

0138

FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE BOARD

WORK SESSION

VOLUME II

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE BUILDING

Anchorage, Alaska

July 24, 2025

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Anthony Christianson, Chairman
Charles Brower, Public Member
Rhonda Pitka, Public Member
Benjamin Payenna, Public Member
Raymond Oney, Public Member
Frank Woods, Public Member
Sara Boario, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
David Alberg, National Park Service
Kevin Pendergast, Bureau of Land Management
Glenn Chen, Bureau of Indian Affairs
Greg Risdahl, U.S. Forest Service

Lisa Doehl, Solicitor's Office

Recorded and transcribed by:
Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
329 F Street, Suite 222
Anchorage, AK 99501
907-227-5312; sahile@gci.net

0139

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Anchorage, Alaska - 7/24/2025)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Welcome back everybody. I'm Anthony Christianson, Board Chair. We're reconvening yesterday's -- somebody's got me on feed through back here.

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, go ahead, Charlie.

MR. BROWER: If I may introduce a person here that's just walked in.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor.

MR. BROWER: Fenton Rexford, you can come up and introduce yourself, please.

MR. REXFORD: This looks familiar. I was one of the original RAC members in 1990, 35 years ago, and I just wanted to stop by and say hello. My name is Fenton Rexford from Kaktovik on Barter Island, and it's in ANWR. We fought tooth and nail for our subsistence way of life here, and still struggling and the biologists, a couple of them, I just wanted to -- the moose travel a lot and we go to certain zones, there's A, B and C hunting zones on 26 for three hunting zones, and these critters move around. And to be restricted to an area that is far away is not right, so you need to think about the moose moving around. That's one of our last battles. But anyway, muskox management, those kind of things happened when I was going on. So I just wanted to stop by and say hello to my nephew and glad that he's with you folks and he's been in wildlife for eons.

So I thank you very much. I appreciate the work that you do in the various regions, Western, Bristol Bay, Eastern Interior, North Slope, Southeast, I think there was one there too, Cook Inlet. So thank you all, the 10 members that help work in the Federal Program. With that, I want to thank you, Tony, I

0140

1 wanted to stop by and say hello real quick.

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. And
4 we appreciate your service, we wouldn't be here if the
5 original RAC members weren't there, so, thank you.

6

7 I think that gave us an opportunity to
8 wrinkle out our technical difficulties. Oh, sorry,
9 that's me.

10

11 (Laughter)

12

13 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: At this time
14 we're going to take up Wildlife Proposal 24-01, that
15 was our time certain today and so we'll go ahead at
16 this time, call on the Staff to present.

17

18 MR. VICKERS: The analysis for Proposal
19 WP24-01 is in your meeting books on Page 73. For those
20 online the analysis is found on the Office of
21 Subsistence Management website under Federal
22 Subsistence Board upcoming meeting materials.

23

24 Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, esteemed
25 Board members as well as Chairs for the Regional
26 Advisory Councils. My name is Brent Vickers and I am
27 the Anthropology Division Supervisor at the Office of
28 Subsistence Management.

29

30 This proposal was submitted for the
31 2024 wildlife cycle by a resident of McCarthy, Alaska,
32 who requests that the Federal Subsistence Board allow
33 for the sale of brown bear hides under Federal
34 Subsistence regulations. The Board deferred this
35 proposal at its April 2024 meeting for two reasons; 1)
36 to potentially establish a work group to negotiate with
37 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game concerning the
38 use of its permit to sell brown grizzly bear hide
39 and/or skull and, 2) to allow time to explore options
40 for Federally-qualified subsistence users to obtain a
41 permit allowing for the sale of a hide from a Federal
42 agency. The following year, in February 2025, OSM
43 presented the proposal again to the Board, this time
44 with an added addendum with new information and a new
45 revised OSM conclusion, which I'll refer to as OSM
46 revised conclusion. The added addendum, which starts
47 on Page 15 of the analysis, which is on Page 87 in the
48 meeting book addressed the Board's reasons for
49 deferring the proposal and contained information such
50

0141

1 as the OSM revised conclusion, that Regional Advisory
2 Councils had not yet seen when they first made the
3 recommendations in fall of 2023, so at the February
4 2025 Board meeting the Federal Subsistence Board,
5 again, deferred action on this proposal. At that time
6 the Board requested that all 10 Regional Advisory
7 Councils provide new recommendations at their winter
8 meetings on the added addendum and the OSM revised
9 conclusion. OSM then presented the added addendum with
10 the OSM revised conclusion to each of the 10 Regional
11 Advisory Councils at their respective 2025 winter
12 meetings, each Council made a new 2025 recommendation
13 on the revised conclusion. Before we get to those RAC
14 recommendations I'll continue with this brief
15 presentation so everyone's caught up on the main
16 concerns and the OSM revised conclusion.

17
18 The Federal Subsistence Board first
19 deferred action on the proposal in 2024 because
20 adopting it, as submitted, might conflict with the
21 Convention on International Trade and Endangered
22 Species, also known as CITES, an International Treaty.
23 The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has delegated to the
24 State of Alaska, Department of Fish and Game, the
25 authority to provide for International trade of brown
26 bear hides only if ADF&G -- is my time up -- okay.

27
28 (Laughter)

29
30 MR. VICKERS: All right, I'm done.

31
32 (Laughter)

33
34 MR. VICKERS: Only if ADF&G issues
35 permits reporting that the trade will not be
36 detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild,
37 therefore, a permit from the ADF&G is required. The
38 Alaska Department of Fish and Game issues a permit to
39 sell a hide of brown bear but only if taken in an area
40 with a two brown bear harvest limit. State of Alaska
41 limits sales on hides because unlimited sales might
42 incentivize legal and illegal harvesting in Alaska and
43 elsewhere in North America. For this reason, State of
44 Alaska's purpose is to prevent hides from entering the
45 commercial markets. While limiting the sale of brown
46 bear hides is necessary for hundreds -- for the
47 hundreds of brown bears harvested in sport and general
48 hunts each year in Alaska in which edible meat may not
49 be salvaged, the much lower number of brown bears
50

0142

1 harvested for subsistence for which the edible meat
2 must be salvaged does not need the same level of
3 restrictions on the sale of hides.

4

5 So that brings us to the OSM revised
6 conclusion, which begins on Page 20 on the analysis,
7 and Page 92 in the meeting books.

8

9 The OSM revised conclusion is to
10 support WP24-01 with modification.

11

12 Whoa.

13

14 (Laughter)

15

16 MR. VICKERS: With modification that
17 the hides of brown bears with or without claws attached
18 may be purchased within the United States for personal
19 use and not be resold. The -- what's going on?

20

21 (Sound amplifies)

22

23 MR. VICKERS: Okay. The hunter must
24 request an OSM customary trade permit and must return
25 the permit. Additionally, this modification eliminates
26 regulations requiring the skin and the skull and the
27 claws of the brown bear hides to be retained at the
28 time of sealing in certain areas.

29

30 As justification for the revised
31 conclusion, the Federal Subsistence Board deferred the
32 proposal on April 2024 because adopting it as submitted
33 might conflict with CITES. In response, OSM
34 modification allows a sale of a hide of brown bear
35 under Federal subsistence regulations, the bear may be
36 taken in an area with one or two bear harvest limits.
37 The focus of the OSM modification is to limit sales to
38 purchase within the United States. CITES only limits
39 International purchases of brown bear hides. This
40 modification allowing only for domestic purchases does
41 not conflict with CITES. As with the State of Alaska's
42 regulations and permit requirements, the OSM customary
43 trade permit requires that; 1) the purchase of a hide
44 for the personal use and not -- or purchase of the hide
45 must be for personal use and not be resold; and, 2) the
46 seal number must be identified in any advertisement for
47 sale. This allows for enforcement to identify that a
48 brown bear hide advertised for sale on the internet,
49 for example, is from a legally harvested brown bear.

50

0143

1 The OSM modification, however, allows for the hide to
2 be sold with or without claws attached and will allow a
3 Federally-qualified subsistence user who removes a claw
4 to incorporate it into a handicraft to then sell the
5 hide.

6
7 Finally, the OSM modification removes
8 from Federal regulations the requirement in some areas
9 that Alaska, that at the time of sealing, the sealing
10 official must remove and retain the skin of the head
11 and the front claws of the bear hide. Current Federal
12 eligible meat salvage requirements will likely protect
13 brown bears from over harvest.

14
15 In conclusion, the OSM modification
16 complies with provisions of CITES and allows Federally-
17 qualified subsistence user to legally sell hides of
18 brown bears while balancing customary trade
19 conservation. Also, it's important to note if the
20 Board adopts this proposal, the regulation will not be
21 effective until the Office of Management and Budget, or
22 OMB, approves for the development of a new Federal
23 permit allowing for the sale of brown bear hides under
24 Federal regulation.

25
26 Thank you for your attention, this is
27 the end of my presentation and I'm available to answer
28 questions.

29
30 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any question
31 from the Board for Staff on the analysis presented.

32
33 MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

34
35 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have
36 the floor, Charlie.

37
38 MR. BROWER: Just a question. It's the
39 beginning -- the process beginning of selling brown
40 bear hides, but is there a grandfather right to the
41 previous harvested animals? No?

42
43 MR. VICKERS: Thank you, Board Member
44 Brower. I believe that it was looked into, this was a
45 question that was raised at the last Board meeting and,
46 no, from what I have read and someone correct me if I'm
47 wrong, but, basically, no, you cannot grandfather
48 previously harvested hides, bear hides.

49
50

0144

1 MR. BROWER: Thank you.

2

3 MR. VICKERS: Thank you.

4

5 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any further
6 questions. Sara.

7

8 MS. BOARIO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
9 Fish and Wildlife Service. Can you tell us more about
10 the development of the new Federal permit with OMB, I
11 guess what else have you guys learned about that, the
12 steps in that process, or?

