: I do. I'd like to thank
28 everyone for coming today.

29
30 This summer in Yukon Flats and Upper
31 Yukon we've had severe fires so we've had firefighters
32 pretty much in the village of Beaver and the
33 surrounding areas all summer. Starting in July there
34 was extreme fire weather so this creates a lot of
35 challenges for habitat in the area and also challenges
36 for the people. So the BLM did an amazing job putting
37 out the fires and everything, thank you. It was really
38 good to work with, you know, professionals who know
39 what they're doing, who do this every day.

40
41 So one of the major challenges that
42 we've had was the amount of severe fires around our
43 area. Chalkyitsik had four fires surrounding it, and
44 in Upper Yukon zone we burned -- there was over 500,000
45 acres burned. In an area this size it's a significant
46 loss, especially around that area in Chalkyitsik. We
47 frequently call that the bread basket of the Upper
48 Yukon.

49
50

1 Fishing was really good this year. I
2 don't really like to talk too much about fishing, I
3 mean my own personal fishing, but everybody's
4 experience along the river was really good and they
5 were able to meet their harvest needs and able to share
6 a little bit with their families. So there was a lot
7 of real good consideration of that.

8
9 I think one of the other concerns that
10 I had this summer wasn't with fishing so much as it was
11 with, you know, the moose habitat and the destruction
12 of that and we're already in an area that has low moose
13 density so it's really concerning to some of the people
14 there. But, honestly, with more fish it takes a lot of
15 the pressure off of moose hunting in the fall. Right
16 now everybody's like, meh, yeah, we'll go hunting
17 eventually, so it's been a really good year for fishing
18 in our region.

19
20 You know, Venetie had a fire pretty
21 much one mile across the river from it, along the
22 Chandalar, so that was really concerning to their
23 people. We've had helicopters in and out of the
24 village, it was quite an experience for a really small
25 village to have that many people descend at once. But
26 all of the employees were incredibly professional and
27 really helped to -- they wanted to alleviate some of
28 the stress on the community so, and I was like well I
29 wouldn't really worry about that, how about you put out
30 the fires, it's okay, we'll worry about water and sewer
31 system later. Fires.

32
33 So it was overall a fairly decent
34 summer and it was just abnormally hot. So I think
35 like, you know -- I think statewide and especially in
36 areas that are incredibly dry like Upper Yukon, we
37 should probably focus more on prevention, fire-wise
38 officers for communities, and plans like this.

39
40 Thank you.

41
42 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg.

43
44 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
45 Back to the ideas of comings and goings of people. I
46 think most people are aware that we brought in a new
47 Assistant Regional Director for the National Wildlife
48 Refuge System, Brian Glaspell. Brian's greatly
49 experienced in Alaska. He left and managed Jackson

50

1 Hole National Wildlife Refuge, or the Elk Refuge for a
2 few years there and then managed to come back here into
3 Alaska. So, again, Brian Glaspell's returning, born
4 and raised here in Alaska. A lot of experience
5 managing Refuges but also very much experienced in the
6 social scientist field. So glad to have Brian back.

7

8

Thanks.

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. FROST: So one thing I forgot to
say was, so Don Stryker, the Superintendent of Denali
National Park and Preserve will be the acting Regional
Director once I leave. But the long-term goal is for
replacing this position permanently. I don't know that
there's a plan yet but, anyway, Don will be the acting
for the interim, at least for the first 120 days.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Charlie.

MR. BROWER: I wasn't going to say
anything, but.....

(Laughter)

MR. BROWER: But welcome everyone here
to the work session, thank you for being here.

We had a very good summer. Got all of
our hunting we needed to get, more than what we wanted,
but there were lots of animals going by, sea mammals,
and so on and we got a whale, got a walrus, bearded
seal, ring seal, some fish. And in talking with all of
my colleagues throughout Alaska they expressed a lot of
good fishing happening throughout the whole state so I
was very -- it was good to hear from all those folks
that were subsistence fishing and hunting, that they
were doing good.

But, otherwise, thank you.

OPERATOR: Tina.

(Teleconference interruption)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, thanks,
Tina. Any additional sharing. I think that was a good
this morning to go ahead and exchange information and
share and, again, welcome to everybody new on board and
good luck to everybody who's moving on.

1 With that we'll go ahead and move on to
2 the next part of our agenda, which is action on
3 Regional Advisory Council annual reports, which is
4 Katrina Wessels.

5
6 MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
7 Good morning, Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. My name
8 is Katya Wessels, or my official name, I guess, is
9 Katrina, so -- but everybody knows me by Katya.

10
11 When our previous Council Division
12 Coordinator, Carl Johnson, resigned in March of this
13 year, I was detailed into his position and one of the
14 responsibilities of that position is to organize and
15 prepare the annual report replies to the annual reports
16 of the Subsistence Regional Advisory Councils that's
17 why I'm reporting to you today on the annual reports,
18 annual report replies for the Regional Advisory
19 Councils.

20
21 So I would like to remind this Board
22 that the authority for the Subsistence Regional
23 Advisory Councils to submit annual reports originates
24 in Section .805 of ANILCA that states that: Regional
25 Advisory Council in each subsistence resource region
26 shall have an authority to prepare an annual report to
27 the Secretary which shall contain identification of
28 current and anticipated subsistence issues of fish and
29 wildlife populations within the region, evaluation of
30 current and anticipated subsistence needs for fish and
31 wildlife populations within the region, a recommended
32 strategy.....

33
34 OPERATOR: All lines are open.

35
36 (Teleconference interruption)

37
38 MS. WESSELS: A recommended strategy
39 for the management of fish and wildlife populations
40 within the region to accommodate such subsistence uses
41 and needs and recommendation concerning policies,
42 standards, guidelines and regulations to implement the
43 strategy. So this opportunity to give an annual report
44 to the Secretary were modified by Secretarial
45 regulations to be a report to the Board, to this Board.

46
47 I would like to mention to this Board
48 that these annual reports are not obligatory for the
49 Regional Advisory Councils, but they have an option to
50

1 submit it. However, this past fiscal year all Councils
2 had topics that they wanted to share with the Board and
3 chose to submit their reports, which is great. Since
4 it gives the Councils another avenue to share concerns
5 with this Board that cannot be addressed through the
6 regular regulatory process.

7
8 I would like to provide a quick
9 overview, particularly to the benefit of our newer
10 Board members on how the annual report reply process
11 works. Our annual reports, are fiscal year annual
12 reports. And the reports that you have in front of you
13 in your books that start on Page 1, they are from the
14 previous fiscal year, 2018. So at the fall 2018
15 meetings the Councils were asked to identify issues
16 they would like to include in their annual reports.
17 With that input the OSM Staff wrote a draft annual
18 report that the Councils then reviewed during the
19 winter 2019 meeting cycle. Staff, mainly from OSM, but
20 also from other offices and other agencies drafted the
21 responses to the issues outlined in the annual reports.
22 Then all this was collated and reviewed by OSM
23 leadership team and then by the InterAgency Staff
24 Committee.

25
26 At this point I would like to
27 acknowledge the incredible amount of work that went
28 into preparation of these replies. Pretty much every
29 division at OSM contributed to drafting the replies.
30 The timing was challenging for us this year because the
31 Staff who were working on these also were developing
32 proposal analysis for the wildlife cycle. In the
33 preparation of some of the replies we worked closely
34 with the Forest Service, BLM, NPS and U.S. Fish and
35 Wildlife Service Staff, as well as we received
36 information to compile the replies from non-DOI or USDA
37 agencies such as NOAA and Coast Guard. ISC Committee
38 members played a crucial role in developing and editing
39 the replies. Their contribution is invaluable in
40 developing substantive replies. And every year we do
41 these I think we put out a much better and better
42 product. Of course there is always room for
43 improvement but I just wanted to recognize that there's
44 a lot of incredible work that went into the development
45 of these annual report replies and I would like to
46 thank the Staff for all the work that they did, and I'm
47 sure the Board appreciates that as well.

48
49 Now, this Board replies to the
50

1 Council's annual reports are before you for your review
2 and approval. My intent is to provide a short overview
3 of issues brought up by the Councils in their reports
4 and then, secondly, provide an overview of the replies.

5
6 First, for your visual aid I provided
7 you with a handout that shows the Regional Advisory
8 Council's annual report duplicative issues. There's a
9 table. That table identifies the issues and concerns
10 that were raised by more than one Council that come up
11 fairly often. Therefore, this table can serve as an
12 indicator of a potential bigger or over-arching issue
13 that can be of importance to more than one region.

14
15 As you can see, you know, the first one
16 is climate change has been on the minds of the Councils
17 for quite a few years now. Within the last five years,
18 eight of the 10 Regional Advisory Councils have raised
19 this issue of climate change and its affect on
20 subsistence resources activities in their reports to
21 the Board. In their FY18 annual reports four Councils,
22 Southeast, Southcentral, YK-Delta and Western Interior
23 raised the issue of the effect of climate change on the
24 environment and subsistence resources.

25
26 For example, the YK-Delta Council is
27 concerned about warmer and wet weather effects on the
28 fall moose hunt and share with the Board the elders
29 teachings and story about famine.

30
31 The Western Interior Council believes
32 that Interior Alaska's rate of warming is uniquely
33 rapid and causing adverse effects for subsistence users
34 in the region.

35
36 Then the next three topics, youth,
37 education, all-Council meeting. In my mind they all go
38 hand in hand and are kind of inter-related.

39
40 The Council members recognize that it
41 is important to involve youth, younger generation into
42 subsistence management. The YK-Delta Council shared
43 with the Board two success stories of young people,
44 Aaron Moses and Alissa Rogers, that started getting
45 involved with the Council at a younger age and they
46 were involved in subsistence management as well. So
47 Alissa Rogers now is the Chair of the YK-Delta Council.

48
49 So our Councils are always eager to
50

1 serve the communities they represent to the best extent
2 possible and, therefore, ask for additional
3 opportunities to learn about the aspects of the Federal
4 Subsistence Management Program and the Council's roles
5 and responsibilities. Several Councils requested that
6 the Program provides them with educational
7 opportunities and made suggestions on what they need.

8
9 Then over the last few years, many
10 Councils were reminiscing about the great success of
11 the all-Council meeting that was a comprehensive
12 meeting of all the Councils together that took place in
13 the winter of 2016 in Anchorage. This all-Council
14 meeting provided to be very educational, eye-opening
15 and empowering for every Council member involved and
16 OSM received a lot of positive feedback. Since then
17 we've received a lot of requests from various Councils
18 to hold another all-Council meeting, which allows wide-
19 sharing of regional issues and ideas, collaboration
20 across the borders and in-depth educational and
21 training opportunities. This year the request was
22 received from Southcentral, Kodiak/Aleutians and
23 Bristol Bay Councils. So there is a potential to hold
24 the next all-Council meeting in the winter of 2021,
25 although a complete project budget will need to be
26 completed and available funding accessed. Since the
27 cost of the last all-Council meeting was about 30
28 percent higher than the cost of all individual Council
29 meetings in one cycle combined. One of the Councils
30 went as far as suggesting agenda items for the next
31 all-Council meeting. That's how they look forward to
32 the next one.

33
34 So then there are issues that also were
35 mentioned by more than one Council, like the effects of
36 hatchery fish on wildlife salmon stocks. Western
37 Interior and Eastern Interior brought up the concerns
38 regarding the long- and short-term effects of hatchery
39 released fish on wild salmon stocks, both in the marine
40 and fresh water environments. While the Western
41 Interior mentioned that there is no data to understand
42 the impacts of the competing populations, the Eastern
43 Interior named several institutions and agencies that
44 conducted and published a substantial amount of
45 scientific research on the hatchery versus wild fish
46 interactions in the marine environment. The Eastern
47 Interior's two major concerns are, one, competition for
48 food in the marine environment, and, two, predation of
49 larger hatchery juveniles on other small salmon smolt.

50

1 So both Councils would like to see more research in
2 this area and a summarization of the findings.

3
4 So that leads us to the most popular
5 item, topic, that was on all the Council's annual
6 reports, that is request for data and research, so
7 eight out of 10 Councils asked for some kind of data or
8 research that needs to be done, and we always get a lot
9 of requests for data and research in the annual
10 reports.

11
12 Southcentral Council outlined the need
13 for more comprehensive salmon research, especially in
14 the marine environment. Southcentral Council also sees
15 the need for a plan to improve biological data sharing
16 between the ADF&G and Federal resource managers. The
17 Kodiak/Aleutian Council sees the need for an annual
18 survey of Adak Island caribou as well as the Council
19 wants to receive the field reports from the Federal and
20 State managers in advance of the meetings. The Bristol
21 Bay Council requests a briefing on the population
22 status of seagulls in the Iliamna Lake area. The YK-
23 Delta Council is interested in fisheries research
24 focused on important but less studied subsistence fish,
25 such as humpback whitefish, coho salmon and Bering
26 cisco. The Western Interior Council believes that
27 there is a lack of annual caribou forage evaluation
28 which deprives State and Federal managers of the
29 information necessary to effectively manage caribou and
30 its habitat and suggests assessment of the annual
31 intake of vegetation by caribou. Seward Peninsula
32 Council would like to see a joint ADF&G and BLM study
33 on moose migration between Unit 22E and 22D, and an NPS
34 and ADF&G study on bear abundance and density on Seward
35 Peninsula. Northwest Arctic Council requests caribou
36 and beaver research to understand wildlife population
37 distribution and abundance and population data on
38 caribou and dall sheep. In fact all the topics in the
39 Northwest Arctic Council's annual report were regarding
40 requests for data and research. The Eastern Interior
41 Council asks for a report with data on perceived local
42 hunter displacement, so-called the domino effect.

43
44 Then two Councils are concerned about
45 aircraft harassing and deflecting of wildlife. That's
46 Bristol Bay and North Slope Councils.

47
48 Then a couple of Councils also raised
49 the issue about responsibilities of managers regarding
50

1 the delegation of authority, Southcentral and
2 Kodiak/Aleutian Councils. They were saying that the
3 managers with delegation of authority not always being
4 present in the field to make in-season management
5 decisions or not consulting with the Chairs when
6 issuing special actions. This Board directs OSM to
7 review guidelines for delegation of authority with the
8 in-season managers.

9
10 I also would like to mention that in
11 the 2010 Secretarial Review a directive was set forward
12 to specifically ensure that the Secretaries are
13 informed when non-Departmental rulemaking entities
14 develop regulations that may adversely affect
15 subsistence users. So sometimes those issues come up
16 through the annual report process. But this year,
17 however, we had no issues in the annual reports that
18 will need to be elevated to the Secretaries.

19
20 However, I would like to mention a
21 couple of issues.....

22
23 OPERATOR: Tina.

24
25 (Teleconference interruption)

26
27 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Let's take
28 five, sorry about that.

29
30 MS. WESSELS: That's okay. Hopefully
31 it will give people time to absorb all the information.

32
33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We're going to
34 take five for a second for technical.

35
36 (Off record)

37
38 (On record)

39
40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
41 we're back from our IT. Thank you, Tina, for figuring
42 it out. We'll continue with Katya.

43
44 MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
45 Member Peltola had a suggestion that I start it all
46 over from the beginning.

47
48 (Laughter)

49
50

1 MS. WESSELS: But I have a better
2 suggestion, maybe I'll quiz you about which Councils
3 are interested in having another all-Council meeting.

4
5 (Laughter)

6
7 MS. WESSELS: Rhonda.

8
9 MS. PITKA: I am.

10
11 (Laughter)

12
13 MS. PITKA: It was a really good
14 meeting. It was the best.

15
16 MR. SIEKANIEC: Refer to the chart.

17
18 MS. WESSELS: Thank you. So I just
19 mentioned to you that this year we didn't have any
20 issues that will need to be referred to the
21 Secretaries. We also did not have any issues that
22 we'll need to refer to the other agencies. So it's a
23 pretty easy year. There are a couple of issues that I
24 would like to mention to you that they might
25 potentially need Secretarial involvement in the future.

26
27 One is Southeast Council. They wish to
28 advise the Board that it soon may see a petition from
29 Kaagwaantaan Clan or other entities to the Secretaries
30 of the Interior and Agriculture requesting
31 implementation of extra-territorial jurisdiction on the
32 matter of herring harvest in Sitka Sound. That is
33 topic two in their annual report. If that takes place
34 the Board will need to utilize the procedure for
35 addressing petitions for Secretarial extension of
36 jurisdiction for the implementation of a Federal
37 Subsistence priority.

38
39 Another topic was brought up by the YK-
40 Delta Council. They wish to convey to the Board and to
41 the Secretaries a need for full balanced membership
42 since they were very concerned about the number of
43 vacancies created due to the lack of sufficient Council
44 appointments in 2017. The YK-Delta Council pointed out
45 that it serves 40 communities and several of the
46 Alaska's largest rivers and deltas.

47
48 So now I'm going to provide you with a
49 shorter overview of the responses that were developed

50

1 on behalf of the Board.

2
3 First of all I would like to say that
4 we endeavor to provide specific substantive responses
5 rather than kind of your standard agency canned
6 responses. We really want to give the Councils good
7 information in their responses from the Board. And
8 even if it is, in many cases, an issue outside of this
9 Board's jurisdiction we want to make sure that we
10 provide the Council with the tools, information or
11 options to address the issue that is of concern to
12 them. As, for example, many Councils are concerned
13 with climate change. In the Board reply we advise the
14 Councils to invite the representatives from academic,
15 governmental, and non-governmental organizations to
16 speak on the climate adaptation models and other
17 climate change research. And, of course, the Council
18 coordinators can help locating and inviting those
19 specialists. There are always some topics that have to
20 deal with the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program
21 project selection, process of funding, and replies
22 provide a detailed explanation on how funded projects
23 rank and selected and how the FRMP program is funded.
24 When the Council, like Bristol Bay is concerned with
25 low aircraft flying, we developed a reply with the help
26 of the NPS and provide the Council with detailed
27 information on which agency is in charge of air space
28 and which situation and how to work with the NPS to
29 report violations. If a Council is interested in the
30 seagull population in Lake Illiamna area we'll work
31 with specialists and provide the Council with an
32 extensive research report and include it as an
33 enclosure to the reply.

34
35 As usual there are some topics that
36 request funding. As for example, Southeast Council
37 requested funding to send members to the State
38 regulatory meetings, and the reply is that funding is
39 going to be provided on a case by case basis, and they
40 need to provide a justification. There is a request
41 from Kodiak/Aleutian Council to maintain full funding
42 of FRMP and the Board agrees with the Council that this
43 would facilitate additional research and provide needed
44 information and the reply further goes into an
45 explanation of how FRMP is funded and that the Council
46 may choose to inquire further with the U.S. Fish and
47 Wildlife about budget allocations for a more in-depth
48 discussion of the process.

49
50

1 A lot of issues this year dealt with
2 education, youth engagement, learning from elders, all-
3 Chair, and all-Council meeting, which, in my mind, is
4 from the same realm of topics, and the responses to
5 this topic is very positive. The OSM can provide some
6 educational opportunities to the Council members
7 through their annual new Council member training and
8 also opportunities to the youth. For example, one of
9 the replies says, in September of 2018 OSM's tribal
10 liaison, Orville Lind, held a video-conference with a
11 class in Dillingham High School to introduce OSM and
12 the Federal Subsistence Management Program. Youth is
13 always invited to attend the meeting. And then there
14 is other educational opportunities for all the Council
15 members and youth that can be possibly provided if a
16 2021 all-Council meeting, will become a reality.

17
18 So one of the Councils was concerned
19 about Federal Subsistence regulations are not being
20 published because in the mind of the Councils, they
21 expire, but we explain to the Councils that the
22 regulations do not expire, that they can go with old
23 regulations until the new ones are published. Then
24 there are some Councils concerned about Refuge
25 Staffing, so we developed responses together with the
26 U.S. Fish and Wildlife about how these concerns will be
27 addressed.