13

14 MR. VICKERS: Thank you for that
15 question, Chair Member Boario. I probably know about
16 as much of OMB as you do, probably a lot less, I know
17 it could take awhile, that is certain. If our
18 regulation specialist Justin Koller's online and would
19 like to approach this or if it looks like Wildlife
20 Division Supervisor Lisa Grediagin would like to get at
21 this I hand the mic over.

22

23 MS. GREDIAGIN: Thanks. For the
24 record, my name's Lisa Grediagin, the Wildlife Division
25 Supervisor with OSM. And, again, if Justin's online he
26 might want to jump in as well and provide
27 clarification. But my understanding is that any
28 additional information collection, it requires OMB
29 approval, and so this additional customary trade permit
30 is additional information and so we have to put that
31 information in a proposed rule and so once the Board --
32 you know, assuming the Board adopts this proposal, then
33 we could put that information in the next -- like the
34 Fisheries Proposed Rule, and hopefully it would be
35 approved through that and then it could be finalized in
36 the 2026 wildlife final rule. That's our hopeful
37 timeline.

38

39 MS. BOARIO: Follow up.

40

41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

42

43 MS. BOARIO: So that sounds like, so
44 there's a couple pieces, right, like that sounds like
45 the Paperwork Reduction Act piece of it, where you have
46 to like notice that you're going to be collecting
47 information from people in the Federal Register. But
48 then there's like the administration of the permit
49 piece too, like what does that look like?

50

0145

1 MS. GREDIAGIN: So you're asking --
2 assuming OMB approves it and we're able to implement
3 the permit, I mean my understanding is it would be
4 implemented just like any other Federal permit, you
5 know, we create it in our data base just like any other
6 harvest permit and then it could be issued through
7 Federal managers, you know, at field stations or, you
8 know, they could request it through OSM and then
9 there's also the reporting requirement that they would
10 have to return that to OSM, that we would track the
11 bears sold. But I mean to be honest with you I think
12 some of these details would have to be worked out, you
13 know, afterwards with OMB and through the development
14 of the permit. So I mean I guess if the Board has any
15 strong feelings about the permit, you know, you could
16 provide those details now to make sure they're
17 considered and incorporated.

18

19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I hear Justin's
20 online if you wanted to add anything, you have the
21 floor.

22

23 MR. KOLLER: Thank you, Chairman
24 Christianson. Members of the Board. I think
25 everything was covered pretty well. Yes, it's a
26 Paperwork Reduction Act requirement that we go through
27 OMB for approval for a new permit, which does take a
28 bit of time. And then once we're approved for that
29 permit it's going to be handled through the permitting
30 system as usual.

31

32 Thank you.

33

34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
35 Justin. Any other further questions from the Board for
36 Staff on the analysis.

37

38 (No comments)

39

40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. I
41 think next we call on Orville, summary of tribal
42 consultation.

43

44 MR. LIND: Quyana. Quyana, Mr. Chair
45 and Council members. Glad to be here, and this is
46 going to take awhile. We have not had any tribal
47 consultations on Wildlife Proposal 24-01, and that's my
48 report.

49

50

0146

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Are you sure,
2 Tribal Liaison, for the record -- thank you, Orville.

3
4 (Laughter)

5
6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No voice means
7 concurrence, oh, I mean, you know, I mean if nobody
8 jumps up on the sidelines and hollers.

9
10 (Laughter)

11
12 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: What are we on
13 now, I'm getting in trouble here. Before we open the
14 floor to tribes and ANCSA Corporation testimony,
15 anybody here in the building, anybody online would like
16 to be recognized, this is your opportunity if you
17 represent a tribe or an ANCSA Corporation.

18
19 (No comments)

20
21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: That would be
22 Number 5, to raise your hand.

23
24 MS. LEONETTI: Star five.

25
26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Or six to
27 unmute your phone, star six.

28
29 (No comments)

30
31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
32 next on our agenda to be heard is the SRC Advisory. I
33 think Eva.

34
35 MS. PATTON: Thank you, Mr. Chair and
36 members of the Board. For the record, Eva Patton,
37 Subsistence Program Manager for the National Park
38 Service. We did have several Subsistence Resource
39 Commissions that had originally made a recommendation
40 on the original WP24-01 proposal back in 2024 and then
41 only two that either had an opportunity, due to the
42 timing of the latest version, that made a
43 recommendation, and I'll provide comments for all
44 except for Wrangell-St. Elias, we do have Barbara
45 Cellarius who is the Coordinator for the Wrangell-St.
46 Elias SRC so she can provide that SRC's comment.

47
48 So in 2024 the Kobuk Valley, Gates of
49 the Arctic, Aniakchak and Wrangell-St. Elias SRC's all
50

0147

1 supported the original WP24-01 and then, again, for
2 this year in 2025 either due to the timing of it coming
3 before the SRCs during their spring meeting only Lake
4 Clark and Wrangell-St. Elias provided comment on this
5 updated version.

6

7 So the Lake Clark National Park
8 Subsistence Resource Commission met in Pedro Bay on
9 April 26th of 2025 and the SRC reviewed the Federal
10 Wildlife Proposal for WP24-01 regarding the sale of
11 brown bear hides that have been taken under Federal
12 subsistence regulations that will be considered by the
13 Federal Subsistence Board during the upcoming summer
14 work session. The SRC wanted to provide comments, they
15 did not make a formal recommendation to take action on
16 this proposal officially but they did want to share
17 their thoughts and concerns with the Board.

18

19 So while several members expressed
20 support for the idea of providing more opportunities
21 for subsistence users, multiple members also disagreed
22 with the idea that a subsistence user should be
23 permitted for profit commercially from a subsistence
24 harvest. As one member stated, they feel both ways,
25 it's good to be able to do with more with your harvest
26 but it would only be subsistence harvest that you're
27 allowed to profit off of and that's not why they're
28 given the opportunity that individual felt. And
29 another member of the SRC also felt that if the sale of
30 hides was approved it should only be allowed if the
31 claws and feet were removed prior to the sale. Similar
32 to requirements for other bear hides. Several members
33 also repeated their concern that allowing the sale of
34 brown bear hides could potentially incentivize the
35 taking of brown bears primarily for their hides and not
36 for the meat.

37

38 So they did want to express those
39 concerns but, again, did not make a formal
40 recommendation one way or the other on this proposal.

41

42 And then we do have Barbara Cellarius
43 online to present the Wrangell-St. Elias SRC comments.

44

45 Thank you.

46

47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Eva.
48 Any questions for Eva on what's presented so far.

49

50

0148

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the
4 floor, Barbara, online.

5

6 MS. CELLARIUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
7 I'll just check and make sure that you can hear me.

8

9 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We can hear you
10 fine.

11

12 MS. CELLARIUS: Great, thank you very
13 much. So my name is Barbara Cellarius. I am the
14 Subsistence Coordinator for Wrangell-St. Elias National
15 Park and Preserve and in that capacity I provide Staff
16 support to the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park
17 Subsistence Resource Commission, which met in Copper
18 Center, Alaska on February 25th and 26th, 2025 and at
19 the meeting the SRC reviewed the addendum to deferred
20 Wildlife Proposal 24-01 and would like to provide the
21 following comment.

22

23 The Wrangell-St. Elias National Park
24 Subsistence Resource Commission unanimously supported
25 WP24-01 with the revised OSM conclusion and addendum.
26 Given the requirement to salvage hides, subsistence
27 users should be able to sell them. Additionally,
28 customary trade of brown bear hides is important for
29 use in handicrafts. One member noted that he doesn't
30 make handicrafts himself but he could sell the hide to
31 someone who does make and sell handicrafts.

32

33 So that concludes the SRC comment.

34

35 Thank you.

36

37 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
38 Thank you for that presentation. Again, any questions.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Eva.
43 Thank you, Barbara. I'll move on, at this time we open
44 up the floor to public, anybody here in the audience,
45 anyone online who would like to speak to this this is
46 your opportunity, general public.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50

0149

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And, operator,
2 if anyone is queuing you this is their opportunity.
3 Thank you.

4
5 (No comments)

6
7 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
8 we'll open the floor now to Council Chairs.

9
10 Dan.

11
12 MS. PERRY: Hello. Hello, Member --
13 oh, sorry, go ahead. This is DeAnna with the Southeast
14 Regional Advisory Council, did you want me to go next?

15
16 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We had Dan and
17 then you'll be next.

18
19 MS. PERRY: Oh, okay, thanks.

20
21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
22 Thank you for calling in, appreciate you calling.

23
24 MR. DUNAWAY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
25 Dan Dunaway, Bristol Bay Vice Chair. It's interesting
26 to hear the Lake Clark comments, we didn't hear those
27 in February when we had our winter RAC meeting that I
28 recall. I don't have the vote in front of me, but I
29 believe we unanimously supported this proposal.

30
31 I'll add a little personal knowledge.
32 I know of a guide in the Dillingham area who has sold
33 one or two hides, my impression is the market for these
34 hides is pretty limited, especially on a whole hide
35 basis and it's difficult, I think, in fact, to sell
36 them. There are some roadblocks later down the road
37 for secondary sale. I think there wouldn't be for
38 handicrafts. So keep that in mind. I think the
39 concerns for incentivizing it are -- I haven't seen it
40 happen in our area.

41
42 I wanted to also make you aware of in
43 the next round of wildlife proposals, the Bristol Bay
44 RAC has two proposals -- what's the numbers here, WP26-
45 38, which actually I wrote to go to a two bear brown
46 bear bag limit to correspond -- for Game Unit 17, to
47 correspond with the same rule for the State regulation.
48 It makes it a lot easier for folks out on the
49 countryside to go, what boundary am I on and so on.
50

0150

1 And then WP26-39 would be to modify the seasons to a
2 year-round brown bear season which, again, the State
3 just adopted that in January. The main impetus there
4 for the State was to improve reporting, especially what
5 used to be called a DLP shooting, defense of life and
6 property, the current biologist was aware that we
7 probably had a number of shootings that went
8 unreported, partly if you're in the middle of setnet
9 season, you whack a bear that's messing with your gear
10 or whatever, you don't have time to be filling out
11 papers and this way they have a lot more time to get
12 the bear sealed, so hoping to get better biological
13 harvest data. And then in Game Unit 17 we generally, I
14 think, Frank would probably back me up but we feel like
15 there's an awful lot of brown bears and they're hard on
16 our moose and caribou and we, both, the RAC and the
17 Advisory Committee for the area have strongly supported
18 the bear reduction program. And I think that's also
19 indicated we have far more bears than we ever dreamed
20 of in the area.

21
22 So I'm just hoping those will give you
23 some background perspective for the Bristol Bay. I'm
24 speaking mostly for Nushagak but I hear a fair amount
25 of concern about the abundance of bears in the Naknek,
26 King Salmon, Lake Iliamna area, many of my friends --
27 I'm in close contact with several folks in the Lake
28 Iliamna area and when the bear removal program first
29 got started I was getting hammered with, why isn't it
30 over here too, so if that's helpful. I hope that is
31 helpful.

32
33 Thank you.

34
35 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Dan,
36 appreciate that. And then I did get a list here so
37 I'll apologize if I gave somebody the wrong impression,
38 but we'll go down the order here. So at this time
39 we'll give Southeast RAC Chair an opportunity, if
40 they're online.

41
42 MS. LEONETTI: Or DeAnna, if she wants
43 to speak.

44
45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And, DeAnna,
46 you have the floor now.

47
48 MS. PERRY: Hi mem -- thank you, Tony.

49
50

0151

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, thank you.

2

3

4 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair. Hello, members
5 of the Board, my name is DeAnna Perry, I'm the
6 Coordinator for the Southeast Alaska Subsistence
7 Regional Advisory Council. Our Chair, Don Hernandez,
8 does send his regrets that he was unable to attend the
9 Board's work session this wee but I'm happy to provide
10 the Council's latest recommendation on this proposal.

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

In its winter meeting this past March,
the Southeast Regional Advisory Council voted to
support WP24-01 as modified by Office of Subsistence
Management. The Council noted that brown bears are not
a conservation concern in Southeast Alaska and felt
that Federal regulations protect brown bears from over
harvest. They believed, partly based on public
testimony at that meeting, that there was substantial
evidence that people do need to be able to sell these
hides to provide raw materials for skin sewers to make
handicrafts and to continue their culture.

This concludes the most recent
recommendation and justification on WP24-01 by the
Southeast RAC.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
DeAnna. Any questions from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
next we'll call on Southcentral.

MS. MCDAVID: Good afternoon, Mr.
Chair. For the record this is Brook McDavid, I'm the
Council Coordinator for Eastern Interior and YKDelta
RACs and I'll be helping present the recommendations on
behalf of the Chairs that were not able to make it
today.

So Southcentral Council supported
Proposal WP24-01 as modified by OSM. The Council said
that allowing the sale of brown bear hides is
beneficial to subsistence users and is already allowed
in some areas of Alaska. The sale of hides is likely
to occur at a low level because of low demand. The

0152

1 Council is aware of cultural sensitivities in some
2 areas of their region to the harvest and use of brown
3 bears and their parts, which may come up at the Federal
4 Subsistence Board meeting.

5

6 And that concludes the Southcentral
7 recommendation, thank you.

8

9 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Next is Eastern
10 Interior -- oh, Kodiak Aleutian, sorry, I thought she
11 said she was doing two. Thank you. Rebecca, you have
12 the floor.

13

14 MS. SKINNER: Thank you. Rebecca
15 Skinner from Kodiak/Aleutians RAC. So the KRAC
16 originally, with the original proposal, we supported it
17 with modifications that would allow the sale of brown
18 bear hides that were taken in Kodiak so basically not
19 just limited to areas where you can harvest at least
20 two bears. In Kodiak, the way the subsistence harvest
21 is set up, the entire area, we can only take 13 bears
22 total because there are so many bears per community and
23 there's nowhere near that many subsistence bears taken.
24 I think the most we've had is three and it's usually
25 much less than that. So originally the RAC did support
26 wanting the ability to sell bear hides with -- but not
27 going down the road of only allowing that in areas
28 where there was unlimited bear harvest potential
29 because Kodiak would be excluded.

30

31 When the RAC voted on this proposal
32 with OSM changes at our February meeting, you can see
33 in our report that it was a tie vote so the RAC did not
34 end up voting to support OSM's proposal. I'm happy to
35 take questions, I guess I'll try to give a little bit
36 of context from being in the meeting.

37

38 There were concerns voiced by some RAC
39 members that in the past, so I think this must have
40 come up before 10 or 20 years ago, so in the past the
41 RAC had not supported selling bear hides because the
42 subsistence users didn't support doing that. When we
43 voted on this in February, nobody came forward with
44 those concerns and the people sitting around the table
45 who actually use subsistence bear -- so they either do
46 subsistence bear hunts, or they use the bear, the hides
47 or the fur to make handicrafts, they all supported the
48 ability to sell the bear hide. So at the meeting we
49 had we did not hear concerns from subsistence users

50

0153

1 about not wanting to be able to sell the hides but it
2 was referenced that in the past that had been a
3 concern. So I think it seemed like that was a big, I
4 guess I would say, source of discrepancy, and then, you
5 know, our region as I said is very, very spread out and
6 I think people out on the Chain, we had people in the
7 meeting say we don't know anything about Kodiak bears,
8 we don't want to vote on this, so I mean there was
9 acknowledgement that people that don't live in Kodiak
10 didn't have the same familiarity because they're -- you
11 know, I think we all try to become familiar with our
12 area but when you have a very geographically spread out
13 area it's challenging.

14
15 So I'm happy to answer questions, but I
16 guess the bottom line is we did support this in the
17 past and then the last vote we didn't support it so
18 that's what I've got, thanks.

19
20 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Is there any
21 questions from the Board for Rebecca.

22
23 MR. CHEN: Mr. Chair.

24
25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Glenn.

26
27 MR. CHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
28 Question for you, Ms. Skinner. So the OSM analysis
29 reflects that you opposed the proposal although you
30 provided details saying that it was a tie vote that
31 caused it to fail, correct, and then you also --
32 there's also -- the analysis also mentions that your
33 Council had reservations about this not being a
34 traditional practice as being the reason for opposing,
35 so is your information -- I'm trying to reconcile the
36 information you just provided with what's in the book.

37
38 MS. SKINNER: Yeah, so before the
39 meeting started I did go back and look at the
40 transcripts and there was a motion to support the
41 proposal and it failed on a five/five vote so that's
42 where I'm getting my conclusion that it was a tie vote
43 and it didn't pass. There was no vote to oppose it,
44 there was a vote to support it that failed.

45
46 The question about, I guess, the
47 traditional values around being able to sell the bear
48 hide, that's what I was trying to speak to. So I think
49 that around the table there were non -- you know, non-
50

0154

1 users of subsistence bears that articulated that in the
2 past they had heard concerns from subsistence bear
3 users that those people, in the past, disagreed with
4 selling the hides but when we voted on this in
5 February, the people around the table who actually do
6 subsistence bear hunting and use subsistence bear
7 parts, that was not what they said, what they said was
8 they would very much appreciate the ability to fully
9 utilize all parts of the bear and that being able to
10 sell the hide would allow better utilization because --
11 partly because subsistence hunting and fishing is
12 expensive, especially bear hunting, and I think in the
13 report there was a reference to profiting off of
14 subsistence bear, you know, being able to sell the
15 parts. I don't -- my impression is people aren't
16 thinking about profiting, they're thinking about -- not
17 even breaking even, but just being able to help support
18 their ability to do the subsistence because of the cost
19 of fuel or if you have to get a plane out to a site
20 it's very expensive.

21
22 So I don't -- I hope that answered your
23 question.

24
25 MR. CHEN: A follow up, Mr. Chair, if I
26 may.

27
28 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

29
30 MR. CHEN: So you did mention that five
31 of your Council members voted in opposition of this,
32 did they articulate any reason why they were voting no?

33
34 MS. SKINNER: Yeah, the -- again, from
35 scanning through the minutes a few minutes ago, the
36 primary reasons -- where somebody articulated a reason
37 for voting no the primary reason was that in the past
38 they had heard from subsistence people that -- people
39 that they knew that either engaged in subsistence bear
40 hunting or were from the villages, disagreed with the
41 thought of selling the bear hide. So that was the
42 biggest reason given. I don't think that the issue of
43 conservation concerns or incentivizing more bear hunts
44 came up. Again, with Kodiak there's a cap, you can
45 only take 13 subsistence bears so I think everybody
46 recognized that that provides a very clear line that
47 would not be exceeded.

48
49 MR. CHEN: Thank you very much.
50

0155

1 MR. PENDERGAST: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
2 Just a procedural question. It sounds like it's
3 assumed and understood, but a tie vote in the RAC
4 process equates to opposition?

5
6 MS. LAVINE: Motion fails.

7
8 MR. PENDERGAST: Motion fails, okay,
9 thank you.

10
11 MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

12
13 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Charlie.

14
15 MR. BROWER: Same question. If it was
16 a tie, the action on that just died, there's no
17 opposition, nothing, it just faded away so there was
18 really no action taken is my understanding. If there's
19 a tie vote, the motion just died and faded away so
20 there was no action taken but for some reason they put
21 oppose here so.

22
23 MS. BOARIO: Uh-huh, that's what I was
24 going to ask, it says opposed.

25
26 MR. BROWER: Yeah, and it's conflicting
27 to when you have a tie vote. Robert's Rules of order,
28 it just dies and fades away unless someone else makes
29 another motion.

30
31 Thank you.

32
33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So that might
34 just be something that clarifies the record here?

35
36 MS. LEONETTI: Robbin, do you have an
37 answer?