28
29 This leads me to the second table that
30 I provided to you which is titled keeping track of
31 FY2018 annual report reply followups. And there is a
32 lot of times that annual report replies make a lot of
33 representations, you, the Board, are telling these
34 Councils that we will provide you with this resource,
35 we'll make this happen, we will do this or that, so
36 this table will help us to keep track of what is in
37 these replies and make sure that we follow up on behalf
38 of the Board.

39
40 So like I said, from this table, as you
41 see no items will need to be referred to the
42 Secretaries, no items will need to be referred to the
43 other agencies.

44
45 There are other items we'll need to
46 follow up, I've broken them down by the Council so you
47 can see them. That's what the Board is promising to
48 the Councils, what we will do. And a lot of this is
49 like directing Staff, encouraging followup, encouraging

50

1 monitoring of a particular issue like, for example,
2 organizing new Council member training in Anchorage in
3 January of 2020 or assisting Southeast Council to hold
4 telephonic meeting to discuss DEIS for the Alaska
5 Roadless Rule, or assisting Western Interior Council in
6 drafting a letter for the Board's consideration to
7 further pursue the National Standard Aid discussion
8 with the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council.
9

10 So that's like a very brief overview of
11 the replies that this Board is providing to the
12 Councils, and, again, they were developed with
13 substantial involvement from the InterAgency Staff
14 Committee members and InterAgency Staff Committee
15 members reviewed the replies. At this time I would
16 like to proceed as the Board wishes. If you have some
17 specific things that you would like to ask me regarding
18 the annual report replies I can do that, and if the
19 Board members have any suggestions to change particular
20 language, or insert, you know, any other things in the
21 replies we can just proceed discussing that, or
22 whichever way you would like to go.
23

24 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
25

26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for
27 that good report, Katya. Any questions for Katya?
28

29 Rhonda.
30

31 MS. PITKA: Thank you very much for
32 your thorough responses. I'm sure they appreciate all
33 the detail back. I certainly did as a Regional
34 Advisory Council member, to not get the canned borough
35 response.
36

37 Has the schedule been released for the
38 fall meetings for the Regional Advisory Councils?
39

40 MS. WESSELS: Yes.
41

42 MS. PITKA: Okay, good. I wanted to
43 make sure that's been announced.
44

45 MS. WESSELS: It's been released.
46

47 MS. PITKA: And then one of them
48 mentioned Council representation at State regulatory
49 meetings as a funding issue. So how is that being
50

1 followed up on by OSM? And then does each Regional
2 Advisory Council have their own separate budget or is
3 it just determined at the agency?

4

5 Thank you.

6

7 MS. WESSELS: Tom, do you want to
8 address that or do you want me to.

9

10 MR. DOOLITTLE: You can.

11

12 MS. WESSELS: Well, each Regional
13 Advisory Council doesn't have a separate budget. It's
14 all a part of the OSM budget. When a Council has a
15 request to attend, to send a representative to attend
16 the State regulatory meeting it's decided on a case by
17 case basis with each Council and they will need to
18 provide justification why do they need to be there.
19 For example, one of their proposals that they submitted
20 to the Board of Fish or Board of Game is being
21 discussed, then they definitely need to be there. If
22 they just maybe want to go to attend just because then
23 they might not get funded for that. But if they have a
24 reasonable justification for being there, then, yeah,
25 we will fund their travel to those meetings.

26

27 MS. PITKA: Thank you for all your work
28 compiling that information and making it available.

29

30 Thank you.

31

32 MS. WESSELS: You're welcome.

33

34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other
35 questions or comments for Katya.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing or
40 seeing none, that opens up the floor for Board action.

41

42 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair. I move to
43 approve the 2018 Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory
44 Council annual report replies with any modification or
45 revisions that may come about or be offered by the
46 Board during discussions post-motion.

47

48 MR. BROWER: Second.

49

50

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion been
2 made and second to accept the report as presented by
3 Staff.
4
5 Any discussion.
6
7 (No comments)
8
9 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: It looks like
10 you did a good job, Katya.
11
12 Call for the question.
13
14 MR. SIEKANIEC: Question.
15
16 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been
17 called. We'll do roll call.
18
19 MR. DOOLITTLE: David Schmid.
20
21 MR. SCHMID: Yes, I support.
22
23 MR. DOOLITTLE: Bureau of Indian
24 Affairs.....
25
26 REPORTER: Tom, your microphone.
27
28 MR. DOOLITTLE:Gene Peltola.
29
30 REPORTER: Tom.
31
32 MR. DOOLITTLE: Excuse me. Bureau of
33 Indian Affairs, Gene Peltola.
34
35 MR. PELTOLA: Support.
36
37 MR. DOOLITTLE: Public Member Rhonda
38 Pitka.
39
40 MS. PITKA: Support.
41
42 MR. DOOLITTLE: Public Member Charlie
43 Brower.
44
45 MR. BROWER: Support.
46
47 MR. DOOLITTLE: National Park Service,
48 Herbert Frost.
49
50

1 MR. FROST: Support.
2
3 MR. DOOLITTLE: BLM, Chad Padgett.
4
5 MR. PADGETT: Support.
6
7 MR. DOOLITTLE: Last but not least,
8 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Greg Siekaniec.
9
10 MR. SIEKANIEC: Support.
11
12 MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay. Motion passes.
13
14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Support.
15
16 MR. DOOLITTLE: Oh, Anthony
17 Christianson -- sorry.
18
19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support.
20
21 MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay, good.
22
23 (Laughter)
24
25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I lost 10
26 pounds and he can't see me no more.
27
28 (Laughter)
29
30 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
31 thank you very much for that, Staff. We'll move on to
32 revisions to nonrural determination policy. Jennifer
33 Hardin and Robbin Lavine.
34
35 MS. HARDIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
36 Members of the Board. For the record my name is
37 Jennifer Hardin and I'm the Subsistence Policy
38 Coordinator for the Office of Subsistence Management,
39 and I'm here today with my colleague, Robbin Lavine,
40 who's an anthropologist at the Office of Subsistence
41 Management.
42
43 We are here in front of you today to
44 talk to you about some suggested revisions to the
45 Federal Subsistence Board's policy on nonrural
46 determinations. Specifically we're going to be
47 presenting possible revisions to Section B of the
48 policy and Table 1 in the policy. We'll also present
49 to you some draft templates for assessing threshold
50

1 requirements in future proposal cycles. The meeting
2 materials associated with this agenda item begin on
3 Page 321 of your book. There are also copies of all of
4 the meeting materials in the lobby for members of the
5 public.

6

7

MR. BROWER: What page?

8

9

MS. HARDIN: 321.

10

11

Okay.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Just as a reminder, the Board adopted a
policy on nonrural determinations in January of 2017.
A copy of that policy is in your meeting materials,
again, it starts on Page 321. The policy outlines the
process for submitting and assessing nonrural
determination proposals. It also describes the Board's
decisionmaking process and provides a detailed timeline
for the four year nonrural determination proposal
cycle. As a reminder, the Board opted for developing a
policy instead of rulemaking to provide a more flexible
platform that recognizes and is designed to take into
account regional differences throughout the state. The
Board also favored a policy over rulemaking so that
adjustments could be made to the proposal evaluation
process more easily, if necessary.

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

The first nonrural determination
proposal cycle began in January of 2018 and to-date
we've completed the first piece of that process, which
is the threshold requirements determination process.
And you will remember that you looked at one proposal
in April and you determined that that proposal met the
threshold requirements and then you directed Staff to
move forward with a full analysis. So having test
driven that portion of the policy the first time, we
identified some issues, potential issues that we'd like
to clarify in the policy with your concurrence and so
that's what we're here to talk with you about today.

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

If you would turn in your book to Page
342, I'm going to focus specifically on Section B of
the policy, which is called, requirements for proposals
threshold requirements. And what I've done is
extracted that section from the policy and put it on
342 so you can see the current language.

When nonrural proposals are submitted

1 to the Board, the Board must first determine if each
2 proposal meets the threshold requirements that are
3 listed in the policy before moving to full analysis of
4 the proposal. So the current threshold requirements
5 for proposals to both make a nonrural determination and
6 proposals, to rescind a nonrural determination are,
7 again, on Page 342 of the meeting materials. These,
8 again, were the requirements that were used during the
9 first cycle of nonrural proposals that began in 2018.

10

11 As we worked through that first
12 process, that first time, OSM received a fair amount of
13 feedback from the affected Regional Advisory Council,
14 from the Solicitor, from the InterAgency Staff
15 Committee and we had quite a bit of lively discussion
16 internally about the threshold requirements. The
17 majority of the feedback that we received indicated
18 some amount of disagreement or confusion about the
19 meaning of some of the original requirements that were
20 listed in the policy. So as a result of that feedback,
21 OSM is recommending revising the threshold requirements
22 to hopefully achieve greater clarity for the next round
23 of nonrural proposals, which will not begin until
24 January of 2022.

25

26 If you turn to Page 343 in your
27 materials you'll see the suggested revisions in tract
28 changes. The main change that we're suggesting is to
29 eliminate the first requirement, the first bullet
30 entirely and replace it with a requirement that states
31 the proposal provides new or different information than
32 was used by the Board in its most recent decision about
33 the nonrural status of the individual community or
34 area. The purpose of this change is to emphasize that
35 something must have changed since the Board's most
36 recent official action in order to accept a proposal to
37 either make a nonrural determination or rescind a
38 nonrural determination.

39

40 Changes to the second and third bullet
41 sentences are word changes for clarity and to more
42 clearly differentiate between the two requirements.

43

44 If you'd like to see a clean copy of
45 what those changes would look like without the tract
46 changes you can turn to Page 344. And so those
47 threshold requirements that are listed on Page 344,
48 when we complete our full presentation today we're
49 going to be asking you -- that's one of the pieces

50

1 we're going to be asking you to consider approving.

2

3 I just want to emphasize and Robbin and
4 I will probably emphasize this a few times, that should
5 you approve these changes or any others to the
6 threshold requirements, the revisions would not take
7 effect until the next nonrural cycle which begins in
8 January of 2022. So everything that's in process now
9 will continue as is, these changes would not take
10 effect until the next nonrural proposal cycle.

11

12 At this point I would like to pause
13 just for a moment to see if you have any questions or I
14 can just turn it over to Robbin who will proceed on
15 with agenda item, I think it's 4B.

16

17 MS. LAVINE: Uh-huh.

18

19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any questions
20 for her.

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing or
25 seeing none, thank you Jennifer.

26

27 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
28 Members of the Council. For the record my name is
29 Robbin Lavine, I'm an anthropologist here at OSM.

30

31 So we are now at agenda item 4B. I'll
32 be discussing 4B and 4C, two items that you'll be
33 taking -- of the three that you'll be taking action on
34 today.

35

36 So I'd like you to direct your
37 attention to Page 345 in your paper materials and I
38 want you to look at the edits in blue, bold blue, and
39 then there are some that -- any deleted items will be
40 struck out. Okay. This timeline has been edited to
41 include language that a threshold assessment will be
42 conducted by Staff as directed in April and to clarify
43 Council involvement in the nonrural regulatory cycle.
44 The marked up version of the timeline demonstrating
45 suggested edits is on Page 345 of your documents, but
46 I've also passed out a hard copy handout of the what
47 the final version of the timeline would look like
48 should you approve these changes. So that would be
49 Table 1, and that's the final version, if you want to

50

1 go ahead and approve those.

2
3 Now, on Pages 347 and 349 you'll see
4 that we have the templates. So at its April meeting,
5 the Board directed Staff to revise the policy as
6 outlined by Jennifer and also to bring a threshold
7 assessment template for your review and approval at
8 this work session. This was not part of the original
9 policy but this was a tool that we found would be
10 helpful in our process, it would be helpful for the
11 Councils, based on their feedback, and I think we all
12 determined during the Board meeting in April that it
13 was actually -- it was also helpful for you. So these
14 templates before you are based on the threshold
15 requirements assessment document the Staff developed to
16 support your decisionmaking on Rural Proposal 19-01.

17
18 So the first template is for making a
19 nonrural determination; the second template is for
20 rescinding a nonrural determination, there's a slight
21 difference in the language of each. And I did actually
22 pass out another hard copy for the making, which there
23 was a little bit of -- we found a couple of edits that
24 we wanted to take care of on the original paper copies
25 -- I think it's been corrected in the digital copies
26 but here's a hard copy handout anyway. So, again,
27 should you -- well, yeah, so there are slight
28 differences in language of each but these templates;
29 one, they anticipate changed language for the threshold
30 requirements, and they can be easily modified if you
31 don't want to make that language change, and they also
32 provide written documentation of Council and ISC input
33 on the threshold assessment so you can see that at the
34 back, if you turn the page over. So, again, should you
35 approve these edits to the policy and the timeline and
36 approve this template format, these changes will not
37 take effect until the next nonrural regulatory cycle
38 beginning in 2022.

39
40 So, in summary, you are taking action
41 on three items. On the agenda they are A, B and C.
42 You're taking action on recommended edits to the
43 threshold requirements on Page 344. The timeline,
44 Table 1 on Page 345. And to approve the threshold
45 assessment template, Pages 347 and 349.

46
47 We're ready for discussion and
48 questions if you have them.

49
50

1 Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you guys
4 for that work and presentation. Any questions to the
5 Staff.

6

7 (No comments)

8

9 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I think it's
10 pretty straightforward. Did someone write down that
11 motion that Robbin so kindly laid out there.

12

13 (Laughter)

14

15 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll open it
16 to the Board.

17

18 MS. PITKA: I move to approve suggested
19 language for revisions to the nonrural determination
20 policy threshold criteria, Table 1 timeline process
21 description and the threshold assessment template.

22

23 MR. SIEKANIEC: Greg Siekaniec supports
24 the motion -- or seconds the motion.

25

26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
27 There's a motion on the floor and seconded.

28

29 Any further discussion.

30

31 MR. CHEN: Thank you, Robbin and
32 Jennifer for that excellent presentation.

33

34 We just wanted to make sure that on the
35 record we can highlight the value and importance of the
36 Regional Advisory Council participation and involvement
37 in this process.

38

39 Thank you.

40

41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other
42 questions or comments.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing or
47 seeing none, call for the question.

48

49 MR. FROST: Question.

50

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been
2 called. Go ahead, Tom.
3
4 MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay. We're voting on
5 the action item to review the -- to vote on the
6 threshold criteria, amendments to the policy, Table 1
7 timeline process description and the threshold
8 assessment templates that have been drafted by OSM for
9 your approval.
10
11 BLM, Chad Padgett.
12
13 MR. PADGETT: Support.
14
15 MR. DOOLITTLE: National Park Service,
16 Herbert Frost.
17
18 MR. FROST: Support.
19
20 MR. DOOLITTLE: U.S. Fish and Wildlife
21 Service, Greg Siekaniec.
22
23 MR. SIEKANIEC: Support.
24
25 MR. DOOLITTLE: Public Member Rhonda
26 Pitka.
27
28 MS. PITKA: Support.
29
30 MR. DOOLITTLE: Bureau of Indian
31 Affairs, Glenn Chen.
32
33 MR. CHEN: Support.
34
35 MR. DOOLITTLE: Public Member Charlie
36 Brower.
37
38 MR. BROWER: Support.
39
40 MR. DOOLITTLE: U.S. Forest Service,
41 David Schmid.
42
43 MR. SCHMID: Support.
44
45 MR. DOOLITTLE: Last, but not least,
46 Chairman Anthony Christianson.
47
48 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support.
49
50

1 MR. DOOLITTLE: And the motion passes.

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
4 we'll take another break because if we keep going this
5 fast we'll be done at lunch today.

6

7 (Laughter)

8

9 MR. FROST: Nothing wrong with that.

10

11 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, so let's
12 take a good nice visit break here for a few minutes and
13 then we'll get back to Wildlife Temporary Special
14 Action. Before we do break, again, public testimony,
15 to make a really quick statement about that, we do have
16 blue cards, we will be following our procedures for
17 considering special action requests and then we will
18 also ask that the public be mindful of other presenters
19 and keep it to a limit of 10 to 15 minutes.

20

21 Thank you.

22

23 (Off record)

24

25 (On record)

26

27 (Teleconference technical interference)

28

29 (Staff presentation of WSA19-01)

30

31 MS. WORKER:but there has been a
32 State season in the area since 2005. And somewhere
33 along the line as regulations were changed in Unit 18
34 for moose and the hunt areas were defined and adjusted,
35 the State and the Federal boundaries just became
36 misaligned. And for a long time there were really not
37 very many moose at all in this area but the population
38 has grown fairly significantly recently. Between 2013
39 and 2018 it grew 42 percent annually and that has
40 resulted in an estimated 173 moose in the Kanektok and
41 Arolik drainages at the last count, that was in 2018.

42

43 Through regulatory year 2018/2019
44 harvest occurred under State regulation and it occurred
45 by.....

46

47 OPERATOR: Tina.

48

49 (Teleconference interruption)

50

1 MS. WORKER:harvest ticket and
2 reported harvest was quite low under this system
3 averaging just four moose per year between 2003 and
4 2018. A better estimate of harvest likely comes from
5 the household surveys that the ADF&G Subsistence
6 Division does and they indicate significantly more
7 harvest. For instance, residents of Quinhagak report
8 that they harvested 33 moose in 1983 and 42 moose in
9 2013. Beginning this regulatory year, so on September
10 1st, the State will implement their hunt using a
11 registration permit, rather than a harvest ticket, and
12 the expectation is that with time harvest reporting
13 will probably improve in that hunt area with the use of
14 a registration permit.

15
16 In terms of the effect of this request,
17 it makes a lot of sense to align the Federal and State
18 boundaries, obviously from a compliance standpoint and
19 from an enforcement standpoint it makes sense to have
20 the same boundaries under all jurisdictions. But it
21 also makes sense biologically because the proposed
22 addition to the Federal hunt area is currently part of
23 Unit 18 remainder, and Unit 18 remainder mostly occurs
24 in the Lower Yukon area and there's a very high moose
25 density there and the regulations are quite liberal,
26 both in terms of season and harvest limit.

27
28 The population in the Kanektok/Arolik
29 drainages is growing and it does warrant a season but a
30 much more limited season than currently exists in that
31 proposed addition to the Federal hunt area.

32
33 One of the things we were concerned
34 about is the effect that this request might have on
35 neighboring communities. Quinhagak is the only
36 community within the hunt area and we expect that most
37 of the harvest will come from that community, however
38 residents of neighboring communities, Eek, in
39 particular, will be affected by the proposed regulatory
40 change if they hunt in the area, specifically a State
41 registration permit will be made available only in
42 Quinhagak, that's how the State regulation is currently
43 written. And so that will limit participation by non-
44 subsistence users, presumably, but it could also limit
45 legal participation by subsistence users from Eek or
46 other communities who want to hunt in this hunt area
47 and will first have to travel to Quinhagak to secure a
48 registration permit.

49
50

1 When we took this issue to the public
2 and the tribes we didn't hear any concern about this
3 particular issue and we also learned at those meetings
4 that the ADF&G area biologist can expand the permit
5 distribution to neighboring communities if it becomes
6 clear that that is necessary. And so this is something
7 to keep an eye on but it's not something that we feel
8 precludes supporting the request at this point as it
9 was submitted.

10

11 As I mentioned, we held consultations
12 and public meetings on this special action request and
13 we held those meetings in the community of Quinhagak
14 and they were very well attended. When we met with the
15 board of the village corporation we did hear some
16 concerns from them and they were mostly related to the
17 impact that an influx of sporthunters might have on --
18 both on corporation lands and on subsistence users if
19 the quota were met early, for instance. The tribal
20 consultation included quite a bit of discussion about
21 the implications of the newly implemented State
22 registration permit and how it would intersect with the
23 proposed Federal hunt. The tribe didn't take a formal
24 position on this request but several of the tribal
25 council members expressed support for the additional
26 subsistence opportunity that it would provide. The
27 conversation at the public meeting was similar to the
28 conversation we had at the tribal consultation, in
29 that, we answered a lot of general questions about
30 licensing and permitting. We talked about enforcement
31 and we also talked quite a bit about private lands and
32 how hunting and fishing is administered on private
33 lands and what authority land owners have in limiting
34 access to their lands. So a lot of just sort of
35 general discussion that felt really productive.
36 Ultimately the participants who spoke during the public
37 comment portion of the meeting all expressed their
38 support for the special action request noting that
39 they've observed the growth of the moose population and
40 supporting the additional subsistence opportunity that
41 it would provide.