38
39 MS. LAVINE: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair.
40 Members of the Council. Robbin LaVine. At the meeting
41 there was a motion to support as modified and that
42 motion failed and there was no further motion made.
43 There was not a motion made to oppose it but the motion
44 to support failed.

45
46 Thank you.

47
48 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So I guess
49 that's why it's important here that we have Regional
50

0156

1 Advisory Council Chairs that sit here and the ones that
2 take it to heart are here face to face or calling in
3 and they're articulating the point of view and interest
4 beyond that point in the meeting they did have with the
5 interested parties who showed up, was that they support
6 the proposal and would like us to make it concurrent to
7 the rest of the reg so that they could partake in a
8 statewide regulation we're trying to set here and not
9 put a carve out, I remember that's part of it. So I'm
10 just sticking to my own flavor so I really appreciate
11 Rebecca being able to put that on the record here and
12 articulate it here because things change from like
13 before to now and what not and so I guess we're
14 building that record right now and so I'm glad that
15 we're taking that opportunity to ask good questions and
16 tease it out and correct some procedural things as the
17 process unfolds.

18
19 So any other questions for Rebecca --
20 go ahead, Greg.

21
22 MR. RISDAHL: Mr. Chair. Rebecca, I
23 should know the answer to this question but I don't so
24 I'm going to ask. Is there a Federal brown bear season
25 in Unit 9 on the Peninsula? Like I know in Cold Bay
26 that you can get State permits, registration permits
27 over the counter and they have a year-round village
28 season, so are those bears, would they become available
29 -- I mean there'd have to be a Federal season,
30 basically?

31
32 Mr. Chair

33
34 MS. SKINNER: Yeah, this is Rebecca
35 Skinner. I'm going to have to phone a friend on that
36 one.

37
38 MS. GREDIAGIN: Lisa Grediagin for the
39 record. So the Federal regulations for Unit 9 brown
40 bear are in Units 9A and 9D, there is no Federal open
41 season. But in the remainder of Unit 9, so Unit 9B,
42 9C, 9E there is a Federal brown bear season. Do you
43 want more details?

44
45 MR. RISDAHL: Do you have the map
46 handy? Thank you.

47
48 MS. GREDIAGIN: The map of Unit 9?

49
50

0157

1 MR. RISDAHL: Yes.

2

3 MR. WOODS: Mr. Chair.

4

5 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead,
6 Frank, you have the floor for a second.

7

8 MR. WOODS: I'd like to commend Rebecca
9 and the Kodiak RAC that they include the cultural
10 aspect of this, you know, because it's important when
11 the villages -- you know in our area every village has
12 a bear problem and my grandmother said that my aunt --
13 we used to -- we're part of the Bear Clan, and I'm
14 saying that because we would be in support of utilizing
15 what you just stated and the RAC addressed, is
16 utilization of the whole animal. In that process, you
17 know, it gets confusing because we have a mix of
18 cultures, we have a different value system, but
19 subsistence is based on a cash economy now, we have to
20 pay for gas, we have to have an outboard, we have to
21 have a snowmobile, we have to process, we have to get
22 access to it and we have to actually buy a license to
23 subsist, and that's -- we went over this over and over
24 and we have a two bear limit in Bristol Bay and I think
25 all of Bristol Bay now, except for 9, that's
26 commercial.

27

28 MR. DUNAWAY: Unit 17.

29

30 MR. WOODS: 17 is two bear limit. And
31 then we have Federal subsistence bears that get taken
32 at the Togiak Refuge. So great discussion, I think
33 it's well vetted, so thank you.

34

35 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any more
36 further discussion, questions on this one.

37

38 (No comments)

39

40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll move on
41 to Western Interior, thank you Rebecca.

42

43 MS. CLEVELAND: Hi, Jackie Cleveland,
44 YKRAC. If I'm loud enough I'll start by during our
45 winter 2025 meeting in Bethel, our RAC supported WP24-
46 01 as modified by OSM. And we thought it would better
47 align Federal and State regulations across the Delta
48 and making it simpler and easier for users who hunt
49 both on Federal and State managed lands. And it would
50

0158

1 create more opportunity for Federally-qualified
2 subsistence users.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 There was discussion about whether it
11 was culturally appropriate to sell them or not but in
12 the end we did decide that individual hunters could
13 make that determination.
14
15 We did, however, though, in 2023, fall
16 of 2023, oppose it when we first voted on it. I guess
17 we found it difficult to -- like it's already difficult
18 to obtain an accurate population of the brown bear in
19 our area and also we thought it wasn't in our place to
20 vote for other regions because we know of our region
21 and what the brown bear meant to us, and even within
22 our region it means something different in different
23 places.

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

So, yeah, so those were our reasons we
opposed it at first and then when we met again we
decided to support it after more discussion.

Doi.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Jacqueline. Any questions for YK from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Appreciate it.
Next we have Western Interior.

MS. MCDAVID: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
This is Brooke McDavid, again, for the record. The
Western Interior supported -- or Western Interior
Council supported the proposal as modified by OSM.
They noted that brown bear hides must be sealed before
they can be sold so harvest is tracked. The harvest of
brown bears is not constraining brown bear populations.
If harvest rises above harvestable surplus, regulation
changes can reduce the legal harvest of brown bears in
a hunt area. Only Federally-qualified subsistence
users will be eligible, a smaller number of hunters
then is eligible to harvest brown bears in general.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any questions
from the Board.

0159

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Frank.

4

5 MR. WOODS: So how did you come up with
6 the harvestable numbers and then -- I'm teasing.

7

8 (Laughter)

9

10 MR. WOODS: Because we have a hard time
11 -- we have more brown bears in the Bristol Bay region
12 than we have people. We have a hard time feeding our
13 residents off of that land that we manage let alone
14 bears. But I really commend the State of doing
15 accurate surveys and then they coordinate with Togiak
16 Refuge and it's really a good coordination between the
17 biology and the management to address the survey
18 concerns. And the information that was presented --
19 I'm going to concur with Dan, that in both arenas, I
20 think we asked, Togiak Refuge and ADF&G, to bring all
21 those surveys and that information because that
22 information becomes real important to make these kind
23 of decisions.

24

25 So thank you for your addressing the
26 harvest levels and population.

27

28 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
29 further questions.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Seward
34 Peninsula.

35

36 MS. MCDAVID: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
37 Seward Peninsula Council also supported WP24-01 as
38 modified by OSM. The Council stated that the sale of
39 brown bear hides harvested for personal use is
40 beneficial for subsistence users. The Council also
41 noted that the proposal with the revised OSM
42 modification, if adopted, is likely to create confusion
43 for the residents of Unit 22C. The unit is
44 predominately State managed lands with a one bear
45 harvest limit.

46

47 Mr. Chair

48

49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any

50

0160

1 questions.

2

3

(No comments)

4

5

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Northwest

6

Arctic.

7

8

MS. MCDAVID: Northwest Arctic

9 supported WP24-01 as modified by OSM. The Council
10 expressed support for allowing hunters to utilize and
11 sell more parts of the brown bear. The proposal gives
12 hunters the option to sell the bear hide with or
13 without claws helping them sustain their subsistence
14 lifestyle by providing additional income for essentials
15 like fuel, food and hunting activities.

16

17

Thank you.

18

19

20

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
questions from the Board.

21

22

(No comments)

23

24

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Next, Eastern

25

Interior.

26

27

MS. MCDAVID: The Eastern Interior

28 Council supported the proposal as modified by OSM. The
29 Council noted that allowing the sale of brown bear
30 hides would not result in conservation concern because
31 it would only apply to Federally-qualified subsistence
32 user and the salvage of meat would remain a
33 requirement. Brown bear are not widely targeted for
34 subsistence food in the region but due to increasing
35 food security issues from declines in other more widely
36 more targeted species, like caribou and salmon, their
37 importance for subsistence will likely continue to
38 increase. Allowing the sale of brown bear hides would
39 help Federally-qualified subsistence users obtain some
40 additional value added benefits from their subsistence
41 harvest. However, the Council noted the importance of
42 tracking brown bear harvest and hide sales particularly
43 in more easily accessible units to ensure no negative
44 impacts. They also noted the need to prioritize bear
45 population surveys since there are significant data
46 gaps in many areas.

47

48

49

Lastly, the Eastern Interior Council
thought that this proposal would best be dealt on a

50

0161

1 region by region basis, rather than statewide.

2

3 Thank you.

4

5 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
6 Brooke. Any questions for Eastern Interior.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing and
11 seeing none we'll move on to North Slope.

12

13 MS. MCDAVID: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
14 And this is the last Council recommendation for this
15 proposal.

16

17 North Slope supported WP24-01 as
18 modified by OSM. The Council said that brown bears are
19 abundant in the region. They support the proposal as
20 modified but also noted that the permitting and sealing
21 requirements to sell brown bears are burdensome to
22 subsistence users.

23

24 Thank you.

25

26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
27 Brooke. Any questions.

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Appreciate the
32 presentations from the Regional Advisory Councils, we
33 value their input in our decisionmaking process. Next
34 is Mr. Mulligan from the Department of Fish and Game.

35

36 You're coming in looking good partner -
37 multiple comments)

38

39 MR. MULLIGAN: Flattery will get you
40 nowhere Mr. Chair. Flattery will get you nowhere.

41

42 (Laughter)

43

44 MR. MULLIGAN: But maybe snacks will.

45

46 (Laughter)

47

48 MR. DUNAWAY: Bear jerky.

49

50

0162

1 MR. MULLIGAN: Rendered bear fat is
2 really good too.

3
4 (Laughter)

5
6 MR. MULLIGAN: With the levity aside,
7 for the record my name is Ben Mulligan, Deputy
8 Commissioner for the Alaska Department of Fish and
9 Game. As I think most Board members are aware and even
10 the new ones, just through the packet, we originally
11 opposed WP24-01 preferring that if the Federal
12 Subsistence Board was going to pass anything that it
13 align with State regulations. Later on, per the
14 direction of the Board, when OSM reached out to us,
15 after talking with DWC leadership we knew that we were
16 going to be unable to take on any additional burden
17 that, you know, as of that moment having to seal and
18 differentiate between Federally-qualified and non-
19 Federally-qualified users would do and I think that's
20 why you have gone down the Federal permit route.

21
22 So I guess at the end of the day we'd
23 prefer for you to align but since you've taken us
24 basically out of this then we can step aside.

25
26 Thank you.

27
28 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Ben.
29 Anybody. Rhonda.

30
31 MS. PITKA: So does that mean you're
32 neutral?

33
34 MR. MULLIGAN: As amended, yes. If we
35 truly have no part to play in this I will say neutral.

36
37 MS. PITKA: Okay, so as modified by OSM
38 you're neutral?

39
40 MR. MULLIGAN: Yes.

41
42 MS. PITKA: Thank you for the
43 clarification, I just wanted to make sure it was clear
44 on the record.

45
46 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I try.

47
48 (Laughter)

49
50

0163

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other
2 questions from the Council, yes, Kevin.

3

4 MR. PENDERGAST: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
5 Ben, I'm just -- I want to make sure I understand being
6 relatively new to this issue, what does it mean to say
7 that Fish and Game is out of it?

8

9 MR. MULLIGAN: So by the OSM, and
10 someone from OSM or ISC can correct me, with the
11 development of a Federal permit that means that the
12 State is no longer in a position of having to carry out
13 regulations, Federal regulations. That was going to be
14 our big hangup because we do not want to put our
15 sealing officers in a position of having to
16 differentiate between Federally -- folks hunting under
17 the Federal system and folks hunting under the State
18 system. So when I say we're out of it, it means that
19 we're no longer impacted. So I mean I'll say for the
20 record it is neutral, but as always we'd much prefer
21 the Board to align regulations -- I mean that's your
22 prerogative but you've taken us out of the equation,
23 you have removed what we have said was our main concern
24 so I mean it's completely up to you now.

25

26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I guess one
27 question before I turn it to Frank is, do we have
28 sealers?

29

30 MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

31

32 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Uh, let me just
33 ask.....

34

35 MR. BROWER: Just a concern.

36

37 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh.

38

39 MR. BROWER: You're still following
40 your guidelines with claws attached and the Federal --
41 with or without the claws; is that right?

42

43 MR. MULLIGAN: Are you asking the
44 Federal system or the State system?

45

46 MR. BROWER: No, the State.

47

48 MR. MULLIGAN: I can't answer that for
49 you Mr. Brower. Then -- so if this -- and that's the
50

0164

1 thing is that you've -- for the record, then someone
2 needs to get up here and say it, because right now we
3 will not be carrying that out because we're not going
4 to have our sealers differentiate between the two. So
5 if, for the record, someone can state that those folks,
6 under the Federal Subsistence Program will need to come
7 in to State sealers we will not be carrying out those
8 seals.

9

10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, and that's
11 what I was asking, do we have sealers that -- so how's
12 that -- how are we going to implement a regulation that
13 we're going to impose something that they don't have a
14 place to go, outlet it to, so that was my concern,
15 that's what I was trying to get on the record here,
16 was.....

17

18 MR. MULLIGAN: And, Mr. Chair.....

19

20 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

21

22 MR. MULLIGAN:OSM was well aware
23 of that ahead of time before we hit this meeting.

24

25 MR. RISDAHL: Mr. Chair. I do know
26 that some of us have sealed brown bears, but we're
27 using the State's, right, as the Refuge Manager at
28 Izembek, I sealed a lot of bears but they were
29 harvested under the State system. I'm not sure how
30 that relates -- you know, how -- that apparently others
31 can seal permit -- seal bears, but, thank you.

32

33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I'll go to you,
34 then I have a question.

35

36 MS. GREDIAGIN: Lisa Grediagin for the
37 record. So bears harvested by the State subsistence
38 registration permit are not required to be sealed
39 unless they're removed from the unit and so if they are
40 removed from the unit, or in this case, are intended to
41 be sold they need to be sealed. However, a condition
42 of the State subsistence permit is that at the time of
43 sealing, the sealing officer retains the claws and the
44 skin of the head. And so currently State and Federal
45 regulations are aligned in this, however, the current
46 OSM modification eliminates that requirement for the
47 skin of the head and the claws to be retained at the
48 time of sealing. And, again, this only applies to
49 bears harvested by the State subsistence registration
50

0165

1 permit and for the most part this is kind of a non-
2 issue because that permit is so rarely used. You know
3 in Unit 22 that permit has been used twice, or two
4 bears have been harvested under that permit in the last
5 20 years. However, if it becomes an issue then we can
6 have a proposal submitted to eliminate that State
7 permit requirement and either require no permit or
8 require a Federal permit. And so that's where I
9 understand the State concern, that the sealing officer
10 isn't going to differentiate between a bear harvested
11 under Federal regulations by a State permit versus a
12 bear harvested under State regulations by a State
13 permit. However, you know, we can always change
14 Federal regulations to not require the State permit.

15

16 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Basically what
17 I'm teasing out, though, is what we're trying to do is
18 to be able to sell it says they have to have it sealed
19 so the whole pretext of this is to allow the sale of
20 bear and if they can't go get it sealed then they can't
21 sell the bear anywhere. So that's kind of the -- so
22 unless we're ready to say as a Board, we're going to
23 issue permits, and what Greg said, within the timeframe
24 it takes to get this in we'll probably get some sealers
25 ready in the areas most affected maybe? I don't know,
26 I'm just thinking process-wise, right? I'm looking at
27 my partners here, the land managers saying, okay, if
28 this happens and it may be only two or one, you know,
29 but if we put it in the regulation who's catching that
30 burden. So I'm just putting it on the record.

31

32 Thank you.

33

34 (Pause)

35

36 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: At this time,
37 if nobody doesn't mind, what I'm going to do is take a
38 five to 10 for conference, take a break, let's have a
39 little shake it off, thank you.

40

41 (Off record)

42

43 (On record)

44

45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Welcome back,
46 this is us, hello, hello.

47

48 (Pause)

49

50

0166

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We just took a
2 little five minute break so we can kind of confer about
3 the direction the Board wants to go so what I think we
4 need to do is have a little bit of discussion on the
5 record so that we can figure out what direction the
6 Board is going to go at this time.

7

8 MS. LEONETTI: We also still have.....

9

10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, we still
11 have a few things on here but I'm just saying we've
12 heard the State and any other questions at this time.

13

14 (No comments)

15

16 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll move on
17 to the next part so we can open up the floor for the
18 record discussion. Any questions here right now so I
19 can move on to the others.

20

21 MS. LEONETTI: Yes, Sara does.

22

23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Sara.

24

25 MS. BOARIO: Mr. Mulligan, would you
26 mind explaining on the record just like the practical
27 implications on the ground for the sealer. You alluded
28 to it earlier, I think it's really helpful to
29 understand. Sorry, if I'm not speaking close enough.

30

31 MR. MULLIGAN: Through the Chair.
32 Member Boario. So in the instance where you have an
33 individual hunting under Federal regulations but you
34 guys are utilizing our State subsistence permit with
35 the different requirement for head and claws it would
36 then force our sealers then to have to try to
37 differentiate between the two and, again, on the record
38 and before this and now, we're not going to require our
39 sealers to do so. That is a very hard thing to do and
40 during my tenure I don't see it being done amongst the
41 Federal agencies right now, so if no one else is doing
42 it, I can't expect our folks to do it as well.

43

44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for
45 that Ben. Any other questions from the Board.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, we'll

50

0167

1 move on to InterAgency Staff Committee recommendation.

2

3 MS. LAVINE: Thank you. Mr. Board
4 [sic]. For the record, Robbin LaVine. The InterAgency
5 Staff Committee reviewed the analysis and provided the
6 following comments as is our practice when there are
7 Council recommendations.

8

9 The revised OSM modification adds new
10 information in response to the Board's requests
11 following deferral at its February 2025 meeting. It
12 limits sales to purchases for personal use only within
13 the United States, thereby complying with the
14 provisions of Convention on International Trade and
15 Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora or CITES.
16 Further, the OSM modification allows a hide to be sold
17 with or without claws attached. This will allow a
18 subsistence user to remove a claw or claws for a
19 handicraft and then sell the hide separately. Current
20 Federal subsistence edible meat salvage requirements
21 will help protect brown bears from over harvest while
22 allowing for the sale of the hide with an OSM customary
23 trade permit.

24

25 The OSM modification also removes from
26 Federal regulations the requirements in some areas of
27 Alaska, that at the time of sealing, the Alaska
28 Department of Fish and Game authorized sealing official
29 must remove and retain skin of the head and front claws
30 of the bear hide. Removing this clause from Federal
31 regulation will align with current ADF&G general hunt
32 regulation requirements for sealing of brown bear
33 hides, however, it will then be out of alignment for
34 Federally-qualified subsistence hunters who are
35 utilizing a State subsistence registration permit for
36 harvest of brown bear in Units 9B, 9E, 17, 18, 19A and
37 19B, 21D, 22, 23, 24, and 26A identified in Federal
38 Subsistence Management regulations.

39

40 All 10 Regional Advisory Councils
41 reviewed the revised proposal during their winter 2005
42 [sic] meetings with nine supporting the proposal as
43 modified by OSM. The Kodiak/Aleutians Council opposed
44 for reasons stated in the analysis, and as you just
45 heard represented by the Chair. On statewide proposals
46 such as this, the Board can choose to adopt regulations
47 by region and recognition of each region's unique
48 cultural traditions, local community feedback and
49 recommendation by the Councils.

50

0168

1 If adopted by the Board, the regulation
2 will not be effective until the Office of Management
3 and Budget approves the development of a new Federal
4 permit allowing for the sale of brown bear hides under
5 Federal regulations.