42

43 So the OSM conclusion is to support
44 WSA19-01.

45

46 And that's all I have but I am happy to
47 take questions if there are any.

48

49 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

50

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
2 Susan, for that presentation.

3
4 Glenn.

5
6 MR. CHEN: Thank you, Suzanne. That
7 was a very good presentation.

8
9 The notion that residents outside of
10 Quinhagak may be able to get a permit without having to
11 travel to Quinhagak, that's an idea that's still being
12 formulated, is there a certainty that, say, if someone
13 from Eek who wants a permit issued in Eek can get that
14 at a later date or is that still being resolved?

15
16 MS. WORKER: So to my understanding,
17 and the State might have a more definitive answer on
18 this, so in the State regulation book it says that the
19 permits will only be distributed in Quinhagak and so I
20 don't know if that can be resolved this year. But it
21 was communicated that in the future permit distribution
22 can be expanded to neighboring communities.

23
24 So that's my understanding.

25
26 I don't know if Mark wants to clarify
27 that.

28
29 (No comments)

30
31 MS. WORKER: He's shaking his head no.

32
33 MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

34
35 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Charlie.

36
37 MR. BROWER: As you stated -- thank you
38 for the presentation -- when the State permit system
39 came there's some confusion and also that one of the
40 State biologists has discretion to change the where and
41 how the State permits will be issued, and there's also
42 that confusion where residents of Eek might have
43 customary and traditional use on Federal land, how are
44 they going to coincide with what's being changed?

45
46 MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Brower. So
47 the residents of Eek do have a customary and
48 traditional use determination for this hunt area and
49 you can see on your map the community of Eek is a

50

1 little bit hard to see on the map but it is directly
2 north of the northern boundary of the hunt area, and so
3 they actually are pretty close to some of this hunt
4 area. Under current State regulation and under the new
5 State permit they will have to secure a registration
6 permit, presumably in Quinhagak, this year at least.
7 And it is the first year that the State registration
8 permit has been required and so, you know, we ended up
9 talking about that quite a bit just because it's new.

10

11 MR. BROWER: Okay. Thank you.

12

13 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other
14 questions for Staff.

15

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, hearing
20 none, thank you for that and we'll move on to Regional
21 Advisory Council, or InterAgency Staff Committee
22 recommendation.

23

24 MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For
25 the record my name is Jennifer Hardin, I'm the OSM
26 subsistence policy coordinator and the Chair of the
27 InterAgency Staff Committee.

28

29 The InterAgency Staff Committee
30 recommendation is to support Temporary Special Action
31 Request WSA19-01.

32

33 The InterAgency Staff Committee concurs
34 with the OSM Staff analysis that this action would
35 provide for increased moose hunting opportunities for
36 Federally-qualified subsistence users and reduce
37 regulatory complexity by aligning State and Federal
38 regulations in hunt areas. This would ease compliance,
39 simplify enforcement and facilitate harvest management.
40 Concerns were expressed during tribal consultation and
41 public meetings about the potential for more non-local
42 users to participate in the hunt and the requirement to
43 obtain a State registration permit versus Federal
44 registration permit. The State requirement to obtain
45 registration permits in person from Quinhagak should
46 reduce potential increases of non-local participation
47 in the new hunt area while making permits available to
48 local users. The requirement of a State registration
49 permit would also consolidate both Federal and State

50

1 reporting requirements into a single system further
2 reducing regulatory complexity.

3
4 The proposed change to the current
5 Kanektok/Arolik hunt area will align all Federal and
6 State hunt unit boundaries within Unit 18 and would
7 reduce regulatory confusion. Changes in seasons and
8 harvest limits associated with alignment of boundaries
9 would improve moose harvest management and enforcement.
10 Full rescission of the closure would provide addition
11 opportunity to both Federally-qualified and non-
12 Federally-qualified users. The additional harvest by
13 non-Federally-qualified users is anticipated to be
14 minimal due to harvest -- I'm sorry -- is anticipated
15 to be minimal due to the localized permit distribution
16 out of Quinhagak. Limiting distribution of permits
17 from Quinhagak may negatively effect users from Eek by
18 requiring them to travel to Quinhagak for permits,
19 however, this impact is expected to be small given that
20 the reported harvest by residents of Eek is low and
21 that permitting locations can be expanded, if
22 necessary, to accommodate local subsistence needs.

23
24 During the April 2020 wildlife
25 regulatory meeting the Federal Subsistence Board will
26 have a chance to consider Eek's situation further when
27 deliberating on Wildlife Proposal WP20-32/33 that
28 proposes to make this special action request a
29 permanent regulation.

30
31 Rescinding the Federal public lands
32 closure is consistent with the Board's closure policy.
33 The moose population has increased significantly since
34 the closure was established in 1991 and showed a 42
35 percent growth rate from 2013 to 2018. This action is
36 not anticipated to have a negative effect on the moose
37 population given the rate of growth. Furthermore, the
38 State has allowed harvest since 2006 of one antlered
39 bull on State lands within the hunt unit area where
40 Federal lands are currently closed indicating
41 additional harvest is sustainable.

42
43 Approving this temporary special action
44 request will also allow communities to access the new
45 hunt structure for the 2019 season prior to Board
46 evaluation of WP20-32/33 that could make these
47 regulations permanent.

48
49 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

50

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
2 questions for Staff.

3
4 MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

5
6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, go ahead,
7 Charlie.

8
9 MR. BROWER: Thank you, Jennifer. I
10 noted that from the previous years from 2002 to 2013,
11 the population was pretty low, then all of a sudden
12 from '13 to the '18 it expanded four times and so that
13 won't have any major effect on harvesting, what, 42
14 moose, or what's the annual take going to be at that
15 rate?

16
17 MS. WORKER: I can try to address that
18 question.

19
20 So, Mr. Brower, we don't feel like we
21 have a good handle on harvest in the area, reported
22 harvest isn't a very good indicator of actual harvest
23 as far as we understand. The household surveys
24 indicate how many moose were taken by the community of
25 Quinhagak, that doesn't mean they were only taken in
26 that hunt area so this isn't very precise. And those
27 household surveys are also, you know, a single survey
28 in one year using a sample of the community. So we
29 don't know what the harvest is. We assume that there
30 is a lot of unreported harvest but when you look at the
31 way that the population has increased, it's clear that
32 whatever harvest that has been happening is not out-
33 pacing growth.

34
35 So establishing a Federal season
36 doesn't seem problematic at this point, especially if
37 we limit the influx of sporthunters.

38
39 MR. BROWER: Thank you. Thank you, Mr.
40 Chair.

41
42 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Rhonda.

43
44 MS. PITKA: So I understand that there
45 was no time for Regional Advisory comment on this
46 correct?

47
48 MS. WORKER: No.

49
50

1 MS. PITKA: Okay. But it will go to
2 Regional Advisory comment when it becomes a permanent
3 proposal, right?

4
5 MS. WORKER: Yes, that's correct.
6

7 MS. PITKA: Thank you.
8

9 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other
10 questions or comments of the ISC.

11
12 (No comments)

13
14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none
15 we'll move on to public comment.

16
17 (No comments)

18
19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I don't think
20 we've got any public comment on this one.

21
22 Is there anyone on line?

23
24 OPERATOR: There are no questions in
25 que at this time.

26
27 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, I
28 don't hear anybody on line.

29
30 Offer the State an opportunity.

31
32 (No comments)

33
34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: None taken.
35 All right, man, this is going to be a fast day.

36
37 (Laughter)

38
39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Board
40 discussion on this proposal.

41
42 (No comments)

43
44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I think we've
45 discussed it. We'll move on for Federal Board action.

46
47 MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair.

48
49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg.
50

1 MR. SIEKANIEC: Greg Siekaniec, U.S.
2 Fish and Wildlife. Mr. Chair, I would like to move
3 that we approve Wildlife Special Action 19-01. If I
4 get a second I will provide my justification.

5
6 MR. BROWER: Second.

7
8 MR. SIEKANIEC: This action unifies
9 Federal and State hunt unit boundaries and harvest
10 regulations which will reduce user confusion and allow
11 users to hunt all lands under one permit regardless of
12 State or Federal ownership. Rescinding the closure and
13 establishing a season will significantly increase the
14 land area available for moose hunting by Federally-
15 qualified subsistence users providing an increase in
16 subsistence opportunity. Although rescinding the land
17 closure provides opportunity to non-Federally-qualified
18 users, the requirement to obtain State registration
19 permits from Quinhagak will likely limit participation
20 by non-locals.

21
22 Moose population data clearly shows a
23 healthy and increasing population for this region that
24 indicates there is no longer a conservation concern and
25 subsequently, as we have heard, rescinding the closure
26 is appropriate in accordance with the Board's closure
27 policy.

28
29 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

30
31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
32 further discussion.

33
34 Glenn.

35
36 MR. CHEN: So the BIA certainly
37 appreciates the possibility of folks out in the region
38 being able to hunt moose with the expanded population.
39 We do have some concerns about how the permits will be
40 issued and specifically that they'll be issued in
41 Quinhagak and while the Eek residents, as you pointed
42 out, there is low participation, there is actual
43 participation and so if I understand correctly for this
44 particularly special action for this season, those Eek
45 folks will have to go Quinhagak to get their permits.
46 Is there any possible work around that could be
47 developed?

48
49 MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Chen. So

50

1 to my understanding of State regulation there isn't a
2 work around for issuing permits in Quinhagak. I mean
3 the obvious alternative is a Federal registration
4 permit, that does complicate things for users in its
5 own way although more equitably, I guess, across
6 communities.

7
8 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And I heard
9 Susan mention they will try to work in that maybe
10 making them available, is that by the end of the --
11 after the next cycle, like in our January Board
12 meeting, or next season, potentially?

13
14 MS. WORKER: Presumably that would be
15 the next regulatory year. But that is a State
16 regulation, you know, how those permits are distributed
17 is up to the State.

18
19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And just to
20 update Gene, we're in the middle of a motion with a
21 second to accept Temporary Special Action 19-01. So
22 we're just in discussion about it and Glenn was in a
23 conversation about the permits and issuance between Eek
24 and Quinhagak and equitably making that available.

25
26 MR. PELTOLA: And I apologize for my
27 absence but I had to be pulled away for a second.

28
29 But could I ask to hear the motion
30 which was made since I missed that. How was the motion
31 made?

32
33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, go ahead,
34 Greg.

35
36 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
37 Yeah, the motion is to approve Wildlife Special Action
38 19-01, and then of course I provided a justification.

39
40 Justification is, the action unifies
41 Federal and State hunt unit boundaries and harvest
42 regulations which will reduce user confusion and allow
43 users to hunt all lands under one permit, regardless of
44 State or Federal ownership. Rescinding the closure and
45 establishing a season will significantly increase the
46 land available for moose hunting by Federally-qualified
47 subsistence users providing an increase in subsistence
48 opportunity. Although rescinding the land closure
49 provides opportunity to non-Federally-qualified users,
50

1 the requirement to obtain State registration permits
2 from Quinhagak will likely limit participation by non-
3 locals.

4

5 Moose population data clearly shows a
6 healthy and increasing population for this region that
7 indicates there is no longer a conservation concern.
8 Subsequently, rescinding the closure is appropriate in
9 accordance with the Board's closure policy.

10

11 Thank you.

12

13 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you. So, Mr.
14 Chair, I understand we're in the discussion phase of
15 the motion, correct?

16

17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

18

19 MR. PELTOLA: Okay. If I may.

20

21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead.

22

23 MR. PELTOLA: One thing I'd like to
24 point out is if you look at the Kuskokwim range itself
25 on the south end, the Kanektok, where the potential
26 lifting of this closure is proposed to the Board, that
27 is similar in topography and habitat type, but
28 anecdotally has a lower density compared to the
29 headlands of the drainages as you go up north of the
30 Kilbuck Range, which include the Eek, the Kwethluk, the
31 Kisaralik, the Fog River and the Tuluksak. If you take
32 those upper drainages into consideration with regard to
33 the moose harvest in the Kilbucks we have a State
34 registration permit which is issued for that section of
35 the game management unit with exception of, once you
36 get into those hills or the upper portions of the
37 tributaries, which are similar to the upper Kanektok,
38 but probably a bit higher density, it is managed via
39 two different geographic regions. You have one on the
40 mainstem and one on the upper tributaries, which the
41 upper tributaries of the aforementioned drainages are
42 very similar to the Kanektok with exception of there's
43 probably lower densities in the Kanektok than the
44 others. Those upper drainages, which, if the Kanektok
45 is within Togiak National Wildlife Refuge, all the
46 others with Yukon-Delta, all the other drainages, the
47 up river portions, once you get out of the flats in the
48 hills are managed under a different management scenario
49 where you have to be a Federally-qualified user only,

50

1 which I mentioned there are similar topography,
2 riparian corridors, everything else, and as a matter of
3 fact there's probably exchange between the upper
4 Kanektok population with Eek and the Kwethluk because
5 they come fairly close together and it's just a hop,
6 skip and a jump away from these upper tribs.

7
8 So the question I had and maybe OSM
9 could address this, is that, if we have enough concern
10 for those drainages up the Kilbuck range where they're
11 limited to Federally-qualified users only, therefore,
12 why are we going to a State permit opened to all users,
13 not only Federally-qualified users for the Kanektok.

14
15 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Staff.

16
17 MS. WORKER: Thanks, Mr. Peltola. We
18 don't anticipate a large increase in harvest. And so,
19 you know, I mean an intermediate alternative would be
20 to open Federal public lands only to Federally-
21 qualified subsistence users. Given the way the State
22 permit is distributed the expectation is that we will
23 not see an influx of sporthunters so the difference
24 between those two actions might not be very significant
25 in terms of actual increase in harvest.

26
27 MR. PELTOLA: If I may.

28
29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead.

30
31 MR. PELTOLA: I understand that line of
32 thinking, although, if the density is low enough to
33 have permits issued in a community, which I think that
34 Glenn mentioned that residents of Eek, who may be
35 eligible to participate in the Kanektok harvest would
36 have to go Quinhagak to get a permit and they're also a
37 real isolated community, that doesn't necessarily
38 follow the same logic applied by the program for those
39 other drainages which are anecdotally higher density
40 than the Kanektok, in the sense that if we're
41 restricting harvest on the others and we're not on the
42 Kanektok. And I'm not advocating for one or the other
43 but it appears to me that -- I understand the
44 rationale, but that rationale could be applied to
45 elsewhere and the Program chooses to go a different
46 direction with the other four or five drainages than we
47 are in the Kanektok.

48
49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg.

50

1 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
2 Gene, I think I'm following your question, is your
3 question bringing us back to the idea of should we be
4 looking at the other areas to determine whether or not
5 there is a conservation issue there and we should have
6 a, you know, not be limiting it to a Federally-
7 qualified user in those areas?

8
9 MR. PELTOLA: That is a yes and a no.
10 Yes, for that area, or, no, then we should be
11 considering the same for the Kanektok. Either or.
12 Because there's inconsistencies applicable to the
13 Program when you look at those ranges of the Kanektok
14 versus the Eek, the Kisaralik, the Kwethluk, the Fog,
15 the Tuluksak.

16
17 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Gene. So
18 should those be part of then the next wildlife
19 regulatory cycle where we actually look at more than
20 just this particular special action, I mean is that
21 what you would recommend?

22
23 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, if I may. My
24 thinking would be that if we take an action that it be
25 consistent with that is in effect already for the other
26 drainages and then if we deem that is not appropriate
27 then we should take a closer look on how we implement
28 the harvest on the Kanektok in addition to those other
29 drainages going up the Kilbuck Range.

30
31 MR. DOOLITTLE: So, Mr. Peltola and Mr.
32 Siekaniec, are you both, you know, suggesting that --
33 again, this unit within the Goodnews Drainage --
34 Kanektok Drainage be closed all but to Federally-
35 qualified users and there wouldn't be a State
36 registration hunt, with people going, you know, there,
37 and with the understanding that in all the headwater
38 areas, you know, that are open now to Federally-
39 qualified users in the other drainages you mentioned
40 are, in many ways, you know, not necessarily close to
41 any villages to those headwater areas, is also
42 relatively remote and sometimes require, you know,
43 specialized equipment to get, you know, far up in the
44 reaching drainages, just something to offer to the
45 discussion.

46
47 MR. PELTOLA: And I mention it -- Mr.
48 Chair, if I may.

49
50

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Gene.

2
3 MR. PELTOLA: I mention it for
4 consideration of the Board because if we take the
5 proposal as listed, I'm not necessarily advocating for
6 a limitation of Federally-qualified users only but
7 there could be argued that a higher -- it'd be a better
8 argument for the Kanektok and this area if we're
9 initiating harvest and for existing harvest which
10 occurs on those up river. So we may have differing
11 justifications at times, depending on what aspect,
12 whether Kanektok or further down, potentially an
13 animal could be harvested on the Kanektok, which is
14 also present if you cross this imaginary line across
15 the tundra in the hills where it's available to a
16 different subset of harvesters. So what I'm advocating
17 for is the Board to take serious consideration on the
18 action so we don't have discrepancies between the two.

19
20 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Tom.

21
22 MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, I would also
23 think, you know, within the present closure, you know,
24 policy, is it doesn't have to be closed or open, there
25 can be that limitation to kind of ease the opening of
26 an area to Federally-qualified users as a first step as
27 you have an expanding population as an initial step, so
28 it's not just A or B. There is that wiggle room within
29 policy.

30
31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So what I hear
32 is a suggestion to a soft amendment for consistency and
33 I like consistency so I mean I don't know if that's a
34 first step to potentially look at a special action and
35 then maybe discuss it more.

36
37 MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
38 just wanted to note to the Board that if there's
39 interest in opening Federal public lands only to
40 Federally-qualified subsistence users there might need
41 to be a discussion about the use of a State
42 registration permit and perhaps some input from the
43 State about whether or not that would be acceptable.
44 Because it would be asking for the use of a State
45 registration permit in a way that is not allowed by
46 non-Federally-qualified users on lands where non-
47 Federally-qualified users would not be able to hunt.

48
49 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair. I think that

50

1 is the case for GMU18 Kusko mainstem where a
2 registration permit issued by the State of Alaska is
3 utilized for harvest on the mainstem itself, which is a
4 mix of State jurisdiction in addition to Federal. But
5 when it comes to the upper portion of the tributaries
6 of the -- you know, upper tributaries of the
7 aforementioned rivers is that that registration permit
8 is still utilized for the harvest, although it is open
9 only to Federally-qualified users only.

10

11 MS. WORKER: That's correct. The
12 situation does exist in adjacent hunt area boundaries.
13 I just wanted to make sure the Board understands the
14 complexities that come with an amendment.

15

16 MR. PELTOLA: One other consideration
17 may be that the -- and I don't recall the Kanektok and
18 Goodnews versus GMU 18 and the main Kusko Valley, but
19 one consideration, would be to authorize the in-season
20 manager -- you know, go forth as recommended by OSM,
21 and in addition to the motion made, but also if we have
22 the ability within the delegation of authority to allow
23 the in-season manager to limit the harvest to
24 Federally-qualified users only if so need be.

25

26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Is that already
27 in that delegation to that game unit?

28

29 MR. PELTOLA: I don't recall which,
30 whether it's Yukon-Delta or Togiak National Wildlife
31 Refuge has the delegation for the Kanektok and the
32 Goodnews.

33

34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Tom said it
35 should be Togiak.

36

37 MS. WORKER: Yes. And.....

38

39 REPORTER: Suzanne, stop, I'm sorry.

40

41 (Technical issue)

42

43 MS. WORKER: How about this?

44

45 MS. PITKA: Yes.

46

47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, we're
48 good. Thank you, Tina.

49

50

1 MS. WORKER: Okay. So what I was
2 saying was that the Kanektok/Arolik hunt area is within
3 Togiak National Wildlife Refuge but there is no
4 delegation of authority letter for the Refuge of that
5 manager to manage the moose harvest. That doesn't mean
6 there can't be one, but there's not currently one.

7
8 MR. PELTOLA: And if I recall, if there
9 was a friendly amendment to the motion to authorize the
10 in-season manager to do such, that could be addressed
11 in a timely enough manner if the Board votes and gives
12 authorization for such.

13
14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I would ask the
15 original maker of the motion if we just added that as a
16 direction to Staff to include that in what we pass here
17 or don't pass here today as just an -- just direction
18 to Staff that maybe we do issue a delegation of
19 authority letter that would put the ball in the court
20 of the area manager, if there's an issue with harvest
21 and, I mean, we could speculate but if there is an
22 issue where there is a whole horde of hunters that come
23 flying in there, I mean, there should be a tool to
24 interject.

25
26 MR. PELTOLA: And I make that comment
27 based on, not that -- to ensure that the Board
28 considers all options available before us to ensure
29 that the rural preference and priority consumptive use
30 is addressed by the body.

31
32 MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair. Yeah, I
33 think that's an appropriate move. I'm still trying to
34 figure out, so if we're talking about primarily the
35 issue of Eek residents having to go to Quinhagak to get
36 a permit? That does not address that issue.

37
38 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No, I think
39 he's talking about the issue of opening it up to
40 everybody when there's restrictions on adjacent game
41 units that aren't consistent with the action that we
42 would take here today and so if we inject that
43 delegation of authority it would give us a tool to make
44 it consistent if it needed to be.

45
46 MR. PELTOLA: And it's not necessarily
47 a mandatory first step, but gives the in-season manager
48 a tool to address that if it does occur, and then I'd
49 feel a lot more comfortable voting in the affirmative

50

1 for the proposal if we had that safeguard in place.

2

3 MR. SIEKANIEC: Yeah, Mr. Chair, I
4 think it's appropriate that we provide the in-season
5 manager with all the tools that might be necessary for
6 managing this hunt. So that part I'm absolutely fine
7 with.

8

9 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Ken.

10

11 MR. LORD: Just to confirm, that
12 delegation would only be for the duration of this
13 special action, correct?

14

15 MR. PELTOLA: That's what I would
16 imagine and then if the Board has a proposal, address
17 it in the regulatory cycle, then we address it at that
18 time as something potentially for future consideration.

19

20 MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair. Just to
21 make sure I'm following. So the motion stands. And as
22 a Board we will just assign this to Staff to come up
23 with the delegation of authority letter, we're not
24 adding that as an amendment to the motion?

25

26 MR. PELTOLA: Personally I'd feel a lot
27 more comfortable if there was an amendment to the
28 motion because the original motion would still stand
29 with the addition of that OSM will be directed to write
30 a new delegation of authority with the Board's
31 concurrence to give the in-season manager the option to
32 limit to Federally-qualified users only if the
33 situation so warrants.

34

35 MR. SIEKANIEC: Okay, I'm fine with
36 that if an amendment gets offered. I just was trying
37 to sort out where we are in the process.

38

39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So I would go
40 ahead and open the floor for an amendment.

41

42 MR. PELTOLA: So moved as previously
43 stipulated.

44

45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Is there a
46 second.

47

48 MS. PITKA: I'll second.

49

50

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any more
2 discussion on the amendment.
3
4 (No comments)
5
6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
7 all in favor of the amendment to the original motion to
8 include delegation of letter of authority to the in-
9 season manager until the next regulatory cycle please
10 say aye.
11
12 IN UNISON: Aye.
13
14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Opposed same
15 sign.
16
17 (No opposing votes)
18
19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion carries
20 to accept the amendment to the original motion. We'll
21 go back and any discussion on the original motion.
22
23 (No comments)
24
25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All in favor of
26 the original motion as presented with the amendment
27 please say aye.
28
29 IN UNISON: Aye.
30
31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Opposed same
32 sign.
33
34 (No opposing votes)
35
36 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion carries
37 unanimously to accept Special Action 19-01 with the
38 amendment.
39
40 Thank you, Staff, appreciate it.
41
42 That will move us on to WSA19-02, Unit
43 2 wolves, Lisa Maas and Pippa.
44
45 (Makes wolf sound)
46
47 (Laughter)
48
49 MS. MAAS: All right, thank you, Mr.
50

1 Chair. Members of the Board. My name is Lisa Maas.
2 I'm a wildlife biologist in the Office of Subsistence
3 Management. I'll be presenting a summary of the
4 analysis for Temporary Wildlife Special Action WSA19-
5 02, which begins on Page 369 of your meeting books.
6

7 WSA19-02 was submitted by the Southeast
8 Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council and
9 requests extending the sealing period for wolf hunting
10 and trapping in Unit 2 from within 14 days of harvest
11 to within 30 days of the end of the season and removing
12 language referencing a combined Federal/State harvest
13 quota for wolves in Unit 2.
14

15 The Alaska Board of Game adopted a new
16 harvest management strategy for wolves in Unit 2 in
17 January 2019 resulting in misalignment of State and
18 Federal regulations. The proponent states that their
19 intent is to align State and Federal regulations to
20 facilitate coordination between State and Federal
21 managers and to reduce confusion among users.
22

23 Of note, Unit 2 wolves are part of the
24 Alexander Archipelago subspecies which occupies
25 Southeastern Alaska and Coastal British Columbia. In
26 1993 and 2011 the Alexander Archipelago wolf was
27 petitioned to be listed under the Endangered Species
28 Act. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service found the
29 listings not to be warranted on both occasions as the
30 range-wide population appeared stable. In 1997 the
31 Board of Game and the Federal Subsistence Board adopted
32 harvest guideline levels to manage the Unit 2 wolf
33 population, which established annual harvest quotas
34 based on wolf population estimates. Seasons would
35 close early if quotas were expected to be met. Between
36 2013 and 2018 seasons closed early with reported
37 harvest well exceeding harvest quotas in some years.
38 In 2018 ADF&G submitted Proposal 43 to the Board of
39 Game to change the harvest management strategy from
40 using harvest management guidelines to meeting
41 population objectives. The Board of Game adopted
42 Proposal 43 in January 2019 establishing the Unit 2
43 population objective range as 150 to 200 wolves. The
44 Board of Game also extended the State trapping season
45 aligning Federal and State seasons.
46

47 The Southeast Council also submitted
48 Wildlife Proposals WP20-16 and WP20-17 which closely
49 mirror this special action.
50

1 During the tribal consultation the
2 Craig Tribal Association voiced support for WSA19-02
3 stating it would provide better harvest opportunity and
4 that the Unit 2 wolf population is abundant, needs
5 higher harvest and is negatively impacting the deer
6 population. During the public meeting four testimonies
7 in support and none in opposition of WSA19-02 were
8 received. The Craig Tribal Association echoed comments
9 from the tribal consultation. Other comments included
10 that the wolf population is up, the population
11 objective range is sustainable and that the deer
12 population has declined due to wolf predation and
13 decreasing habitat quality. One testifier expressed
14 concern over how Federal and State managers would
15 establish season lengths and another commented that
16 coordinating State and Federal regulations would be
17 helpful to Unit 2 residents. ADF&G submitted comments
18 in support of WSA19-02 stating it would facilitate
19 implementation of the new harvest management strategy,
20 eliminate regulatory conflicts and reduce user
21 confusion.

22
23 Before 2013 Unit 2 wolf abundance was
24 uncertain. Since 2013 a DNA method has been used to
25 generate population estimates. Between 2013 and 2018
26 wolf population estimates have ranged from a low of 89
27 wolves in 2014 to a high of 231 wolves in 2017. Human
28 harvest accounts for the vast majority of wolf
29 mortality in Unit 2, however wolves are very resilient
30 to high harvest levels due to their high reproductive
31 potential and ability to disperse long-distances. In
32 Unit 2 wolf abundance is closely linked with deer
33 abundance, their primary prey. Deer are primarily
34 limited by habitat, which is being negatively affected
35 by logging of old growth forest in Unit 2. Logging
36 operations also construct roads providing easy hunter
37 and trapper access into previously remote areas.

38
39 The new harvest management strategy
40 consists of four zones as depicted in Figure 2 on Page
41 381. Different zones correspond to different
42 population levels and season lengths. Zone 3 is the
43 desirable zone where the wolf population is within the
44 objective range of 150 to 200 wolves and a season of up
45 to two months would be announced.

46
47 Between 1997 and 2018, total trapper
48 numbers in Unit 2 average 14.5 trappers per year. With
49 Unit 2 residents primarily from Klawock and Craig
50

1 harvesting 89 percent of the wolves on average. Over
2 this time period catch per trapper averaged 3.4 wolves,
3 however, usually just two to three skilled trappers
4 harvest most of the wolves. Harvest primarily occurs on
5 non-Federal lands under a combination hunting/trapping
6 license and little harvest occurs before mid-November,
7 when only the Federal hunting season is open. Since
8 1997 when the harvest guideline level was initiated
9 annual reported harvest has ranged from seven to 76
10 wolves, averaging 50 wolves. And the annual harvest
11 quota has been exceeded five times. High, unreported
12 harvest rates of 38 to 47 percent have likely resulted
13 in unsustainable harvest in some years.

14
15 Approving WSA19-02 would extend the
16 sealing requirement and eliminate the Federal/State
17 harvest quota. Extending the sealing requirement would
18 align Federal requirements with sealing requirements
19 for the State trapping season and decreases the burden
20 on users by allowing them to seal all of their wolf
21 pelts at one time.

22
23 Eliminating the harvest quota and
24 managing for a population objective provides managers
25 with a quantitative benchmark to gauge success and
26 mitigates disagreements between stakeholders over what
27 is a sustainable wolf population. Additionally,
28 harvest quotas discouraged harvest reporting because of
29 the threat of seasons closing early. Announcing season
30 lengths ahead of time provides predictability, allowing
31 trappers to plan for the season and importantly does
32 not discourage harvest reporting.

33
34 The new management strategy also
35 alleviates concerns about illegal or unreported harvest
36 by basing management on population estimates and
37 objectives rather than on harvest quotas and reported
38 harvest. While the new management strategy depends on
39 year old population estimates to determine season
40 lengths, the harvest guideline level strategy also
41 depended on year old estimates to announce quotas.

42
43 One reason a species can be listed
44 under the Endangered Species Act is an inadequacy of
45 existing regulatory mechanisms. In response to the
46 2011 petition, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service found
47 wolf harvest regulations in Unit 2 to be inadequate in
48 ensuring sustainable harvest, especially since reported
49 harvest well exceeded quotas in 2016 and 2017.

50

1 The Wolf Technical Committee stated
2 that establishing population objectives through a
3 public process reduces the likelihood of future
4 litigation.

5
6 While managing through season length
7 may initially result in more or less wolves harvested
8 than expected, State and Federal managers can fine-tune
9 season lengths over time as patterns are established.
10 However, past experiences suggest harvest is more a
11 function of abundance rather than season length.

12
13 The Craig District Ranger currently has
14 delegated authority to close, reopen or adjust the
15 Federal hunting and trapping season for wolves in Unit
16 2. This individual would announce season length in
17 coordination with State managers after the population
18 estimate is available. Effective wolf management in
19 Unit 2 depends on coordination between State and
20 Federal regulations, managers and users. Approving
21 WSA19-02 facilitates management and reduces user
22 confusion.

23
24 The OSM conclusion is to support WSA19-
25 02.

26
27 Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd be happy to
28 answer any questions.

29
30 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for
31 that. any questions for Lisa.

32
33 (No comments)

34
35 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Good
36 presentation, appreciate that.

37
38 Regional Advisory Council or ISC
39 recommendation.

40
41 MS. HARDIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For
42 the record, Jennifer Hardin, Chair of the InterAgency
43 Staff Committee.

44
45 The InterAgency Staff Committee
46 recommendation is to support Wildlife Temporary Special
47 Action Request WSA19-02. Past management of wolves in
48 Unit 2 focused on harvest through the setting of
49 harvest quotas based on a population estimate and not

50

1 on how many wolves should remain in the population.
2 This strategy had varying degrees of success.

3
4 In January of 2019 the Alaska Board of
5 Game removed regulatory language regarding the
6 percentage of wolves to be harvested in Unit 2 and
7 replaced the quota management system with a strategy
8 that maintains a population objective of 150 to 200
9 wolves via setting annual season lengths. This new
10 strategy which was developed by the Alaska Department
11 of Fish and Game, the U.S. Forest Service, the
12 Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council
13 and local users was designed to ensure a sustainable
14 population and encourage better harvest reporting.

15
16 Adoption of this request would not
17 align State and Federal hunting season dates or sealing
18 requirements, however the trapping season dates and
19 sealing requirements would be aligned. The vast
20 majority of wolves are taken by Federally-qualified
21 subsistence users during the trapping season.

22
23 As Lisa just mentioned, the Federal in-
24 season manager currently has delegated authority to
25 close, reopen or adjust the Federal hunting and
26 trapping seasons for wolves in Unit 2. If this request
27 is approved, the in-season manager would determine
28 season lengths annually in cooperation with the State
29 managers based on population estimates. Early closures
30 of seasons would not likely happen as harvest reports
31 would not be known until post-season. Wolf populations
32 in Unit 2 are primarily influenced by harvest.

33
34 The success of this new management
35 strategy will depend upon coordination of State and
36 Federal management, regular communication between State
37 and Federal managers, active involvement of user groups
38 accurate harvest reporting and regular monitoring of
39 wolf populations.

40
41 Managing for a population objective and
42 announcing pre-determined season lengths ahead of time
43 provides predictability which allows trappers to plan
44 and prepare for the season and may improve harvest
45 reporting. While managing harvest through season
46 length may initially result in more or less wolves
47 harvested than expected, State and Federal managers can
48 fine-tune season lengths over time once relationships
49 between season length, harvest, and population

50

1 estimates are better established. Shifting the
2 strategy of managing by harvest quotas to predetermine
3 season lengths based on a population objective makes
4 the requirement for in-season sealing unnecessary.

5

6 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

7

8 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
9 questions for ISC.

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
14 we'll move on to public comment. I didn't receive any
15 cards. Is there anybody on line who wants to speak to
16 this.

17

18 OPERATOR: No questions in the cue at
19 this time.

20

21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I didn't
22 understand her.

23

24 MR. DOOLITTLE: Tina.

25

26 REPORTER: There's no questions at this
27 time.

28

29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Tom.

30

31 MR. DOOLITTLE: Has a motion been made.

32

33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No, no, I'm
34 just going down the list here.

35

36 State.

37

38 (No comments)

39

40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Board
41 discussion.

42

43 Greg.

44

45 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
46 So I'm very much in support of this population based
47 proposal and how we would approach managing this and,
48 leaving, you know, the adjustments to be made in the
49 future with our in-season management, as well as

50

1 working closely, coordination with the State.

2

3 The one question I do have, though, is
4 I think we have in front of us an opportunity to truly
5 align with the State to, again, reduce what was
6 identified as user confusion, and we don't quite get
7 there. We still have a hunt between September 1 and
8 what would be, the end of November, that would not be
9 in synch with the State's beginning of December 1st to
10 March, and everything I seem to hear from the testimony
11 is that the wolves would not be important during that
12 window for subsistence harvest anyway. I mean pelts,
13 generally, would not be prime until you hit into that
14 December window. So I'm -- I think we have an
15 opportunity that we're not taking here, especially
16 given the Secretary of Interior's interest in trying to
17 align with State regulations as often as we possibly
18 can. We have it right here in front of us but we're --
19 we don't seem to be getting there.

20

21 So that's just an observation that I
22 have. I think it would behoove us as a Board to give
23 serious consideration to truly aligning this with the
24 State since it fits all of the subsistence interests
25 and needs.

26

27 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Lisa.

28

29 MS. MAAS: Thanks. The Regional
30 Advisory Council, they submitted this special action
31 but they did not have an opportunity to officially vote
32 on this special action, but they did explicitly state
33 that they appreciate the opportunity in the fall to
34 harvest wolves while deer hunting. And as part of
35 their proposal, their wildlife proposal, they actually
36 are asking to increase the harvest limit, the hunting
37 harvest limit from five wolves to unlimited wolves so I
38 just wanted to relate to the Board that the Southeast
39 Council is in support of that additional opportunity
40 for hunting in the fall and they actually are even
41 asking to increase that opportunity through their
42 wildlife proposal.

43

44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg.

45

46 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
47 Lisa, so are the wolves that would be harvested during
48 that early hunt season an important subsistence
49 resource at that time, is that?

50

1 MS. MAAS: Yeah, thanks. That's
2 something we're hoping that the Council can clarify
3 because in their justification and rationale for the
4 proposal they didn't explicitly address why they wanted
5 to increase that opportunity. And so we're hoping in
6 the fall meeting the Council can specifically address
7 that issue. But other, in our OSM internal
8 discussions, there are other Councils at other times in
9 previous years have mentioned that they -- like for fur
10 sewing, I guess, they actually prefer shorter hair for
11 certain things, so there is potential use for wolf
12 pelts in September, but we're hoping, again, to get
13 that straight from the Council in the fall.

14
15 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
16 Part of the presentation, I recall hearing the majority
17 of the harvest is by Federally-qualified users. Then
18 with sealing data that has been returned, do you have
19 anything specific on the numbers of animals or wolves
20 harvested during that extended period with regard to
21 the Federally-qualified user versus the State
22 regulations?

23
24 MS. MAAS: Yeah, the vast majority of
25 wolves are harvested once the trapping season starts in
26 mid-November. I don't have the exact numbers off the
27 top of my head, but it's well under 10 percent. I
28 think, actually, in the past couple of years, just
29 because the season has closed so early in December,
30 it's kind of biased, that percentage high that are
31 harvested in September through November, but
32 historically when they had the full season it was just
33 a couple, you know, maybe two percent or something, of
34 the wolf harvest that occurred in that September and
35 October, and that was enacted I think back in 2003 just
36 for additional opportunity and there was testimony --
37 when the Board acted on liberalizing the season,
38 opening it September 1st, that wolf pelts do prime
39 early in Unit 2. I don't have specific details on that
40 but that was just in the transcripts from that past
41 motion -- or past regulation.

42
43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Tom.

44
45 MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, just one addition
46 for the Board to consider relative, is part of our
47 process is, you know, within the regulations does the
48 priority exist. So, to me, you know, there is a
49 priority, you know, when I see the earlier season and
50

1 so when we work through an exercise of alignment with
2 the State, I want to be sure that we're also looking at
3 the Federal subsistence priority and Title VIII as part
4 of the process and if the two worlds meet, then, great,
5 but sometimes that's not necessarily the means to the
6 end. So, again, what I see here is the only priority
7 that's provided to Federally-qualified users, and I
8 could be mistaken, is that earlier part of the season
9 for hunting.

10

11 MR. PELTOLA: And, Mr. Chair, that is
12 the indirect point I was trying to get to by my level
13 of question and comments.

14

15 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, and just
16 knowing this issue pretty closely, too, I know it's
17 just to provide that opportunity for the local
18 subsistence user to take that wolf as they're hunting,
19 which is a common practice. And I know a big argument
20 or conversation was around illegal harvest, and so this
21 is also an opportunity to make it a legal activity for
22 the subsistence users on the ground as they engage in
23 other activities, i.e., deer hunting or whatever, that
24 they want to make sure that opportunity was available
25 for those guys because there's a perception that, you
26 know, there's an illegal wolf harvest on the island,
27 and I know that was very contentious conversation
28 during the whole trying to weed all of this out. And I
29 think that was a big sticking point for the Council is
30 to keep that front end open so that if they do see that
31 opportunity they can take it.