6
7 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

8
9 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
10 Robbin. Any questions from the Board for the ISC on
11 the recommendation.

12
13 (No comments)

14
15 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing and
16 seeing none, thank you, Robbin, for that.

17
18 Board deliberation and discussion right
19 now, I mean it's usually on here where we just kind of
20 kick it around a little bit before we open up the floor
21 for a motion. I think there's a little bit of
22 discussion here unless somebody magically has a thought
23 here.

24
25 Frank.

26
27 MR. WOODS: For the record, Frank
28 Woods, Public Member. I really enjoyed the State
29 coming in and explaining the sealing requirements
30 because that was the biggest, hottest issue for, at
31 least, for a resident. You know this will clarify a
32 whole bunch of issues, not just the sale of brown bears
33 but then jurisdiction, right. Because I live in Togiak
34 Refuge and there's Becharof and Lake Clark Park and
35 Preserve in our area, and we work at aligning
36 everything to make it easier for the subsistence user.
37 There was a time when I went before the RAC and I
38 brought eight permits, I remember coming here and
39 explaining to this process how complicated it was to
40 hunt and subsist on Federal and State land and dual
41 management because I had eight permits for the same
42 location. This will help, at least, the Federal side,
43 you know, and thank you for clarifying the State is
44 going to step down and I agree it's not your job to do
45 our job, so what we are doing is setting precedent so
46 we can allow subsistence users, not only to gain income
47 but also utilization of a hide that normally just sits
48 somewhere and I don't know what it looks like. I've
49 shot one bear in my time and after skinning that one
50

0169

1 bear I don't want to skin another bear and that's
2 reality. Yep.

3
4 (Laughter)

5
6 MR. WOODS: Yep. Yep. So we're good,
7 I really -- yeah, this is a process that's been years
8 in the making. I remember going through this in
9 probably '08, Dan, or earlier, yeah, so we're -- you
10 know, we're years into it and a lot of people involved,
11 a lot of information so thank you. And thanks, Ben.

12
13 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Glen.

14
15 MR. CHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
16 Question for you, Mr. Mulligan. So we were wondering
17 about what steps the State might do to prosecute
18 someone, a Federal hunter who sells a hide without kind
19 of meeting some of these requirements, would you have a
20 sense of that?

21
22 MR. MULLIGAN: Through the Chair.
23 Member Chen. No, I do not. You know the modification
24 was presented to us on July 8th, I got time enough to
25 talk to DWC, as you're probably aware we do not conduct
26 enforcement and prosecution activities. Alaska
27 Wildlife Troopers and the Department of Law carries
28 that out and it would take me more time to see -- to
29 give them a scenario in what they may or may not under
30 the provisions that you are looking at right now.

31
32 MR. CHEN: Thank you, Mr. Mulligan.

33
34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, I guess
35 -- Board Chair here -- was there somebody else here to
36 recognize -- no, I'll recognize you Kevin.

37
38 MR. PENDERGAST: Thank you. So I just
39 want to make sure I understand the Statewide system.
40 For non-Federally-qualified users, they can harvest a
41 brown bear in most units and bring it in, head and
42 claws still attached, but the State collects head skin
43 and claws and retains those; is that correct?

44
45 MR. MULLIGAN: No, it's a require --
46 sorry, through the Chair. Member Pendergast. To
47 clarify, because earlier in the conversation -- we just
48 require that because we may need to take samples from
49 that, it's not a total confiscation or retention of
50

0170

1 those materials, we just require -- same as is if you
2 look at our book on Page 16, in some places we require
3 proof of sex as well for said animal, so it's just we
4 need that, some for data collection, some for just
5 proof to prove the legality of the animal that was
6 harvested.

7

8 MR. PENDERGAST: Follow up question.
9 Thank you, that's helpful. So let me just kind of flip
10 it around in my own mind to make sure I understand.

11

12 So the State's not particularly
13 concerned whether the harvested hide is coming from
14 State or Federal lands, the only thing preventing
15 someone -- the only thing preventing a Federally-
16 qualified user from selling the hide is strictly our
17 regulations, it's not -- there's currently no
18 misalignment with the State as far as how the hide is
19 presented?

20

21 (Laughter)

22

23 MR. MULLIGAN: Give me a minute, that
24 was pretty funny.

25

26 (Laughter)

27

28 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We're not
29 aligned.

30

31 MR. MULLIGAN: Through the Chair.
32 Member Pendergast. No, there's not a conservation
33 concern. As I think has been mentioned and is what
34 we've realized, we don't think there'd be a huge up
35 tick in harvest because of this. We don't see it right
36 now, it just gives folks that opportunity and so, yes,
37 the difference in what I guess you consider the rub is
38 that differentiation where, again, we'd be looking at
39 conflicting regs of what an individual would need to
40 bring with them in order to seal that hide, that's
41 where it really comes down to. If everything else was
42 the same and you couldn't tell the difference between
43 said Federally-qualified user and non-Federally-
44 qualified user, I mean we wouldn't have an issue.

45

46 Now, with that said I'm going to go
47 back to our original position. I feel it would be a
48 lot easier, and it won't cover areas like for Kodiak
49 Island, I don't think they'll ever go to a two bear

50

0171

1 limit on Kodiak just given just everything that goes on
2 for bear management and everything, but in a lot of
3 places including, I think, the one from the original
4 sponsor, you know, go to the Board of Game, get a two
5 bear limit, that Board has been very friendly towards
6 the harvest of bears and that would have solved the
7 issue already.

8

9 MR. PENDERGAST: Thank you.

10

11 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So what I was
12 suggesting, Christianson here, was, I didn't know if
13 there was an agency here that, you know, seeing if we
14 were going to enact something that would put the
15 subsistence user out there, we don't want them to run
16 into what we're talking about here which is there isn't
17 a clear end to what it is we're proposing here and
18 without a clear end I'm not clearly -- I'm clearly
19 thinking there's either room for more discussion on
20 this until we clarify how this looks, unless there was
21 an agency that jumped up right now and said, we'll seal
22 those bears or something around the table, I'm just
23 saying, you know, but, anyway, all I'm saying is is
24 without that I don't know how, you know, we would
25 proceed if we're going to potentially even put one of
26 our residents at risk of not meeting a requirement that
27 may or may not put them at jeopardy with legal people,
28 right, like that's not something I think this Board is
29 looking at doing. Right now I'm not hearing, here's
30 the plan if we got it out -- take the State, make it
31 all Federal, make our whole permit, remove that it's
32 still just going to create more of a complication that
33 you hear the Board here not wanting to do, you know,
34 out there on the landscape making it more complicated
35 for the user, right. I mean I think our intent here is
36 to not make it more complicated but also to provide
37 that opportunity so they can do it and sell some of
38 those parts that they feel usual and accustom to.

39

40 So speaking to the proposal for all the
41 RACs here, that's their wish, is to make sure we can do
42 this, which we've always done, and I know that's what
43 they're listening to at the regional levels, this is
44 our inherent right so let's bring it to there but I
45 don't think right now I hear a clear articulated path
46 forward to really move. That's my point of view right
47 now unless somebody steps forward and clearly can do
48 that, I would almost entertain.

49

50

0172

1 Nobody wants to say it, I entertain a
2 deferral.

3
4 MS. LAVINE: Hello, Mr. Chair. Members
5 of the Board. This is Robbin. I just really quickly
6 wanted to note that this is the opportunity for Board
7 discussion with liaisons and so that means not just
8 with the State liaison, Ben Mulligan, but also Council
9 Chairs, if anyone has information or thoughts or
10 suggestions to offer, the liaisons to the Board can all
11 participate in the discussion.

12
13 Thanks.

14
15 MR. RISDAHL: Okay, Mr. Chair, I have a
16 thought but I've kind of thrown it out there already
17 and it doesn't sound like it's going anywhere, but --
18 because OSM did not consider it in their analysis, and
19 that is it has to do with the sealing requirement to
20 sell brown bears, that's a CITES requirement, right, in
21 order to sell hides outside of the State, outside of
22 the country. So what if we don't require brown bear
23 hides to be sealed by the State? You get a permit
24 through the Federal government and if we need to --
25 there's a need to track, right, we need to know what's
26 going on, the State's going to want to know what's
27 going on but if they don't have to do the sealing and
28 we have a permit, a Federal permit, we don't
29 necessarily need to seal them, I think there are other
30 ways we can track the harvest like we do for other
31 species. So it's just a thought but it sounds like
32 people are saying that's pushing it too far at this
33 point. Because really I think -- I mean I know you
34 don't even have to seal brown bear hides in a lot of
35 the units under State regulations, right, it's not an
36 absolute requirement. That locking tag is a CITES
37 requirement for selling them, you know, across borders,
38 International borders.

39
40 Anyway, it's just a thought. But,
41 again, it will require more research and more -- first
42 of all we need to find out if we can even get a Federal
43 permit. I'm pretty sure that's a possibility because
44 there are Federal permits for other species, walrus,
45 for instance. But, anyway, thank you, Mr. Chair.

46
47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Well, that's
48 why I was hoping there'd be an agency here, you know,
49 because we do walrus, we do sea otter, we do polar
50

0173

1 bears, you know, they hunt whales, there's harvest out
2 there, you have to seal your wolf, I mean it's a State
3 deal but I mean it happens, it can't be something --
4 well, I mean, not the Commissioner, I was looking at
5 Charlie over there, not you.

6
7 (Laughter)

8
9 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So just saying,
10 you know, I think the power in the room to do it but,
11 again, unless lips open.

12
13 MR. WOODS: I like the idea -- Frank
14 for the record, Public Member, remove the sealing
15 requirement wouldn't be a problem. You don't have to
16 seal it unless you move it, right, and maybe there
17 ought to be a -- we got two years, it's going to go
18 into regulation, we got two years to figure out how to
19 move it. Either the Park Service takes over or your
20 office or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or OSM. There
21 are tags we can -- I mean tags you can get and I'm
22 speaking frankly.