32

33 And, I know Dave heard a lot of this as
34 well.

35

36 MR. SCHMID: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair.
37 I did. And while that harvest is fairly small it does
38 seem to be important as well to folks for sewing skins
39 and some others. It was very important locally to the
40 RAC.

41

42 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other
43 discussion.

44

45 (No comments)

46

47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll move on
48 to Board action.

49

50

1 Dave.

2
3 MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chair. Dave Schmid
4 with the USDA Forest Service.

5
6 I move to approve WSA19-02 to extend
7 the sealing period for wolf hunting and trapping and
8 removing language referencing a combined Federal/State
9 harvest quota for wolves in Unit 2. If I get a second
10 I will provide my justification.

11
12 MR. BROWER: Second.

13
14 MS. PITKA: I'll second.

15
16 MR. SCHMID: Thank you. Past
17 management of wolves in Unit 2 focused on the setting
18 of harvest quotas based on a population estimate and
19 not on how many wolves should remain in the population.
20 This strategy had varying degrees of success.

21
22 In January of 2019 the Alaska Board of
23 Game removed regulatory language regarding the
24 percentage of wolves to be harvested in Unit 2 and
25 replaced the quota management system with a strategy
26 that maintains a population objective of 150 to 200
27 wolves via setting annual season lengths. This new
28 strategy, which was developed by the Alaska Department
29 of Fish and Game, USDA Forest Service, Southeast Alaska
30 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council and local users
31 was designed to assure a sustainable population and
32 encourage better harvest reporting. Managing for a
33 population objective and announcing pre-determined
34 season lengths ahead of time provides predictability
35 which allows trappers to plan and prepare for the
36 season and may improve harvest reporting. While
37 managing harvest through season length may initially
38 result in more or less wolves harvested than expected,
39 State and Federal managers can fine-tune season lengths
40 over time once relationships between season length,
41 harvest and population estimates are better
42 established.

43
44 Adoption of this request will not align
45 State and Federal hunting season dates or sealing
46 requirements, however, the trapping season dates and
47 sealing requirement would be aligned. The vast
48 majority of wolves are harvested by Federally-qualified
49 users while trapping. Shifting the strategy of

50

1 managing by harvest quotas to pre-determine season
2 lengths based on a population objective makes this
3 requirement for in-season sealing unnecessary.

4
5 The OSM, ADF&G and InterAgency Staff
6 Committee recommendation are to support Temporary
7 Special Action request WSA19-02. All public hearing
8 comments were in support, including Craig Tribal.

9
10 Thank you.

11
12 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: There's been a
13 motion and a second. Any further discussion.

14
15 (No comments)

16
17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing or
18 seeing none, we'll call for the question.

19
20 MR. BROWER: Question.

21
22 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been
23 called, roll call.

24
25 MR. DOOLITTLE: Alrighty. Here we are
26 at Wildlife Special Action 19-02 Unit 2 wolves, and
27 this would be for wolf hunting, five wolves, any wolf
28 taken in Unit 2 must be sealed within 30 days of the
29 end of the season, season dates of September 1st
30 through March 31st. Wolf trapping, no limit. Any wolf
31 taken in Unit 2 must be sealed within 30 days of the
32 end of season. And, again, November 15th through March
33 31 season.

34
35 Alrighty.

36
37 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Greg
38 Siekaniec.

39
40 MR. SIEKANIEC: I will support with the
41 thanks to subsistence -- OSM, as well as Tony on the
42 significance of early season wolves to an actual
43 subsistence harvest because that was not evident within
44 the information I thought.

45
46 Thank you.

47
48 MR. DOOLITTLE: Thank you, Greg. U.S.
49 Forest Service, David Schmid.

50

1 MR. SCHMID: Yes, I support for the
2 reasons I stated in the justification.
3
4 MR. DOOLITTLE: Bureau of Indian
5 Affairs, Gene Peltola.
6
7 MR. PELTOLA: Support.
8
9 MR. DOOLITTLE: Public Member Rhonda
10 Pitka.
11
12 MS. PITKA: Support.
13
14 MR. DOOLITTLE: Public Member Charlie
15 Brower.
16
17 MR. BROWER: Support.
18
19 MR. DOOLITTLE: National Park Service,
20 Herbert Frost.
21
22 MR. FROST: Support.
23
24 MR. DOOLITTLE: Bureau of Land
25 Management, Chad Padgett.
26
27 MR. PADGETT: Support.
28
29 MR. DOOLITTLE: And, Chairman Anthony
30 Christianson.
31
32 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support.
33
34 MR. DOOLITTLE: The motion is approved.
35
36 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Should we just
37 do the next one, or how long.....
38
39 MS. PITKA: Just do it.
40
41 MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, that's strategy.
42
43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: WSA19-04.
44 Rhonda said go.
45
46 (Laughter)
47
48 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the
49 floor, go ahead.
50

1 MS. KLOSTERMAN: All right, thank you,
2 Mr. Chair. Members of the Board. My name is Megan
3 Klosterman. I'm a wildlife biologist with the Office
4 of Subsistence Management. And Special Action Request
5 WSA19-04 can be found on Page 395 of your meeting
6 materials.

7
8 This was submitted by the Northwest
9 Arctic Subsistence Regional Advisory Council, and it
10 requests the closure of the cow moose season in Unit
11 23. So basically to do away with cow harvest in this
12 unit.

13
14 The proponent is concerned about
15 declines in the Unit 23 moose population. The Council
16 states that they would like to eliminate the cow moose
17 season to help the Unit 23 moose population recover.

18
19 Just for your information, the
20 proponent also submitted a proposal to mirror to this
21 special action and to require the use of a registration
22 permit so this proposal will be taken up by the Board
23 at their April 2020 meeting.

24
25 Since 2009 the estimated moose
26 population in every census area in Unit 23 has
27 declined. An estimated 70 percent of the Unit 23 moose
28 population is found in the Selawik, Lower Kobuk and
29 Lower Noatak River census areas. All three of these
30 areas have experienced greater than 40 percent
31 population declines since 2011. In 2016 and 2017 the
32 Alaska Department of Fish and Game provided a unit-wide
33 population estimates of 7,500 moose and in 2018 they
34 estimated the population at 6,300 moose. So this was
35 representing a 16 percent decline in unit-wide
36 population estimate. We did receive a more updated
37 population estimate in the State's written comment for
38 WSA19-04. In this comment they stated that the
39 population is now estimated at 5,600 moose.

40
41 Low calf/cow ratios indicate the Unit
42 23 moose population is declining with a possible
43 exception being the Lower Kobuk survey area, which has
44 a larger percentage of maternal cows. In all census
45 areas with multiple composition surveys since 2008 the
46 bull/cow ratio has declined and are below or near the
47 State management objectives.

48
49 Reported harvest by non-local residents

50

1 and non-residents combined with community household
2 survey harvest estimates for local residents indicate
3 that total Unit 23 moose harvest likely exceeds the
4 harvestable surplus in this unit.

5
6 If approved, the Federal cow moose
7 season in Unit 23 will be closed. This could aid in
8 the recovery of the Unit 23 moose population and
9 decrease regulatory complexity in the area.

10
11 One of the alternatives that was
12 considered was to also close all Federal public lands
13 in Unit 23 to the harvest of moose except by Federally-
14 qualified subsistence users. This closure may be
15 warranted for the conservation of the moose population
16 and the continuation of subsistence uses. However, due
17 to the Council sharing their apprehension about closing
18 the Federal public lands due to the possibility of
19 concentrating non-local hunters on State lands near the
20 villages, this alternative was not considered further.

21
22 Tribal consultations were held on July
23 1st via teleconference but no representatives called
24 in. A public hearing was held July 11th in Kotzebue
25 and three people provided testimony in support of this
26 request. No one provided testimony in opposition to
27 this request. The State of Alaska submitted written
28 public comments in support of WSA19-04.

29
30 So the OSM conclusion is to support
31 WSA19-04 to address the serious population viability
32 concerns for Unit 23 moose.

33
34 Thank you, Mr. Chair, that's all I have
35 but I'm available for questions.

36
37 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
38 Megan. Go ahead, Rhonda.

39
40 MS. PITKA: Can you detail some of the
41 public comment that you received.

42
43 MS. KLOSTERMAN: Yes, just a second,
44 let me make sure I represent them correctly.

45
46 So in the current events section of
47 this analysis I have some of the comments listed. So
48 we had an elder of Kotzebue who was there in person
49 that provided comments. And he mentions that how he

50

1 saw the situation was that warmer temperatures and deep
2 snow in the area were taking their toll on the moose
3 population. And he mentioned that he's experiencing
4 moose get stuck in deep snow where they're vulnerable
5 to predators and to hypothermia. And he said that he
6 likes the idea of giving the cow moose a break and
7 supports this request.

8
9 We also had a hunter from Anchorage
10 call in. And he mentioned that he noticed a shift in
11 harvest by locals from caribou to moose as the caribou
12 population has been declining and that due to this he
13 would like to see this approved to preserve the moose
14 population in the area.

15
16 We also had a local Kotzebue resident
17 comment in person on this special action and he simply
18 stated that he thought it was a good idea and that it
19 will give moose populations the chance to recover.

20
21 Thank you.

22
23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other
24 questions for Megan.

25
26 (No comments)

27
28 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for
29 your presentation. Regional Advisory Council or ISC.

30
31 Jennifer.

32
33 MS. HARDIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
34 Jennifer Hardin, Chair of the InterAgency Staff
35 Committee.

36
37 The InterAgency Staff Committee
38 recommendation is to support Wildlife Special Action
39 Request WSA19-04. The OSM Staff analysis provided a
40 thorough and accurate evaluation of Wildlife Special
41 Action request WSA19-04.

42
43 The moose population in Unit 23 is in
44 decline and there are serious concerns for its
45 viability. Elimination of the cow moose season is
46 necessary to address these concerns. Closing the cow
47 season is likely to help the Unit 23 moose population
48 recover more quickly and prevent further declines.
49 Approval of this special action request reduces

50

1 opportunity for Federally-qualified subsistence users
2 to harvest cow moose, however, they will still be able
3 to harvest bulls during the winter season under both
4 Federal and State regulations.

5
6 In 2018 the Federal Subsistence Board
7 approved Emergency Special Action Request WSA18-04 with
8 modification to close the Federal winter cow moose
9 season and close moose hunting on public lands in Unit
10 23 except by Federally-qualified subsistence users.
11 Closure to non-Federally-qualified users may again be
12 warranted due to the limited harvestable surplus to
13 allow for continuation of subsistence uses and to
14 provide a priority for Federally-qualified subsistence
15 users as mandated by ANILCA. However, the Northwest
16 Arctic Subsistence Regional Advisory Council stated
17 concerns at its spring 2019 meeting that a closure to
18 non-Federally-qualified users could be detrimental to
19 Federally-qualified subsistence users due to the
20 potential for this action to concentrate non-Federally-
21 qualified users on State managed lands in Unit 23. For
22 this reason the ISC is not recommending a modification
23 to include a closure for moose hunting by non-
24 Federally-qualified users hunting on Federal public
25 lands in Unit 23. The Board will have an opportunity
26 to consider further action when deliberating Wildlife
27 Proposal WP20-47 which requests closure of the cow
28 moose season and to require the use of a State
29 registration permit to harvest moose in Unit 23. The
30 proposal process will allow for additional input from
31 the public and the Council.

32
33 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

34
35 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
36 questions for Jennifer.

37
38 Gene.

39
40 MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, Mr. Chair, if I
41 may. Could we repeat the part about ISC not making a
42 recommendation about non-Federally-qualified users.

43
44 MS. HARDIN: Certainly. Through the
45 Chair. Mr. Peltola.

46
47 Last year you did approve an emergency
48 special action request that closed to all but
49 Federally-qualified subsistence users. The ISC thinks

50

1 that that may be warranted under current conditions,
2 but the Northwest Arctic Subsistence Regional Advisory
3 Council was opposed to taking that step for concern
4 about concentrating users on State managed lands in
5 Unit 23. While that may be something that is warranted
6 looking at in the future, you'll have an opportunity to
7 consider that through the full public process during
8 the wildlife regulatory cycle that's underway.

9
10 MR. PELTOLA: So if I understand
11 correctly, I understand the justification for the RAC
12 not supporting it but if we move this forward -- this
13 special action request forward we could have a scenario
14 where a local Federally-qualified user cannot harvest a
15 cow moose although a non-resident on Federal lands
16 could harvest a bull moose? I'm trying to understand
17 how it's presented.

18
19 MS. KLOSTERMAN: If I understand your
20 question correctly, you're worried that non-Federally-
21 qualified users will have more liberal regulations?

22
23 MR. PELTOLA: Correct.

24
25 MS. KLOSTERMAN: Currently, under State
26 regulation you are not permitted to harvest a cow moose
27 either. So this would more closely align the
28 regulations. In State regulations you actually need to
29 take an antlered bull, this would just be requesting
30 one bull for Federally-qualified users.

31
32 Does that answer your question?

33
34 MR. PELTOLA: If I may. Partially. On
35 the State regulations, a non-Federally-qualified user
36 can harvest an antlered bull, correct?

37
38 MS. KLOSTERMAN: Yes.

39
40 MR. PELTOLA: And then if the Board, if
41 we take action on this we'll have a restriction to cow
42 harvest for Federally-qualified users even though a
43 non-Federally-qualified user can harvest a moose from
44 the same population?

45
46 MS. KLOSTERMAN: This special action
47 will change the harvest limit from one moose to one
48 bull for Federally-qualified.

49
50

1 MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, on the bull. But
2 my point being is that a Federally-qualified user could
3 not harvest a cow moose on Federal lands if we take
4 action on this.....

5
6 MS. KLOSTERMAN: Yes.

7
8 MR. PELTOLA:although at the same
9 time a non-Federally-qualified user could harvest a
10 bull moose from the same population?

11
12 MS. KLOSTERMAN: Yes.

13
14 MR. PELTOLA: Any other discussion.
15 Questions for Staff.

16
17 MR. PELTOLA: One other question.

18
19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Gene.

20
21 MR. PELTOLA: With regard to the
22 Federal and the State harvest, are they similar in GMU
23 23 with regard to harvest of that -- potentially the
24 harvest of antlered bull or is there a discrepancy and
25 difference between the Federal and State seasons? What
26 I'm trying to get at is where is the rural preference
27 with regard to if the Board takes action on this with
28 regard to the moose population?

29
30 MS. KLOSTERMAN: So the rural
31 preference here would be that State users need to take
32 one antlered bull, Federal users could take just one
33 bull, it wouldn't need to be an antlered bull. Also
34 there is a registration hunt, a registration permit
35 under the State regs, and that is not necessary at this
36 point under Federal regulations.

37
38 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead Tom.

39
40 MR. DOOLITTLE: And one addition, as
41 seen from the season framework is that there's a -- in
42 Unit 23 remainder -- no the seasons are the same, I was
43 seeing if there was a priority for a longer season in
44 Unit 23 remainder, and so it looks like those are
45 aligned. So those are the only two priorities that
46 Megan just illustrated.

47
48 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, if I may.
49 With regard to delegation of authority, is there
50

1 anything specific to the in-season manager through
2 delegation of authority with regard to moose within GMU
3 23 that would allow the in-season manager to address
4 moose harvest if he or she deemed it warranted?
5

6 MR. DOOLITTLE: Chris McKee, could you,
7 relative to Unit 23 moose and delegation of authority.
8

9 Thank you.
10

11 MR. MCKEE: I was just looking that up
12 in the reg book and we have like 45 different
13 delegation of authority letters so I don't have them
14 all off the top of my head. But as far as I know we do
15 not have a delegation of authority letter for moose in
16 Unit 23.
17

18 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So are you
19 looking for the same consistency as your other there,
20 Gene, as maybe putting in that?
21

22 MR. PELTOLA: Not necessarily the same
23 consistency but I'm looking for to where the basic
24 tenants of this program are rural preference and
25 priority consumptive use within the regulations and as
26 recommended for action on this special action, and I'm
27 not necessarily opposed to it, but I'm trying to find
28 out and clearly stipulate if we, as a Board, take an
29 action to restrict the harvest of cow moose for a
30 Federally-qualified user, where else does the priority
31 lie. And to me, having an antlered bull versus a non-
32 antlered bull isn't really a priority, that's just
33 difference of when you harvest that moose within the
34 season. A bull will have antlers up until October,
35 November, early December, depending on the age or
36 whatever, then they'll drop it, it's still removal of
37 moose. So I'm trying to, before I cast a vote on this
38 I'm trying to ensure that the Board takes into
39 consideration where the priorities lie. Do we still
40 provide for a priority consumptive use? Are we still
41 providing for a rural preference?
42

43 But I do understand that the special
44 action was made out of concern for conservation and if
45 the concern for the conservation is strong enough I
46 have no problem voting to limit the harvest of cow
47 moose for a Federally-qualified user but where else
48 does the priority lie?
49

50

1 MR. MCKEE: Just a couple things. As
2 noted in the presentation before, last time we had an
3 emergency special action in which we closed down to
4 non-Federally-qualified users and OSM certainly had
5 discussions about that, during the process of this as
6 well, but given -- as stated before, given the concerns
7 stated by the Councils about concentrating those users
8 on State lands around the villages we didn't pursue
9 that anymore. Certainly we can bring that up again
10 with the Councils at the upcoming Council meeting in
11 the fall.

12
13 I should also state, though, that we --
14 this is not just a conservation of healthy populations
15 issue at this point, from our perspective, it's a
16 viability issue with the population. So that's the
17 overriding idea here is that we, you know, we're very
18 very concerned about moose populations in 23 in
19 general. And so that's why we're moving towards this
20 and that -- you know, the Federal -- while we're
21 certainly sensitive to the Federal priority it doesn't
22 exist outside of biological and viability issues and so
23 that's kind of why we came down with the recommendation
24 we have and, as an aside, why we didn't recommend
25 closing to non-Federally-qualified because of the
26 aforementioned concerns by the Council.

27
28 Thank you. Mr. Chair.

29
30 MR. PELTOLA: I understand the
31 viability concern. And also I was a biologist in this
32 region for over a decade, but, if we have enough
33 concern about the viability of a population then why
34 are we not following the hierarchy of priority
35 consumptive use and the rural preference regard to
36 harvest, which doesn't occur if we limit the harvest of
37 a cow, which is taking a moose out of the population
38 and away from a Federally-qualified user by still
39 allowing the harvest of a moose from potentially the
40 same population to non-Federally-qualified users. That
41 doesn't make sense to me.

42
43 MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, Gene, I
44 understand that. And looking at where the origins of
45 this proposal relative to land use patterns and where a
46 lot of hunting is occurring around the villages and the
47 -- from what I understand the amount of State land, was
48 that actually this proposal was generated out of local
49 concern and many times we ask, again, in our program we
50

1 did ask about whether this should be a closure to all
2 but Federally-qualified users because, just as you
3 stated, it meets that priority consumptive concern that
4 we look at the Program. But we also weigh the balance
5 of what the communities want, where they thought there
6 may be additional hunting pressure, you know, put in,
7 in and around their villages, relative, you know, to
8 State lands, and so this was a balancing act between
9 the wishes of the local communities and pressure or
10 the, you know, the conservation issue of closing to all
11 but to Federally-qualified and when viability comes up,
12 quite frankly you need to close to all users if it's
13 truly a population viability concern.

14
15 And we even had discussions about, you
16 know, calf harvest in that area too, and, of course,
17 this area is very opposed to, you know, to calf harvest
18 as well.

19
20 MR. PELTOLA: I guess, Mr. Chair, I'd
21 feel a lot comfortable about limiting the potential
22 harvest of a moose, albeit a cow, to Federally-
23 qualified users if we did something similar we did for
24 the Kanektok/Goodnews, is give the in-season manager
25 authority to limit the harvest, to Federally-qualified
26 users only if he or she so sees fit based on what
27 they're presented in-season in order to get to that
28 point, I think, for the Board to truly address that,
29 yes, we are trying to preserve the priority consumptive
30 use and the rural preference, which is a mandate of the
31 Program. And with the understanding that that
32 delegation could be carried through with this special
33 action and it would have to be addressed as a
34 regulatory change at the next cycle.

35
36 MS. PITKA: I would suggest we take an
37 action and include that in the motion. Just a
38 suggestion.

39
40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other
41 discussion.

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
46 thank you, ISC, for that. I think that's where we
47 were, right. Good questions. Food for thought. We'll
48 move on to public comment. We do have Roy.

49
50

1 MR. ASHENFELTER: Good morning, Mr.
2 Chair. Board Members.

3
4 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Good morning.

5
6 MR. ASHENFELTER: Thank you for the
7 opportunity to comment. I come from the Nome area and
8 this has to do with -- I'll comment -- share my
9 comments about cow hunting moose in our region.

10
11 The intent here, I believe is to
12 prevent the decline of the population of moose in 23.
13 In 22 we experienced the same situation. We did have a
14 concern for, at least, a biological concern that was
15 presented to us, that there was too many moose for the
16 vegetation for the moose to survive so they had a cow
17 hunt. This was in the early '80s. I did the cow hunt
18 and I have a camp 60 miles out of Nome on the Pilgrim
19 River. I cow hunted for the length of time cow hunting
20 was permitted. I realized after the cow hunt that the
21 moose that we were eliminating on the river because
22 that's where the cows like to hang out, prevented
23 future opportunities that these cows would have that
24 would calve either a cow or a bull. That's what a cow
25 does. I didn't understand that when we eliminated the
26 cows that you would assume that a cow would come in and
27 replace that, it didn't, it took 20 years to get back
28 to where there are now moose on Pilgrim River for us to
29 hunt. There has been take of bulls. But removing a
30 cow is not the same as removing a bull. A cow will
31 live for however many years, it'll produce a calf in
32 most of those years and what happens for us that prefer
33 meat to hunt, generally most of us hunt for meat, not
34 the size of the horn, the opportunity for us to get a
35 moose off the river system is very -- is preferred.
36 We're looking for meat, not the size of the horn. And
37 so when we put food on the table for us, that's what
38 we're looking for.

39
40 So I think when you're trying to
41 increase -- and yet it took so long to -- I understand
42 the reason for, in our case, to try to get the moose
43 population down because of lack of vegetation but man
44 if there was a different way to target moose off the
45 river system that would have been something I would
46 have, not knowing, and having done it, and gone through
47 the experience of the difficulty of the ensuing years
48 to try to get food on the table, made it more
49 difficult, but in this case, the way I understand it,
50

1 and I could be wrong, you're trying to prevent a moose
2 population decline here, you're somewhat aligning the
3 moose hunt both the State and Feds. But you've heard
4 my point earlier, that, if you eliminate a cow, you
5 allow a cow hunt, you really are saying, you know, you
6 don't need no more moose in that area for awhile, and I
7 don't see this -- this -- the intent here is to
8 stabilize the moose population by allowing only a bull
9 hunt.

10

11 One other thing. One of the ways that
12 I also learned in this process of cow hunting, if I
13 ever had to do it again, I would try to do it during
14 the winter because you can go after cows away from the
15 river system during the winter and you could reduce
16 your popul -- control your population better that way,
17 they're easier to see, you can see cows and calves
18 together and they're out in the open because that's
19 wintertime, there's no vegetation on the willows or on
20 the trees and they're generally gathered up in bunches
21 in the wintertime. So there are better methods in my
22 mind to do different things but as my personal
23 experience is, is that, that the intent here is to
24 prevent a decline of the population of moose and by
25 doing that I would support this proposal.

26

27 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Roy.
28 Any questions for Roy.

29

30 Rhonda.

31

32 MS. PITKA: Can you please introduce
33 yourself for the record, I'm sorry, I didn't hear your
34 name.

35

36 MR. ASHENFELTER: Yes, my name is Roy
37 Ashenfelter and I come from the Nome area and I
38 represent Kawarek.

39

40 MS. PITKA: Thank you.

41

42 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Roy.
43 I appreciate your testimony this morning, Roy, thank
44 you, it gives us some perception there.

45

46 All right, any other public comment, on
47 line.

48

49 OPERATOR: There are no questions at

50

1 this time.

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
4 thank you. We'll move on, State.

5

6 (No comments)

7

8 (Laughter)

9

10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Board
11 discussion. Further Board discussion, I think we've
12 discussed it a little bit here, Gene, thank you.

13

14 We'll move on to Federal Board action.

15

16 MR. FROST: Mr. Chair. I move to
17 approve Temporary Wildlife Special Action WSA19-04 to
18 close the cow moose season in Unit 23 for the 2019/2020
19 regulatory year. Following a second I will give the
20 reasons I intend to support this motion.

21

22 MR. BROWER: Second.

23

24 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The motion's
25 been made and seconded.

26

27 Bert.

28

29 MR. FROST: I concur with the OSM
30 conclusion and the ISC recommendations to approve
31 WSA19-04.

32

33 The moose population in Unit 23 is in
34 decline and there are serious concerns for its
35 viability. Closing the cow season is likely to help
36 the Unit 23 moose population to recover more quickly
37 and prevent further declines. Approval of this special
38 action reduces opportunity for Federally-qualified
39 subsistence users to harvest cow moose, however, they
40 will still be able to harvest bulls under both Federal
41 and State regulations.

42

43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
44 discussion.

45

46 Gene.

47

48 MR. PELTOLA: I was going to offer a
49 motion to amend, would it be appropriate at this time

50

1 or wait?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No, this would be the time unless there's further discussion on the original motion, I think this would be the time to amend.

MR. PELTOLA: Okay. Mr. Chair. I move to amend the original motion to include that the delegation of authority to GMU 23 in-season manager be amended to allow for a limitation to Federally-qualified users only if warranted as previously mentioned in the Board discussion.

MS. PITKA: I'll second that amendment.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: An amendment to the original motion to include language to delegate authority in the event of some issue on the landscape that the in-season manager can act accordingly.

Any discussion on the amendment to the motion.

MR. LORD: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Ken.

MR. LORD: I just want to be clear on the record, this is, again, a temporary delegation, correct -- yes.

MR. PELTOLA: Affirmative.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, only effective until the next regulatory proposal cycle.

Greg.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Is this the Park Service that's the delegated manager, do we even -- do we know?

MR. PELTOLA: I believe it is Maija Lukin, because she does -- the Superintendent of Western Arctic ParkLands does have delegation for fisheries, they may be overlapped, but I'm not positive

1 but I thought it was Maija.

2

3 MR. FROST: Chris, can you help us out?

4

5 MR. MCKEE: There are multiple managers
6 there but certainly the vast majority of the land in
7 this unit is managed by the Park Service.

8

9 MR. DOOLITTLE: And if I am correct,
10 Chris, then, you know, Maija was also, when we were
11 working with the issues with Unit 23 under, you know,
12 the temporary special actions at that time so I think
13 that she's the point person.

14

15 MR. MCKEE: Correct. And I would just
16 also add that it would be good for one regulatory cycle
17 because we're coming to the end of a regulatory cycle,
18 this would -- we would explicit -- it would really just
19 be for this upcoming season so that would be explicit
20 in the delegation letter under the effective period, as
21 part of the letter.

22

23 Mr. Chair.

24

25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So noted.

26

27 MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair.

28

29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg.

30

31 MR. SIEKANIEC: So I just want to make
32 sure I understand. So what we're doing is we are
33 specifically saying the delegation of authority to the
34 Park Service in-season manager because I think I heard
35 you say there's several of them, so.

36

37 MR. FROST: That's what I understand.

38

39 MR. SIEKANIEC: Okay.

40

41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: There we go.

42

43 MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair. Just to the
44 Park Service, you know, there's three Refuges, Selawik,
45 Lower Noatak and Upper Kobuk, so does it just pertain
46 to them?

47

48 MR. PELTOLA: If I recall, Mr. Chair,
49 we have a delegated in-season manager with regard to

50

1 the fisheries, which, I believe is the Park Service
2 Superintendent. We also have a delegation of authority
3 for wildlife, and I don't recall whether that
4 delegation differed between the entities, but I believe
5 it is the Park Service Superintendent for Western
6 Arctic ParkLands.

7

8 MR. BROWER: Thank you.

9

10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Somebody will
11 have the authority.

12

13 (Laughter)

14

15 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right. So
16 call for the question on the amendment.

17

18 MR. BROWER: Question.

19

20 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been
21 called.

22

23 MR. BROWER: On the amendment.

24

25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: To the original
26 motion -- all in favor say aye.

27

28 IN UNISON: Aye.

29

30 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Opposed same
31 sign.

32

33 (No opposing votes)

34

35 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion carries
36 unanimously to amend the original motion. We'll come
37 back to the original motion with the amendment.

38

39 All in favor of the original motion
40 with the amendment signify by saying aye.

41

42 IN UNISON: Aye.

43

44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Opposition same
45 sign.

46

47 (No opposing votes)

48

49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion carries

50

1 unanimously.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

Thank you for all that this morning, Staff, and everybody. And if you have a few more minutes before we break for lunch we're going to go ahead and do some presentations to the people we heard this morning who are going to be either retiring, moving on, or moving up, so give us a few minutes here and Tom's going to do some presentations.

(Pause)

MR. DOOLITTLE: Well, Bert, I didn't call on you first and you thought that you might have had me about who was going to go first in this process, but at least it's not a vote.

MR. FROST: There you go.

MR. DOOLITTLE: And this is really the fun part of what I get to do and really to recognize Board members and ISC members and critical leadership team Staff about their service to our program. And I had you Google searched by your Staff a little bit.

(Laughter)

MR. DOOLITTLE: But it was all good though. I was particularly interested in your dissertation work on fishers and -- captive fishers, so I thought that was interesting but whether they actually acted differently than their loud counterparts or not.

(Laughter)

MR. DOOLITTLE: To really go back into the Jurassic period. But that was one of the things that they had brought up.

But more importantly Bert has served as the Regional Director for the National Park Service in the Alaska Region since 2014 and his service to this Board has been instrumental to all of us in the decision process and into the lands that he's cared about near and dear to all of our hearts.

Prior to working for the National Park Service, Dr. Frost was a special enforcement officer

1 for the state of Wyoming and Fish and Game Department.
2 He's an assistant Professor and research assistant to
3 the University of Maine and an adjunct Professor and
4 research coordinator for the Great Basin Cooperative
5 Ecosystems Studies Unit located at the University of
6 Nevada Reno.

7
8 Mr. Frost holds his PhD in wildlife
9 ecology from the University of Maine. Has extensive
10 field research experience with a variety of species and
11 issues. His 1994 dissertation as I said was on
12 reproductive biology of captive fishers. His BS was in
13 wildlife and range management, an MS in zoology from
14 Brigham Young University in Utah.

15
16 In 2008 Bert received an award of
17 professional excellence from the University of Maine,
18 Department of Wildlife and Fishery and Conservation
19 Biology. He's been awarded the professional excellence
20 in 2012 and received the Department's distinguished
21 Wildlife Alumnus Award for his work in conservation.

22
23 So, Bert, from all of us we want to
24 give you a token of our appreciation, from Tony and the
25 Board and all of the OSM Staff and all of us in this
26 room and from the State of Alaska.

27
28 MR. FROST: Thank you muchly,
29 appreciate it. Been a pleasure.

30
31 (Applause)

32
33 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Speech.

34
35 MR. FROST: I gave my speech this
36 morning.

37
38 (Laughter)

39
40 MR. DOOLITTLE: And we're going to send
41 you back with information on Clarence Summers, who's
42 also served, so we will also have you leave with a
43 plaque, since he's not with us today.

44
45 But one of the things that I thought
46 was really most interesting about Clarence Raymond
47 Summers, III., was that he became -- a long career in
48 government service, started his first job as a busboy
49 at the Pentagon when he was only 15 years old. So I

50

1 thought that was starting, you know, quite a while ago.

2

3 The other thing about Clarence is that
4 he applied with his first job with the National Park
5 Service after college and during which he visited
6 several National Parks eventually taking a seasonal
7 position with what was then Glacier Bay National
8 Monument in 1972, his first time in Alaska. So when
9 Bert talked about how seasoned an employee he was,
10 that's pretty exceptional.

11

12 Following the passage of ANILCA,
13 Clarence was the first Yakutat District Ranger for
14 Wrangell-St. Elias and Glacier Bay National Parks and
15 Preserves holding that position from 1981 to 1986. His
16 first office in Yakutat was a desk at city hall and his
17 landlord was Byron Mallott at that time in Yakutat. And
18 there was a few pictures that Barbara -- oops, I
19 spilled the beans Barbara about who my mole was. But,
20 again, there's a few pictures that I have that I can
21 share with folks later with some pictures of Clarence
22 in the early days with Byron.

23

24 And many people did know that Clarence
25 was a mountain climber and that he also climbed Mt.
26 Logan, in fact he almost reached the 17,000 foot mark
27 before being weathered off, and he also successfully
28 summit Mt. Alveston, which is a 14,500 mountain.

29

30 And essentially since 1988 Clarence has
31 served here at the Regional Office for the National
32 Park Service and then again as an integral member of
33 the InterAgency Staff Committee and advisement, I know,
34 to you, Bert, and others and has been part of this
35 family for awhile. So we send that certificate of
36 appreciation, hopefully you can carry the message and
37 our heartfelt thanks from our group back to Clarence.

38

39 MR. FROST: You bet.

40

41 MR. DOOLITTLE: Dan, I'm just going to
42 ad lib you.

43

44 MR. SHARP: That's fine, I'll make it
45 up.

46

47 MR. DOOLITTLE: But, again, from what I
48 remember, almost 25 years worth of service to the
49 Alaska Department of Fish and Game as a fishery

50

1 biologist, area manager in Southeast, also down in
2 Valdez; is that right?

3

4 MR. SHARP: Cordova for 12 years, and
5 regional manager for Bristol Bay for sportfish, habitat
6 biologist in every form in the state -- it's 47 years
7 as a biologist in Alaska.

8

9 MR. DOOLITTLE: That's an incredible
10 time of service. And your service starting in the
11 Federal service as I recollect was in 2008 with one
12 year starting with the Mineral Management Service
13 before you moved over to the Bureau of Land Management
14 and then again with us. And then, again, with us, in
15 the subsistence group since that time, and, again, we
16 appreciate all your time and effort and working with
17 the Federal Subsistence Program and advisement to BLM
18 and the Board over all those years.

19

20 And so I'd like to thank you from the
21 bottom of our hearts.

22

23 (Applause)

24

25 MR. DOOLITTLE: And I hear that you're
26 going to be as optimistic in your retirement as you
27 were in your.....

28

29 MR. SHARP: I'm working on it. I'm
30 working on it.

31

32 (Laughter)

33

34 MR. SHARP: It's been a pressure and a
35 privilege as they say.

36

37 (Laughter)

38

39 MR. DOOLITTLE: Well, sometimes I save
40 the best for last and, you know, there was colleagues
41 that I mentioned that -- a Staff party the other day in
42 recognition of Jennifer Hardin. Dr. Hardin who has
43 been with us for the last four years, she was finally
44 called by one of our Staff members the other day, our
45 Jennifer Hardin, and hopefully she'll remember all of
46 us and all the work that she's done.

47

48 Good person. And I seldom get misty
49 about seeing employees leave but, again, she has served

50

1 this Board, served OSM, and brought a level of
2 professionalism that I can only, you know, say about a
3 number of employees. My only expectations, Jennifer, is
4 that you run a National Park one day or challenge Bert
5 in his job one day because I can tell you you've been
6 an addition to Staff and advisement to me in my
7 position and to Gene in his position over the years and
8 we can't thank you more as Staff, and recognizing you
9 as a person.

10

11 Jennifer.

12

13 (Applause)

14

15 MS. HARDIN: Thank you.

16

17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And
18 congratulations, she's freshly married I hear.

19

20 MS. HARDIN: Following on Dan's lead,
21 the pressure has been a privilege.

22

23 (Laughter)

24

25 MR. DOOLITTLE: I don't get misty very
26 often.

27

28 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, yeah,
29 yeah.

30

31 MR. DOOLITTLE: So, anyway, I'll come
32 back to my seat.

33

34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, 12:23.
35 Thank you for staying for that, we'll be back at 1:30.

36

37 MR. BROWER: 3:00 o'clock.

38

39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: 3:00 o'clock --
40 quarter to 2:00 -- 1:45.

41

42 (Off record)

43

44 (On record)

45

46 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, you're on.

47

48 MR. MATUSKOWITZ: Okay. For the record
49 I'm Theo Matuskowitz, Regulation Specialist for Office

50

1 of Subsistence Management.

2
3 OSM is consistently looking for ways to
4 improve the Program's outreach, both by enhancing our
5 current methods and by searching out new technologies
6 and mediums. An important part of the outreach is to
7 tailor the message and mechanism of delivery to our
8 specific users. For example, what works for Baby
9 Boomers, which is unfortunately my group, which is 55
10 to 75 year olds certainly does not translate well to
11 Millennials, which are 22 to 34 year olds. As an
12 example, we currently have informational fliers that
13 we've worked on in the past and for certain of our user
14 groups they're very popular, people use them, read
15 them, request them, but then for other groups they
16 absolutely have no interest in them, they'd rather
17 watch a video for example.

18
19 Traditional systems of outreach are
20 becoming less reliable and more people prefer to trust
21 word of mouth or platforms that allow individual
22 reviews or comments on the specific issues. People are
23 more willing to get involved in issues where they feel
24 that their involvement can make a difference.

25
26 At this time I'm here to introduce our
27 Outreach Coordinator, Caron McKee. She's been working
28 several months now on an exciting new facet of our
29 Program. I'm really proud of her ideas, her concepts
30 and the amount of work that's gone into this project
31 and I'm sure once you see the work that she's done
32 you'll agree with me.

33
34 Caron.

35
36 MS. MCKEE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
37 Members of the Board. For the record my name is Caron
38 McKee, I'm the Outreach Coordinator for OSM.

39
40 And social media has been a very
41 effective method of reaching people with important news
42 about our Program's activities. Our Facebook Page
43 currently has over 1,300 followers so we wanted to add
44 to this type of outreach but with an even more creative
45 and visual approach in order to have a more diverse
46 collection of outreach tools and to hopefully reach an
47 even wider audience with important information about
48 our Program.

49
50

1 So we've been working on a project to
2 turn content from our existing informational fliers
3 into short videos. We worked with the Alaska Teen
4 Media Institute to develop informational videos and so
5 far two of them are finished. The videos cover how to
6 submit a proposal to change Federal Subsistence
7 regulations and becoming involved with the Regional
8 Advisory Councils. Our plan is to develop several more
9 of these videos covering the most common topics of
10 interest to the public, such as, how to submit a
11 special action request, or how to request a cultural
12 and educational harvest permit. Then we plan to share
13 the videos via YouTube and FaceBook which will allow
14 the public to then share the videos with anyone they
15 know who might benefit from the information. We'll
16 also have closed caption versions of the videos
17 available at outreach events, such as our exhibit
18 booths at various conventions like AFN, so that people
19 stopping by our booths can enjoy the videos even with a
20 noisy background environment.

21
22 And, now, we'd like to show you the two
23 videos that we've completed. Do we have them cued.

24
25 (Video Presentation)

26
27 MR. MATUSKOWITZ: Mr. Chair, that
28 concludes our briefing on our outreach efforts here at
29 OSM.

30
31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
32 That was good, straight, clean-cut. The only thing
33 missing there, Theo, is Charlie's the star and he
34 wasn't even here this afternoon.

35
36 MR. DOOLITTLE: Hey, Theo, what other
37 videos are you putting together?