23
24 MR. DUNAWAY: You always do.

25
26 (Laughter)

27
28 MR. WOODS: I agree.

29
30 (Laughter)

31
32 MR. WOODS: It's going to be two years
33 to figure out how to do this correctly with a tag if
34 you move -- right now I could shoot a bear, don't have
35 to tag it unless I actually have to transport, right,
36 so -- and that takes either -- right now I'm going to
37 pick on the State -- I know -- you have to go through
38 the seal it, but if we come up with our own within the
39 next two years on how to seal it, to move it, either
40 sale or tan, right, because I mean you could sell a raw
41 hide or you could sell a tanned hide, so I would -- I
42 would not agree that we not take action today, I think
43 we take action today and work out the details because
44 there's no requirement to seal, right, if we remove the
45 sealing requirement, we would add in there a provision
46 in order to sell you'd -- and I'm thinking there's like
47 four different offices, either -- like we assign each
48 village -- for sea otter, we have taggers, for walrus
49 we have taggers, for different agencies we have
50

0174

1 taggers, we actually give permits out of the offices
2 and I think those details can be worked. I mean we're
3 talking a minimal amount of people, at least in our
4 area.

5

6 So.

7

8 MR. BROWER: Ben, just a question.

9 Anyone can apply to ADF&G for training for tagging; is
10 that right?

11

12 MR. MULLIGAN: Through the Chair.

13 Member Brower. I'm going to apologize. We've gone far
14 down a road that the knowledge that I have stuffed into
15 my brain for this one has run out. Anything that --
16 the details that we're getting in now I'm reaching a
17 level that I'm uncomfortable trying to answer on the
18 fly, so I will apologize to you for that. But at this
19 point in time until like I see something concrete I can
20 run by my folks I can't make calls at the table.

21

22 MR. RISDAHL: Mr. Chair. So kind of
23 going off of what Charlie and I have been talking about
24 and what Frank was saying. So I've sealed walrus
25 skulls too, tusks, right, people don't have to have a
26 permit to get them, they just go get them, it's a
27 regulation that says you can harvest them, you can pick
28 them up on the beach. In fact, even if you're not a
29 Federally-qualified subsistence user under the -- well,
30 under the Federal Marine Mammal Protection Act you can
31 pick them up, they just bring them in to the office and
32 we tag them. There isn't a requirement for a permit,
33 it's in law that you can harvest them. So we would get
34 that harvest data, we have a regulation that says you
35 can hunt them, and people when they shoot them, they
36 bring them in and we tag them and that's what you got
37 to get from OB, whatever it is, OMB. That's what you
38 need to get is that permit, which is basically the
39 tagging part of it, and if you shoot one and you go in
40 there and get it tagged and you're done.

41

42 MR. ALBERG: Yeah, Mr. Chair. So I
43 don't disagree, these are details that can be worked
44 out. I guess my question for the body here is what is
45 the benefit of voting on this today versus working out
46 those details first because there are some logistics,
47 there's probably some legal questions in there as to
48 how this all would be rolled out. I tend to think
49 deferring this is a better approach for now but -- and
50

0175

1 working through those details so it can be rolled out
2 clean and ready to go but I don't -- I would appreciate
3 anybody's comment on what is the driver for having to
4 bring this across the line today?

5

6 MS. GREDIAGIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
7 Lisa Grediagin for the record. I just want to
8 emphasize the issue with the current OSM modification
9 is the use of the State subsistence permit, that
10 requirement in Federal regulations. And so even if we
11 eliminated some sealing requirement anyone that
12 harvests bears under Federal regulations by that State
13 subsistence permit has to follow the conditions of that
14 permit. And so to me what I would really appreciate
15 since, you know, well, if you guys defer it I'll
16 probably be the one dealing with analyzing it and
17 coming back to the Board in a year again with this, is,
18 better direction on where to go with this. Because to
19 me the simplest thing would be to submit another
20 proposal to just eliminate the State subsistence permit
21 in Federal hunts like across the board. Because that's
22 the sticking point right now is that the State
23 subsistence permit requires retention of the claws and
24 skin of the head at the time of sealing. And, you
25 know, even if we don't require sealing to sell the hide
26 the users still have to comply with the conditions of
27 that permit as required under Federal regulations. And
28 so we could either go the route of just eliminating
29 that State subsistence permit under all Federal
30 regulations so that then they either revert to a
31 Federal permit, or just kind of the State general hunt,
32 which just a side note, all State general hunts require
33 sealing. It's only the State subsistence hunts that do
34 not require sealing unless the bear's going to leave
35 from the unit.

36

37 So that would be the -- you know, it
38 sounds like the Board's going to defer this just
39 because there is this unresolved issue with the
40 requirements of the State subsistence permit, you know,
41 retaining the claws and the skin of the head when it's
42 sealed, so any direction from the Board would be
43 greatly appreciated.

44

45 Thank you.

46

47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So Lisa, that's
48 almost like two parts, too, right. It's like there's
49 this part which is, you know, just two in 20 years that
50

0176

1 we're talking about, and then the 99.9 percent of the
2 users are going to be required anyway even under this
3 regulation. So I see what you're saying, as Staff too,
4 there's a lot of time in analyzing. So I mean
5 potentially if we did move forward we're talking about
6 maybe a procedural part as we develop our permit for
7 that if we do move forward, right? So like if we move
8 forward, I get what you're saying, right, like, but to
9 deal with the little nuance over here in the corner
10 that's chirping at us, like two people in 20 years, so
11 like, you know, to try to figure out like Frank's
12 saying, you know, consider moving, like Rhonda's
13 feeling, pushing, you know, move, that either we can do
14 that like you're maybe hoping for, you know, with that,
15 you know, because like I said I would hate to put our
16 users at a disadvantage knowledge-wise, right.

17
18 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, and I'll just
19 also note, through the Chair, that even if the Board
20 hypothetically approves this with the OSM modification
21 today it's still not going to be implemented until we
22 get OMB approval. So there could be, not a sunset, I
23 guess I sunrise clause, that you're not going to
24 implement this until we're able to address that State
25 subsistence permit. Yeah, I guess I would defer, I
26 don't know, solicit other Board members on your
27 thoughts on kind of deferring it to kind of work out
28 the details of that State subsistence permit, or to
29 approve it with kind of that sunrise clause that you're
30 not going to implement it until we figure that out.

31
32 MR. PENDERGAST: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
33 Kevin Pendergast for the record. Well, I thought this
34 was kind of straight forward walking in here but it's
35 become a little more complex.

36
37 (Laughter)

38
39 MR. PENDERGAST: But I wonder if it
40 isn't actually a little more simple. So this started,
41 what, two years ago with a single person, really,
42 making a proposal in one unit and we've kind of, as we
43 often do as the Federal government, we sort of
44 expanded it into a much more complex process, but I'm
45 just wondering if that proposal wasn't rooted in, hey,
46 I can do this on State lands, I want to do the same
47 thing over here on Federal lands. How do we get to
48 that and why do we need the permits and the sealing and
49 all the additional bureaucracy and process that goes
50

0177

1 along with that when all they want to do is do the same
2 thing they're doing on State land on Federal land?

3

4 MR. ALBERG: Mr. Chair. And just to
5 add to your point, Kevin, that's the theme of one of
6 the Executive Orders by the President, is to simplify
7 and align.....

8

9 MR. PENDERGAST: Yeah.

10

11 MR. ALBERG:Federal and State of
12 Alaska guidelines.

13

14 MR. PENDERGAST: And that's part of
15 what's in my mind. What I feel like what we're doing
16 here is just like diverging and creating a bureaucracy
17 that -- and tell me if I'm wrong but it sounds like the
18 reason we're doing this is because of CITES and
19 International trade requirements, primarily, the whole
20 permitting and everything, and you could address that
21 by just saying you can't sell them Internationally
22 unless you meet some requirements or something. But I
23 just think.....

24

25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Lisa.

26

27 MS. GREDIAGIN: Lisa Grediagin for the
28 record. So this proposal was originally submitted by a
29 resident of McCarthy and so currently in Unit 11 under
30 State regs it's a one bear harvest limit so in Unit 11
31 they can't sell bears under State or Federal regs, you
32 know, State or Federal lands, and also if you harvest
33 from the National Park you can't harvest anything on
34 Park lands under State regulations so when this came
35 before the Board in April 2024 the OSM modification was
36 to align with the State regulations to just allow sales
37 of brown bears from units with a two brown bear harvest
38 limit and the Board, especially the Park Service was
39 really sensitive to that not meeting the intent of the
40 proponent who was coming from a one brown bear unit and
41 a National Park, and they also expressed some concerns
42 over the possibility that if we adopted it, to only be
43 able to sell bears from a two brown bear harvest limit,
44 that then we'd get proposals across the state to just
45 increase the harvest limit to two brown bears in every
46 single unit across the state, which they thought might
47 be a conservation concern. And for the record there
48 currently is a proposal to increase the Federal harvest
49 limit in Unit 11 to two brown bears. And the State

50

0178

1 continues to increase, you know, Unit 13, Unit 18, you
2 know, were just recently increased, Unit 12.

3

4 But to your point, I mean, that was the
5 mind set of the Board at the time and so they wanted us
6 to work to address the concerns of the proponent as
7 well as most -- a lot of the Councils supported it as
8 submitted, like they didn't want -- some Councils
9 supported as modified by OSM, partly because they're
10 like we have a two brown bear harvest limit in our
11 region already anyway so we'd be able to sell under
12 State and Federal regs and other Councils were
13 sensitive that this wouldn't benefit us at all because
14 we just have a one brown bear harvest limit.

15

16 And so then to be able to sell
17 Internationally you need to get that permit to sell
18 from the State and the State said we're not going to
19 give Federal bears a permit to sell from units with a
20 one brown bear harvest limit. They had agreed that if
21 it was a one brown bear harvest limit under State regs
22 and a two brown bear under Federal regs they would
23 still give a permit to sell.