38
39 MR. MATUSKOWITZ: As Caron said we are
40 doing we are doing the special action.

41
42 MS. MCKEE: Yes, how to submit a special
43 action request and how to request a cultural and
44 educational harvest permit. Those will be the next two
45 hopefully completed by the end of this calendar year.

46
47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay.

48
49 MR. MATUSKOWITZ: And there will

50

1 probably be a starring role for a certain Chair.

2

3 (Laughter)

4

5 MR. SHARP: Caron, could I ask one
6 question. I guess in looking at it, I sense the voice
7 over could actually work real well with translations
8 too and I was wondering if you had thought about that?

9

10 MS. MCKEE: Translations as far as
11 captioning or actually into.....

12

13 MR. SHARP: No. Yup'ik language or
14 something over, you know, because a lot of it is voice
15 over and such.

16

17 MS. MCKEE: Right, that's true.

18

19 MR. SHARP: And your part could be
20 replaced by someone from each language in the region,
21 not to dismiss that, but it's a short part and then
22 it's all voice over and it could easily go to different
23 languages, just a thought.

24

25 MS. MCKEE: All right, thank you.
26 That's something good to consider.

27

28 MR. DOOLITTLE: Hey, Greg, next time
29 you ask me about how to do a special action I will.....

30

31 MR. SIEKANIEC: There you go.

32

33 (Laughter)

34

35 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
36 we'll come back to 2019 Federal Subsistence fishery
37 update.

38

39 MR. RISDAHL: Mr. Chairman. Members of
40 the Council. Greg Risdahl, the Fisheries Division
41 Leader for the Office of Subsistence Management. I'm
42 going to give you guys a brief overview of some of the
43 fisheries management actions and escapement runs and
44 harvest information from this past summer. This is by
45 no means a complete summary and I do want to make a
46 note that much of this information, the data, is from
47 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

48

49 Beginning with the Yukon River. By --

50

1 oh, one other thing, I updated the numbers through this
2 weekend and, of course, fish keep swimming upstream so
3 those numbers have actually continued to grow in some
4 instances.

5
6 I'll begin with the Yukon River. By
7 August 4th, 2019 approximately 218,170 chinook salmon
8 were estimated to have passed the Pilot Station sonar
9 located on the Lower Yukon River. No chinook have been
10 counted past at this time. This is at the upper end of
11 the preseason forecast and above the long-term average
12 of 181,475 chinook. Overall chinook salmon escapements
13 on the U.S. side were generally met. In addition, as
14 of August 10th an estimated 44,237 had passed the sonar
15 at Eagle, which also meets the lower end of the interim
16 management escapement goal of 42,500 to 555,000. This
17 is the goal recommended by the Yukon River Panel. It
18 still is not enough to fulfill the Treaty obligations
19 to provide a full harvest share for the in-river
20 fishery in Canada. And the Canadians, themselves, have
21 self-limited and on average they've been taking about
22 2,000 fish a year.

23
24 The summer chum run was about 10 days
25 to two weeks late on the Yukon, however, by July 18th
26 an estimated 1,398 million had passed the Pilot Station
27 sonar. This is at the lower end of the preseason
28 forecast but below the median cumulative count of
29 1.875,091 million.

30
31 The fall chum preseason run projection,
32 which is based on a summer chum to fall chum ratio is
33 for a run size of 500,000 to 750,000 fish. As of
34 August 10th, an estimated 452,000 fall chum passed the
35 Pilot Station sonar. Run sizes over 550,000 fish
36 generally can provide for escapement, subsistence use
37 and limited commercial opportunities. The drainage-wide
38 sustainable escapement goal for this area is 300,000 to
39 600,000 fall chum salmon with an IMEG for Canadian
40 origin mainstem Yukon -- oh, I'm jumping ahead here.
41 That's correct -drainage-wide sustainable escapement
42 goals for 300,000 to 600,000 fall chum salmon with an
43 IMEG for Canadian origin mainstem Yukon River fall chum
44 of 70,000 to 104,000. The estimated drainage-wide
45 escapement was above the upper end of the 500,000 to
46 1.2 million overall escapement goal and provided ample
47 surplus for subsistence and commercial fishing
48 opportunities. As of the 10th, there had been nine
49 commercial openings and I think I just looked and it's

50

1 up to 11 as of today.

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

The coho salmon outlook is for an average return. As of August 10th, an estimated 5,912 have passed the Pilot Station sonar.

Moving on to the Kuskokwim. In April 2019 the Federal Subsistence Board voted to restrict subsistence fishing in the Kuskokwim River drainage to Federally-qualified users and to further restrict subsistence fishing based on an ANILCA Section .804 analysis to those living in the Kuskokwim River drainage and the four villages of Kwigillingok, Kwong, Kipnuk and Chefornak. The catch per unit effort for chinook at the Bethel test fishery during the 2019 season was 850. This is the highest CPUE since 2008. That was the year that the net material was changed in the regulations. An estimated 163,600 chinook salmon passed the sonar by July 26th at which time the sonar project ended.

During the six Federal subsistence fishing opportunities in June an estimated 40,090 chinook salmon were harvested down stream of Akiak. On July 2nd, the State of Alaska resumed management of the chinook salmon fishery.

Similar to the Yukon, the Kuskokwim chum salmon run appears to have been late and below average. Only an estimated 405,700 had passed the sonar by July 26th. This is also one of the lowest since 2008. As of August 11, the CPEU for chum at the Bethel test fishery was 4,815. An estimated 7,150 chum were harvested during those six Federal subsistence fishing opportunities in June.

Moving on to sockeye. The catch per unit effort for sockeye at the Bethel test fishery during the 2019 season was 1,738. As of this past weekend, this is just below the average for the years going back to 2008. An estimated 930,200 sockeye have passed the sonar by July 26th, again, when the sonar project was shut down. Approximately 13,400 sockeye were harvested during those six Federal subsistence fishing opportunities.

As far as coho go, the CPUE for as of the 11th at the Bethel test fishery was 793, and I know that's been going up. There is no sonar estimate for

1 the coho because, again, the project ended on the 26th,
2 and a coho harvest estimate will be available at the
3 end of the season. I don't have any numbers on that
4 yet.

5

6

Any questions about those.

7

8

(No comments)

9

10

11

MR. RISDAHL: If not I'll move on to
Chignik.

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

The 2019 return of the early run sockeye salmon to Chignik was substantially smaller than normal and I put the number there, 345, almost 346,000 fish, however, it was considerably better than last year. Due to conservation concerns the Federal in-season manager restricted the harvest of early run sockeye to Federally-qualified subsistence users from June 26th to July 31st in Federal public waters. This action, along with the closures to the State commercial harvest allowed the run to nearly meet the lower end of the escapement goal, which is 350,000 to 450,000 fish. Restrictions were rescinded on July 25th as the majority of escapement had transitioned into late run sockeye, which met the escapement goal of 220,000 to 400,000 fish, and has provided opportunity for subsistence and other uses. As of August 12th, total of 613,409 sockeye salmon had been counted at the Chignik River weir, of which 267,491 were considered late run sockeye. As far as chinook go on the Chignik, this has been restricted numerous times in the recent years, it returned a reasonable numbers and no special actions were required for the fishery. Escapement goal there for chinook are 1,300 to 2,700 fish. As of July 13th, 1,505 chinook salmon had passed the weir and exceeded the lower end of the escapement goal for the first time since 2016.

Kenai River.

In April 2019 the Board approved Temporary Special Action FSA19-01 to implement the portions of the Cook Inlet Area Final Rule related to the Kenai River community gillnet fishery while waiting for publication of the rule. The final rule was signed by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture and published just this past week, as Mr. Doolittle had mentioned earlier.

1 While the preseason forecast for Kenai
2 River early run chinook salmon was not anticipated to
3 reach the lower end of the escapement goal, which is
4 3,900 to 6,600 large salmon, those over 34 inches, the
5 lower end of the goal was reached through conservative
6 management of the sportfishery and by June 30th an
7 estimated 4,186 early run chinook had passed the sonar.
8 Meeting the lower end of the escapement goal allowed
9 the community gillnet fishery to take up to 50 early
10 run chinook salmon between July 1 and July 15, however,
11 residents of Ninilchik opted to focus their efforts on
12 the community gillnet fishery in the Kasilof River
13 instead. The late run chinook salmon fishery goal on
14 the Kenai is 13,500 to 27,000 large chinook. The lower
15 end of this goal has been met in each of the past four
16 years, but based on the low preseason forecast for
17 2019, sportfishing, again, restrictions were
18 implemented. By August 10th, an estimated 10,753 late
19 run chinook had passed the sonar and the community
20 gillnet fishery and other Federal subsistence fisheries
21 were able to take place. So just a brief review of the
22 Federal subsistence total of 347 permits for Cook Inlet
23 Federal subsistence fisheries were issued this year to
24 qualified rural residents as of August 9th. This
25 includes 256 household annual permits, 81 general
26 subsistence permits, and 10 designated fisher permits.

27
28 The 2019 subsistence dipnet fishery for
29 salmon began on the Kenai and Kasilof Rivers on June 15
30 and 16 respectfully. As of this past weekend, the
31 harvest reported in the dipnet fishery at the Russian
32 River Falls was a total of 1,349 sockeye. The harvest
33 reported for the same time period in the Kasilof River
34 dipnet fishery was 28 sockeye.

35
36 The experimental Kasilof River
37 community gillnet fishery began on the 16th of June and
38 it goes through today, actually. Harvest as of this
39 past weekend, they had taken 553 sockeye, and six pink
40 salmon.

41
42 The Kenai River community gillnet
43 fishery seasons are open from July 1 through August 15,
44 and from September 10 to 30. Harvest reported through
45 this weekend included 2,832 sockeye, six coho and one
46 pink, and they still have not caught any kings. It
47 doesn't look likely this year.

48
49 As far as the Copper River goes, while
50

1 we had exceptionally poor runs during 2018, that led to
2 an unprecedented closure of the commercial fishery and
3 restrictions to State, sport, and personal use fishing,
4 the 2019 season came in above expectation. As of
5 August 8th the drift gillnet commercial fishery harvest
6 was 1.261 million. And the final in-river return
7 measured at the Miles Lake sonar was 1.039,354 million,
8 which is more than double what was anticipated.

9
10 Moving south, Yakutat area. Chinook
11 salmon returns to the Situk River were, again, expected
12 to be low and the Federal in-season manager closed the
13 harvest from June 1 to July 30th, combined with State
14 restrictions, the run surpassed the 300 fish forecast
15 with 585 fish counted by the end of the season. This
16 is above the lower end of the escapement goal of 450 to
17 1,050 fish. The chinook run missed the lower end of
18 the escapement goal in six of the past nine years,
19 however. The Federal subsistence sockeye season on the
20 Situk River was restricted in 2018 due to low returns.
21 The 2019 run, however, surpassed the lower end of the
22 escapement goal of 30,000 fish by July 15th and no
23 restrictions were necessary. As of the 9th, the
24 sockeye count was 71,985 fish.

25
26 The Stikine River. The Federal
27 subsistence fishery for the Stikine chinook salmon was
28 closed the entire season by the Federal in-season
29 manager based on low forecasted returns and to remain
30 in compliance with the Pacific Salmon Treaty. The
31 forecasted run of 8,300 fish, which is well below the
32 escapement goal range of 14,000 to 28,000 fish was
33 deemed insufficient for directed harvest in both the
34 U.S. and Canada. The forecast for the Stikine River
35 sockeye run was 90,000 fish which is well above the
36 escapement goal of 54,000 but well below the recent 10
37 year average of 153,000 fish. In 2019 the in-season
38 assessments of the fishery suggested that the run was
39 coming in well below the forecast, consequently the
40 Federal subsistence fishery for sockeye was closed from
41 July 21 to July 31. Beginning August 1, the
42 subsistence restrictions ended and since then the
43 estimated cumulative subsistence salmon harvest from
44 115 fishing permits was 20 large chinook and 1,800
45 sockeye. Stikine River subsistence coho salmon harvest
46 is not yet available.

47
48 And that's all I have, Mr. Chair.
49
50

1 Thank you very much.

2

3 Any questions.

4

5 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
6 Greg, appreciate that. Any questions for him.

7

8 Gene.

9

10 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So
11 my questions are regard to the Yukon and the Kusko and
12 do you have any preference on which I address first.

13

14 MR. RISDAHL: No, go ahead.

15

16 MR. PELTOLA: Okay. With regard to the
17 Yukon. We had limitations or restrictions of harvest
18 regard to chinook and summer chum based on the early
19 forecast of reduced run for chum, correct?

20

21 MR. RISDAHL: (Nods affirmatively)

22

23 MR. PELTOLA: So with that being said,
24 you also reported that we had nine -- was it nine or
25 10, commercial harvest opportunities as of August 10,
26 so with regard to the commercial opportunities, when
27 was the timing of the restriction on the harvest for
28 chinook and summer chum lifted to when the first
29 commercial exploitation occurred?

30

31 MR. RISDAHL: Through the Chair.
32 Actually I do have that information in my file over
33 there. It comes in pretty much every day and I can
34 give you that and give you those exact dates.

35

36 MR. PELTOLA: And, once, again, what I
37 was looking for is to ensure that it isn't directed
38 Board action but in-season management authority is
39 granted by this entity, so I want to ensure that the
40 rural priority and the priority consumptive use is
41 still preserved, and so I look forward to that
42 information.

43

44 Secondly, on the Kuskokwim, if you look
45 down through here, about middle of your presentation,
46 it says on July 2nd the State of Alaska resumed
47 management of the chinook salmon fishery. Although
48 there's a very controversial action which did or did
49 not occur with regard to management on the Kuskokwim

50

1 which I'm a bit concerned about as a Federal
2 Subsistence Board member. The State of Alaska on June
3 26th, Wednesday at 4:00 p.m., opened up the fishery to
4 everybody. It was stated as a chinook and a -- no,
5 excuse me, a chum and a red fishery. At the date which
6 that occurred, the opening at 4:00 p.m., if my memory
7 serves me right we had a 1. to 1.2 ratio between
8 chinook and chum and reds combined. On the following
9 Thursday that ratio dropped from one chinook to .89
10 chum and reds combined, which means that there is more
11 or less a fishery opened, granted we didn't know what
12 the end numbers would be, that allowed for significant
13 harvest of chinook to be taken on the river for six to
14 seven days. On top of that, we didn't hear anything
15 from the in-season manager for five to six days. So we
16 allowed via inaction, a fishery to occur, and retention
17 of chinook to be allowed by a non-Federally-qualified
18 user when this body limited the fishery to Federally-
19 qualified users through July 1st, which the State did
20 not take over management until 2nd.

21
22 How was that addressed by the Program
23 with OSM's involvement, that scenario?

24
25 MR. RISDAHL: Well, Mr. Peltola,
26 through the Chair. How do I respond to that. We, here
27 at OSM, we discussed this sort of action or inaction at
28 length, but in the end it ultimately came down to the
29 in-season manager making the decisions as to what went
30 on there. We did our best to inform and guide and
31 instruct but that ultimately was the decision of that
32 in-season manager.

33
34 MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, I'd like to
35 reiterate that, again, OSM is an advisory body to
36 others and that the decisionmakers are the Board and
37 the people that are designated by the Board as in-
38 season managers.

39
40 MR. PELTOLA: And that's what I'm
41 building up to. Is that, I have no problem with having
42 decisions made in the field, but if our people making
43 decisions in the field cannot follow the basic tenency
44 of the law, then we should hold them accountable and
45 actually address that scenario.

46
47 Here's a situation where we have the
48 Board like -- everybody knows the Board took an action
49 to limit the fishery to all but Federally-qualified
50

1 users regard to chinook until July 1st. The State of
2 Alaska, and I'm not faulting the State of Alaska for
3 their decision, but they provided an opportunity for
4 all users to harvest salmon on the Kuskokwim, and
5 including the retention of chinook which is limited by
6 this body and, yet, nothing came out of the in-season
7 manager to address that conflict. So what I would like
8 to hear at our January meeting, which is the next
9 available opportunity, is a very thorough explanation
10 of why no action was taken by the in-season manager for
11 five to six days, which allowed for the direction of
12 this Board to be violated.

13
14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg.

15
16 MR. SIEKANIEC: Yeah, thank you, Mr.
17 Chair. Thanks Gene. Maybe I misunderstood what you
18 said, I thought I heard you say on June 26th the chum
19 and red fishery was open by the State, there was no
20 chinook opening provided.

21
22 MR. PELTOLA: No, if you look at the
23 special action and the subsequent information provided
24 to KYAK, such that a public news would be put out,
25 chinook were allowed to be retained by any State user,
26 which is in direct conflict and contradiction to this
27 body's action of limiting the fishery up until June 1st
28 to Federally-qualified users only. So two actions
29 could have taken place. The in-season manager could
30 have rescinded the closure earlier than he did, or he
31 could have came forth and said actually you can't
32 retain a chinook because the Federal Subsistence Board
33 has limited that harvest to all but Federally-qualified
34 user until 12:01 a.m., on July 2nd, which resulted in a
35 one week period where any State qualified user who --
36 which -- who is not a Federally-qualified user can
37 target chum and reds but also retain a chinook in
38 direct contradiction to the Board's action.

39
40 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you. That helped
41 me. I missed that section.

42
43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So, Gene, for
44 the next meeting, which I know we're probably not going
45 to get the answer here, and I see Greg writing fast
46 there, you're looking for an explanation on how that
47 happened or why or how we're going to avoid that from
48 happening in the future. I'm just trying to get it.

49
50

1 MR. PELTOLA: So here's what I've
2 heard. It comes out through the public record, whether
3 it be special actions published by the in-season
4 manager, emergency orders published by the State of
5 Alaska, or news articles which would be specific to the
6 Kusko, on KYAK.org, so the State opened the fishery for
7 red and chums, the ratios were not quite there, if you
8 look at historically when we have passed over
9 management to the State of Alaska, and don't get me
10 wrong, I am not bashing State managers whatsoever, but
11 typically when we pass management over to the State of
12 Alaska regard to chinook actions by this body, we're
13 looking at a 1 to six to seven, or a one to 12 or 14,
14 or such a higher ratio than which was expressed when
15 the action was taken by the State of Alaska. Now, we
16 have given delegation authority to an in-season manager
17 because the Board cannot be and address management
18 action in a timely basis and in-season and in-season
19 decisions have to be made, although when the State
20 announced this, there are two actions that could have
21 been taken by the in-season manager which were lacking.
22 One, he could have lifted the closure that was put in
23 place by the Federal Subsistence Board earlier than he
24 did. And I might remind you all that the State made
25 their announcement on June 26th, Wednesday, saying it's
26 open at 4:00 p.m., we didn't have any public
27 announcement with regard to Federal action until the
28 following Monday, if not Tuesday when the State took
29 over managing, when the Jul-June [sic] 1st date had
30 expired. So we're looking at six to seven days or a
31 week where there was inactivity by the in-season
32 manager which allowed for the retention of a chinook
33 by a non-Federally-qualified user and the Board action
34 was to limit the chinook harvest and retention to
35 Federally-qualified users only. That's the part that I
36 would like to have addressed.

37
38 And, like I said, I'm all in favor of
39 giving people, individual's management decisions in-
40 season because we cannot be in the field, can't make
41 in-season management decisions, although if those
42 decisions aren't being made then they should be held
43 accountable for it. In this case I'd like to hear a
44 clear justification on why no action was taken by the
45 in-season manager when the State action had taken
46 place, and I'm not saying the State was wrong in doing
47 what they did, what I'm saying is that we had a lack of
48 response from our in-season manager, which is
49 reflective of authority from this Board and granted to
50

1 that individual.

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I got that now
4 because that was a long lengthy discussion to even come
5 up with those dates.

6

7 MR. PELTOLA: It was very much so.

8

9 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Very much so.
10 Dan.

11

12 MR. SHARP: It also points a little bit
13 to the failure of the dual management system, I guess,
14 and the communication for the managers out there
15 because these sorts of things should be worked out
16 preseason and well understood, at least the mechanics
17 of how they're going to proceed, I guess. Clearly, if
18 there's a Federal restriction in place, you know, the
19 retention is one thing, if it's closed to all but
20 Federally-qualified users, the State, in their
21 announcement could say, retention of chinook by other
22 than Federally-qualified users, you know, they're
23 playing in sort of a grey area, too, I guess, calling
24 it a sockeye and chum run with that sort of potential
25 harvest of chinook. Again, that's why we try to do a
26 lot of preseason work to address these sort of hiccups
27 and such and so they shouldn't happen, I guess. But
28 there's solutions abound I suspect for this sort of
29 situation.

30

31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Dan.
32 Any other discussion, yeah, Bert.

33

34 MR. FROST: I think the other important
35 piece of information that we need is to understand how
36 many chinook were actually retained because if there
37 were no retained then it's a non-issue. I have no
38 idea, I'm just saying that there has to be -- there may
39 have been good reason that none of us know why the in-
40 season manager decided not to act, and it could be that
41 there were no fish in the river for some reason, I
42 don't know I'm just saying that that's the other piece
43 of the information we need is to understand, how many
44 fish were actually retained, how many chinook were
45 actually retained during that time period.

46

47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, I guess
48 the point for me, too, is, is that, it was Federalized
49 to the 1st, period.

50

1 MR. DOOLITTLE: One to one.

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: One to one, so
4 I mean I could understand that.

5

6 Thank you for your report Greg.

7

8 MR. RISDAHL: You're welcome.

9

10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll look
11 forward to an explanation at the next meeting.

12

13 Thank you.

14

15 MR. DOOLITTLE: One of the things that
16 the Board had requested was looking at off-site
17 meetings and we discussed internally, you know, this
18 ask and in some ways we're going to punt the ask, you
19 know, back to the Board with putting some boundaries.
20 After this meeting we'll be putting out a poll, a
21 doodle poll, but in that we're going to kind of field
22 the Board about, you know, where they think some
23 locations for the next regulatory meeting may be or
24 where the next work sessions may or may not be.

25

26 With that in mind, one of the things
27 about our regulatory meetings that I wanted to put some
28 sidebars on, was that bigger hubs are preferable, one
29 is for public engagement. If we looked at our last
30 year's meeting we had a few hundred people that were
31 actually in attendance and so everything from lodging
32 and for people that want to participate in the
33 meetings, is that, if we were in a place like Juneau,
34 Anchorage, or Fairbanks, we're more apt to -- you know,
35 A, there's lodging, and, B, that will accommodate, you
36 know, a larger number of people in those kinds of
37 locations. So that was what Staff that we talked about
38 briefly.

39

40 However, work sessions, you know, have
41 a higher degree of flexibility. And the work sessions
42 still, again, it's still the accommodation of
43 sometimes, you know, 30 or 40 people going into a spot
44 and we try to assure that there's some sort of good,
45 you know, aircraft service or road -- or, you know, the
46 location's on the road system where we can have access,
47 you know, by the public.

48

49 And so those were the considered -- you

50

1 know those are really some of the considerations and
2 sidebars. So, you know, a place like Bethel or
3 Kotzebue or Nome, going up to Utqiagvik, you know, are
4 all places that have, you know, an ability to be able
5 to, you know, fly in and out. We're holding some
6 Regional Advisory Council meetings, for instance, in
7 Point Hope this year, Cold Bay, and also in McGrath.
8 But that means when you go in, we only have a few
9 flights a week going in and out at some of these
10 locations now and so really then it's almost a weeks
11 worth of somebody's time to attend a meeting in one of
12 those types of -- in one of those locations.

13
14 But I'd like to field, you know, your
15 opinion one more time, I do apologize if I haven't
16 vetted a place, you know, for the Board yet, but I sure
17 will. But if we want to decide as a group that we want
18 the regulatory meeting off-site I'm asking for the
19 consideration that it be a place that can accommodate a
20 larger number of people. And then for a work session,
21 January, the only thing is January is January, about
22 some of our locations, but, again, for next August work
23 session, I think, you know, the sky is the limit to be
24 able to do that, again, with some concession about, you
25 know, some locations that it does take a long time to
26 get in or out without charter flights.

27
28 Thank you.

29
30 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Rhonda.

31
32 MS. PITKA: Okay. So as to the timing
33 issue, it takes me a week to get here and back home, so
34 I'm not very sensitive to other people's time
35 constraints, I apologize. And I do enjoy Kotzebue in
36 January.

37
38 (Laughter)

39
40 MR. DOOLITTLE: I hear you. And we can
41 get in and out.

42
43 MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, Mr. Chair, I made
44 the original request of OSM to look at that. And if
45 you look at the Secretarial Review in 2010 it said the
46 Board will -- I think is how it worded, attempt to or
47 try to meet in rural areas, but there's a caveat within
48 reasonable expense, or I can't remember how it's
49 termed. So I guess that instead of asking the Board

50

1 where we'd like to go, understanding that it's cheaper
2 to go to the hubs than more isolated places, I might
3 request that OSM look at our regional hubs within our
4 10 regions and do a calculation based on what your best
5 estimate is on what it would take to meet in one of
6 those particular hubs within the regions and then we
7 could from there. If it's deemed to be not cost
8 effective, I completely understand that, but also in
9 the chair that I sit for advocating for tribes for the
10 most part within policy and regulation of Title VIII
11 and everything else, I'd be remiss if I didn't ask if
12 the Board consider meeting in a rural location.

13
14 MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, thanks for that
15 Gene, and we will put together a cost analysis for a
16 number of hubs and I'm looking at hubs that would have,
17 you know, air traffic regardless of time of year and I
18 understand. I like Kotzebue in the winter, too,
19 especially ptarmigan.

20
21 (Laughter)

22
23 MR. DOOLITTLE: But, anyways, so we'll
24 get that taken care of and so then that might be
25 something for the Board to take a look at but I would
26 just do it more through the informal channels of an
27 email if that's appropriate.

28
29 MR. BROWER: How come the January work
30 session is always on my birthday.

31
32 (Laughter)

33
34 MS. PITKA: No, no, it is not, I
35 completely disagree, it's always on my birthday because
36 of Federal shutdown.

37
38 (Laughter)

39
40 MR. SIEKANIEC: Don't say that word.

41
42 MS. PITKA: I have spent so many
43 birthdays here.

44
45 (Laughter)

46
47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So I guess we
48 kind of rounded that down to that we'll have our Staff
49 take a look at that, what hub places cost, breakdown.

50

1 Hydaburg's always available.
2
3 (Laughter)
4
5 MR. SCHMID: I like Hydaburg.
6
7 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Right on, Dave.
8 I got to plug here too, that's a second.
9
10 (Laughter)
11
12 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Well, Saxman is
13 rural.
14
15 (Laughter)
16
17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, I
18 better shut up before I get in trouble here. ARD
19 update -- oh, no, budget, sorry. Budget update.
20
21 MR. DOOLITTLE: So this is a very.....
22
23 REPORTER: Turn on.....
24
25 MR. DOOLITTLE: Oh, I should probably
26 turn on.....
27
28 REPORTER:something, any
29 microphone, pick on.
30
31 MR. DOOLITTLE:one of these.
32 Here, Bert, I'll turn on yours.
33
34 REPORTER: Thank you.
35
36 MR. DOOLITTLE: This is a very
37 impromptu, you know, overview of the 2019 budget and
38 kind of where we've been at for the last few years at
39 Board Member Peltola's request and the Board's request.
40
41 And if we could hit the next slide.
42
43 Thanks.
44
45 Essentially when we're looking at the
46 overall appropriation that comes down, you know, from
47 the Department to Fish and Wildlife Service, then
48 actually the Alaska subsistence budget is split out
49 between Fisheries and National Wildlife Refuges and
50

1 then it comes from there to the Alaska region and then
2 after, you know, funds have been allocated through
3 formula it comes to OSM and that's what you see as our
4 retained budget. So that flow chart is pretty well the
5 way things go now and the way that they have gone in
6 the past.

7
8 And so we make sure that, you know,
9 parts of -- when we see some of the allocations that go
10 to Fisheries and Refuges when it comes to OSM,
11 retained, remember that some of our Fisheries groups
12 and Refuges are competing for FRMP funds, we don't
13 write contracts to ourselves, and so essentially
14 they're pulled out of some of this before we will see a
15 realized budget that we put out, FRMP, Partners, pay
16 salaries, travel and those sorts of things.

17
18 Next slide, please.

19
20 As you can see, we've had, you know,
21 our budget's been pretty much flat and then this year
22 we've had a slight bump down by a few hundred thousand
23 dollars and you'll see the reason for that slight
24 downward trend and what's happened. So, anyways, we're
25 showing what many of the programs that have gone
26 through a continuing resolution process, is that we
27 have a pretty well flat budget.

28
29 Next slide, please.

30
31 So you talk about flat, when we look at
32 our enacted, you know, '19 and '18 and '17 budget, you
33 know, we're right exactly at the same number. But when
34 you start to look at our Washington assessment you'll
35 start to see a little bump, you know, for FES bump, and
36 then with special assessments a larger bump than we've
37 had in previous years but not totally out of line with
38 some other years but it's still a little bit higher.

39
40 MS. PITKA: Explain FES.

41
42 MR. DOOLITTLE: Oh, Fisheries and
43 Ecological Services. So when you see the acronym.....

44
45 MS. PITKA: Thank you.

46
47 MR. DOOLITTLE: Excuse me about that.
48 And when you see -- any time I look at 1335 here, I'm
49 talking about fisheries related and fishery directed

50

1 funds that come into the program through FES.

2

3

Next slide, please.

4

5

6 But when we look at the Refuges enacted
7 funds, you start to see again, we had the same amount
8 of money that we've had in previous years, we didn't
9 have the Washington office take from us, and then when
10 we looked at special assessments this year we had about
11 \$210,000 extra dollars. There's a new administrative
12 effort within the Service to try and combine
13 administrative services for HR, for some of our budget
14 process, ethics officers are being hired, you know, as
15 a direction of the Department, so there's a wide range
16 of different reasons for monies and these were assessed
17 across all programs. For some reason FES was, you
18 know, even though it's our larger amount of money that
19 we get, still Refuges is a larger program and there was
20 a different formula so actually some of the assessments
21 were higher as a program for Refuges, but I won't get
22 into the details of that. I think the bottom line is
23 that what we're seeing is a larger, you know,
24 Washington assessment to come out and I would expect
25 that Washington assessment to be that amount or larger
26 in the future.

26

27

Next slide, please.

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

So if we look at the overall, you know,
picture, we did have a similar large assessment back in
2012, but, then again this year 2019 was substantially
above most other years in recent history of \$490,000.

Next slide, please.

So when we look at our budget expense,
we put out about 30 percent of our budget that we
realize into the FRMP and our Partners Program, another
8 percent for our Staff and travel, you know, about 47
percent and then overall, you know, support of the
program from paper to all the other things that we get.

Next slide, please.

So when we go across the board here,
you'll see a few interesting numbers. One is before we
see our consumable budget, so Washington has taken out
this bunch of money, what you'll see is that we have
about \$927,000 that Fishery and Ecological Services

1 will take out, we'll see that Refuges administration
2 will take out about another 649,000 and then these are
3 projects that are like FRMP, projects where we don't
4 write, you know, cooperative agreements to ourselves.
5 So these two, it's like, well, where do these funds go,
6 well, a lot of what Jeff's [sic] program does with, you
7 know, Fisheries and Ecological Services, serve
8 subsistence needs, running from everything from the
9 Kwethluk weir, our in-season managers out at Yukon-
10 Delta, other Refuges, you know, these people are
11 working on subsistence-related activities and so much
12 of these funds are moved out of the program, you know,
13 before we realize it, before we're paying our salaries
14 and we're moving these monies into the FRMP and
15 Partners Program as an example. So the consumable is
16 kind of what we're using for those salaries and so
17 forth.

18
19 So realize that Alaska Subsistence
20 Program just is not OSM exclusively but also it's part
21 of Refuges and Fisheries and Ecological Services as
22 well before we see that realized budget. So it's, you
23 know, in the tune, you can see, you know, some years,
24 you know, there's been better success in FRMP by the
25 Fisheries and Ecological Services Program so that money
26 will fluctuate over the years.

27
28 Next slide, please.

29
30 So common services. This is the one
31 thing that did go down because part of the
32 administrative services that we do see from the
33 Washington assessments, it kind of kicked back but
34 still it was a couple hundred thousand -- you know, it
35 was like \$100,000 difference, so we're still seeing a
36 greater amount of administrative costs relative to the
37 Washington assessments and so that's been one reason
38 that we've dropped. But if you start adding in a 1.8
39 percent wage increase for employees, and if that
40 continues, and if we look at just even prime rate as an
41 indicator of inflation -- inflation area rates, we're
42 looking at two to three percent a years, so essentially
43 when I look at managing for 2020 I'm going to manage at
44 about 10 percent below what I did in the previous year.
45 So we're under those kind of realistic budget
46 constraints so we're not at a flat budget, we're at a
47 declining budget and that's just a product of
48 Administration, inflation and wage increases for Staff
49 that's maturing.

50

1 Next slide, please.

2

3 And we look at the Forest Service, you
4 guys, Dave, I didn't put 2019, but I think you're still
5 at 2 million from the President's budget so it's been
6 very, very static, you know, over the years from the
7 Forest Service, and the Forest Service does provide,
8 you know, funds that come through through an
9 InterAgency budget agreement that does come to us
10 relative to helping support projects in Southeast and
11 in Southcentral, we're trying to work that into an
12 agreement between Fish and Wildlife Service and the
13 Forest Service into a pooled pot of money that will
14 just, you know, serve the entire partners -- not
15 Partners Program, but Fisheries Resources Monitoring
16 Program, so we can try to get that all jelled into one
17 project and one proposal. So we've appreciated the
18 continuing support of USDA Forest Service, you know,
19 coming into the program usually in the tone of between
20 \$100,000 and \$200,000 a year.

21

22 And I don't think there's another
23 slide, is there -- no, there is.

24

25 MS. PITKA: Just to clarify, the
26 Program wasn't included in the President's budget for
27 the last two years, is that right?

28

29 MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, the.....

30

31 MS. PITKA: Okay.

32

33 MR. DOOLITTLE: Yeah, so the
34 President's budget could come in, then, you know, House
35 and Senate do other things, but Dave but probably has a
36 better.....

37

38 MR. SCHMID: Yeah, I can share. So we
39 have an SMSM, it's a line item, it's a very, very small
40 budget line item that only comes to this region and to
41 this area. It's very vulnerable. It's often not in
42 the President's budget and then it gets put usually
43 back in by Congress each year. So we haven't really
44 changed much. We've gone down about half of what we
45 were awhile back but that's the status.

46

47 MR. DOOLITTLE: Okay. Next slide,
48 please.

49

50

1 MR. PELTOLA: Tom, real quick.

2

3 MR. DOOLITTLE: Sure.

4

5 MR. PELTOLA: And that is held true
6 with regard to the \$12.4 million added in every year
7 for the Federal Subsistence Program in Alaska that
8 comes through the Fish and Wildlife Service, correct?

9

10 MR. DOOLITTLE: Yes. I mean so the
11 total allocation that would come in is about \$12
12 million, but, again, once the Washington assessments
13 and everything, it comes down to about 7 million to the
14 Program.

15

16 So, anyways, when you look at our
17 Fisheries Resources Monitoring Program, and just a
18 quick snapshot for you all, about 62 percent of our
19 funding through competitive process went to the State
20 of Alaska, and about 13 percent Federal, which has been
21 down from previous years, and then 22 percent for
22 Alaska Native and rural organizations, and then for
23 private folks, about three percent. So, again, this
24 table will change within the competitive process.

25

26 Next slide.

27

28 And, again, out of OSM realized budget,
29 you can see we get about 85 percent of the funds. 8
30 percent of the allocation goes to Fisheries, 5 percent
31 to Refuges. And then we always try to make a
32 contribution also to law enforcement for subsistence in
33 Alaska between 135,000 and 150,000 in a given a year.

34

35 So that's about it.

36

37 Real quick, I didn't think you probably
38 needed much more than that kind of delivery, but
39 willing to answer any questions.

40

41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Tom.

42

43 Doing more with less. Good job.

44

45 All right, that moves us on to ARD
46 update, and I believe that would be Greg.

47

48 MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
49 So as we had discussed in our last meeting and shortly

50

1 after which, I believe, was in June, I sent out a note
2 that we regrouped on it, we were -- cancelled that
3 advertisement in light of trying to enhance the number
4 of applicants that we could reach for review and for
5 consideration. The job series is still Fish and
6 Wildlife Administrator 0480 and general anthropology
7 0190, neither of which have a mandatory education
8 requirement. It is an education and/or work
9 experience that allows the individuals to be qualified.
10 I worked with the Human Resource office to take a look
11 at the review of the rating questions that establish
12 this base level of qualifications and we have made some
13 appropriate adjustments to try and expand that pool of
14 applicants that will actually make the cert list after
15 HR has the chance to do their initial review, that will
16 then come to us for the purposes of paneling and
17 selecting an individual. The position, I could not
18 post it for 90 days after this body had asked that we
19 pull back on that and try and make another effort, that
20 begins the 21st of August. I spoke with our HR as late
21 as yesterday and they're ready to go with it, so it
22 should be posted. I asked them to post it for a 30 day
23 window so we do not get into the discussion that it was
24 field season, and I was busy and I didn't have an
25 opportunity to get my applications together, so we're
26 trying to give them an adequate window of time in which
27 -- in order to be able to submit their applications and
28 then we will initiate that review process panel and see
29 if we can't end up with a person hired for the
30 Assistant Regional Director for Subsistence Management.

31
32 So that's it in a nutshell.

33
34 Okay.

35
36 MS. PITKA: So.....

37
38 MR. SCHMID: A question.

39
40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

41
42 MS. PITKA: Go ahead.

43
44 MR. SCHMID: How long has that been
45 vacant and acting, ever since I've arrived I think.

46
47 MR. SIEKANIEC: Oh, a year and.....

48
49 MR. PELTOLA: July 6th a year ago.

50

1 (Laughter)

2

3 MR. SIEKANIEC: Yeah, a year and a
4 month.

5

6 MR. DOOLITTLE: One year and one month
7 and 15 days and.....

8

9 (Laughter)

10

11 MR. SCHMID: And hours. I guess with
12 part of that I would just extend my gratitude to Tom
13 and folks for filling in, you've been doing a great job
14 and continuing to just do that, so I appreciate that.

15

16 MR. PELTOLA: And also I know it was
17 stated before, but, also, Dave, thank you, the Forest
18 Service for offering up an employees to assist OSM to
19 keep the ball rolling.

20

21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Sounds good.
22 Thank you guys for the update.

23

24 That would bring us to the end of the
25 regular meeting, could I get a motion to adjourn so we
26 can go into executive session.

27

28 MR. SIEKANIEC: So moved, Greg, Fish
29 and Wildlife Service.

30

31 MS. PITKA: Seconded.

32

33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any opposition.

34

35 (No comments)

36

37 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: None.

38

39 MS. LAVINE: Recess. Recess.

40

41 (Laughter)

42

43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Recess, I mean
44 that was a motion to recess.

45

46 MS. PITKA: A motion to recess, sorry,
47 second.

48

49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Into executive

50

1 session.

2

3 MS. PITKA: I make a motion to move
4 into executive session.

5

6 MR. SCHMID: Second.

7

8 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. I
9 drank two kinds of coffee today.

10

11 (Laughter)

12

13 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
14 everyone.

15

16 (Off record)

17

18 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

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

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

THAT the foregoing, contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE BOARD MEETING, WORK SESSION taken electronically by our firm on the 15th day of August 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 18th day of August 2019.

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