24

25 So that's what led us down this path of
26 trying to follow the direction of the Board from April
27 2024 to meet, you know, the desires of the Councils and
28 the proponent to allow sales across the state
29 regardless of harvest limit under State regulations.

30

31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So that
32 explanation helped me fall back to maybe, I think,
33 Frank's suggestion of potentially moving forward today
34 with what we have with the administrative instruction
35 that as we proceed with the Federal process that
36 there's still a program that has to be developed for
37 that, right, with the understanding, OMB permitting has
38 to happen, that we still need to figure out how we
39 would permit or tag those bears, that there's these
40 little hanging things out there but, you know, like we
41 said we have a little time. But for the rest of the
42 proposal I think it does our justice to our RACs if we
43 do make that motion as well, you know, they all
44 concurrently agree minus, you know, the one bear that
45 doesn't meet, but 90 percent of our RACs have weighed
46 in, which is hard to not listen to at this point
47 because that's who we sit here as our constituents, are
48 the ones that we work for, and, albeit it's a small
49 percentage we might be able to work it around, but the
50

0179

1 proposal itself still clearly states everybody
2 participating and that still has to go through all of
3 the State processes. So we'd be talking about over
4 here and a potential opportunity and that timeframe to
5 educate our Boards on what that looks like, you know,
6 as far as we come into our fall cycle, hey, we got this
7 to this point but we have these things that we're
8 working out because of this potential conflict of the
9 sealing.

10

11 That's just where I'm feeling we've
12 kind of worked our way around to, if there's a
13 different opinion.

14

15 Go ahead, Glenn.

16

17 MR. CHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. That
18 is correct we have spent lots of time and energy
19 getting to this point. We still have concerns,
20 however, given that there's some very critical details
21 that need to be worked out that a subsistence user
22 might inadvertently try to harvest a bear, try to sell
23 it in advance of these details worked out and therefore
24 get cited. And the risk is maybe small but it is still
25 there. So we would feel more comfortable with having
26 all the details worked out first before approving the
27 proposal.

28

29 Thank you.

30

31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. I can
32 see like I'm on Humpty Dumpty here, I sit on a wall, so
33 you guys have to make us make a great fall.

34

35 (Laughter)

36

37 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Charlie.

38

39 MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair. So your
40 recommendation, or willing to defer until the next
41 cycle or what, or until the ISC come up with some
42 recommendation to the Staff for us to consider?

43

44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I think that's
45 what we have here before us, I think Glenn's saying
46 where his comfort level is, I hear other people kind of
47 leaning in a direction here, I also feel pressure to
48 move forward, so, Rhonda.

49

50

0180

1 MS. PITKA: I was going to pressure you
2 to move forward please.

3
4 (Laughter)

5
6 MS. PITKA: No, I mean it's been two
7 years. This came up two years ago, like literally what
8 more information does anybody need to be comfortable,
9 you have been thoroughly briefed by the ISC, there are
10 hundreds of pages of documents that you can read, we
11 have had briefings on this like four times. What more
12 comfort level do we need to not make a decision?

13
14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Well, another
15 suggestion is we could vote on it and then we know how
16 everybody feels and then we can move forward based on
17 the vote of this Board and that's always an option. We
18 can put it on the Board, we can put it up, down, left,
19 right and then we can make recommendations while the
20 motion's on the table and then after that we can direct
21 our Staff of which direction we go with that, so,
22 that's all a third option here.

23
24 Frank.

25
26 MR. WOODS: So, Mr. Chair, when I first
27 got on the RAC and the RAC came up with proposals and
28 with OSM's blessings, you pointed out something that 90
29 percent were in favor, that that direction needs to be
30 followed by this Board. At least that was the
31 recommendation when I was -- Molly gave me that
32 recommendation, I was like -- I don't know if I was
33 confused but I was happily elated that a recommendation
34 from the public were getting heard at this level, so 90
35 percent of the RACs voted for this with exception of
36 Kodiak and that exception fully vetted, I would move
37 forward just the fact that we -- we've done our duty.
38 I remember this whole issue coming before, not just the
39 RACs but the ADF&G, the whole process on moving
40 forward, that, I would love to see it move forward in
41 one degree or another as written or as modified, so,
42 thanks.

43
44 MR. RISDAHL: Mr. Chair. I guess I
45 would agree with that concept of moving forward but I
46 think that adding the ISC contingency that it has to --
47 before obviously the law would go into effect,
48 regulation would go into effect, the background work
49 would have to be done through OMB, otherwise, you know,
50

0181

1 we're putting up a law that really may or may not be
2 possible so it would be contingent on the response that
3 we get from OMB.

4

5 Thank you.

6

7 MR. PENDERGAST: But I believe that
8 would only be true if we decide that there's an
9 additional permit required. This whole specter of OMB
10 and Paperwork Reduction Act and that's strictly if
11 we're going to issue or come up with basically a new
12 permit, this customary trade permit. That doesn't
13 exist right now, right, but there's nothing that says
14 that that's required, that's just something we're
15 coming up with as a means of tracking or CITES
16 compliance.

17

18 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, we got to
19 be on the track, the harvest and the take and if we're
20 going to be allowing the sale of it we should be
21 recognizing that animal and have it on the record, hey,
22 they took an animal, they reported it to the officer
23 for permitting and that that animal now -- that that
24 person now has a sellable animal. So, you know, like
25 that would be on the Federal government. That's what
26 Ben's saying, it wouldn't be on the State anymore to
27 meet that requirement. What that does to the user is
28 the concern you hear coming from Glenn, you know, that
29 we can put a small fraction of our users at some
30 jeopardy there so I think that's what we're weighing
31 here again. But that's all contingent on OMB permit.

32

33 MR. PENDERGAST: So just kind of a
34 thought experiment here. So if we just move forward
35 and approve the proposal as originally submitted, with
36 no additional permit requirements, and it aligned with
37 the State's regime, am I correct that nobody would be
38 in jeopardy of violating State or Federal law at the
39 user level. The user who submitted it, under the
40 current regime, wouldn't enjoy the new flexibility
41 because in his unit there's only one bear and that
42 doesn't -- so that wouldn't work, so maybe he could
43 approach the Board of Game or something, so that might
44 be a regrettable outcome, but I just -- I guess I'm not
45 understanding where the actual need is for a customary
46 trade permit. It's a method of tracking, there must be
47 other methods with less bureaucracy associated with
48 them. So, you know, that's -- we could defer, we could
49 go on the record and kind of vote or make amendments

50

0182

1 and so forth, I kind of favor the latter, but to be
2 honest, yeah, right now I just feel like we've created
3 a lot of potential process and multiple years probably
4 in the current environment of trying to get a new
5 permit in place and things, and I just am not
6 understanding the value of that for the user when we
7 could simply align with the State system and let people
8 do it on Federal lands the same way they do it on State
9 lands.

10

11 MS. GREDIAGIN: Lisa Grediagin for the
12 record. And the customary trade permit replaces the
13 State's permit to sell and so the State -- to sell
14 under the State regulations you need a permit to sell
15 but since we're trying to find a way to allow the sale
16 of brown bears anywhere in the state regardless of
17 harvest limit, you know, we have to use that customary
18 trade permit since we can't use the State's permit to
19 sell. And just to note that, you know, the analyst who
20 worked on this proposal for like the past two years
21 recently retired but she worked very closely with Ken
22 Lord on this conclusion and recommendation so it was
23 pretty thoroughly vetted by the Solicitor and, you
24 know, it would make me pretty uncomfortable to just say
25 we don't need a permit because it's just extra
26 requirements and then there's no way to track it when
27 the State, you know, they track it through their permit
28 to sell and so it's just a replacement of that.

29

30 MR. PENDERGAST: And just a follow up,
31 and maybe that's a piece I'm not appreciating is what
32 the State permit to sell piece, we would need -- we
33 wouldn't be able to take advantage of that process or?

34

35 MR. MULLIGAN: So, again, you guys have
36 gone down the rabbit hole so far that I am
37 uncomfortable making a decision at the table at this
38 time.

39

40 MR. PENDERGAST: Hum.

41

42 MR. MULLIGAN: If you guys want to
43 bring something to me or you guys can go -- I mean it's
44 your regulatory body, you can make your decisions and
45 we will react accordingly but at this time I'm -- it's
46 too far down the rabbit hole.

47

48 MS. SKINNER: Thanks. Rebecca Skinner.
49 So I don't know all of the logistical details of what
50

0183

1 is required for the sealing and what not, what I am
2 getting out of this is if the Board decided to just
3 default to the State system, the users in Kodiak would
4 definitely not be able to sell a bear hide probably
5 ever because as Mr. Mulligan already said the Board of
6 Game is probably never going to allow a two bear
7 harvest limit in Kodiak under the State system. So for
8 us it makes a tremendous difference whether you're
9 defaulting to the State system or if on the Federal
10 side there's another option, which is what I understood
11 this to be.

12
13 I do tend to agree that tracking is
14 really important, tracking harvest, tracking if people
15 put in for a permit, so they're interested in
16 harvesting and then the actual harvest so you know how
17 much was taken, it becomes very relevant in the
18 resource world. I know some subsistence users, they
19 don't like to report, they're offended at having to
20 report data, I get that, but having the data and being
21 able to show that there is harvest and interest is
22 really important, so if we're not using the State
23 system where that permit and that tracking is
24 happening, I understand why there's a desire and I do
25 think a need to have that on the Federal side.

26
27 It also seems like there are a lot of
28 logistical questions. Like sealing, who can do
29 sealing, who's willing to do sealing, what does it take
30 to be a sealer, that nobody at the table can answer. I
31 tend toward approve this today and then you have a
32 deadline to figure out the answers. My concern is
33 that if it doesn't get approved today it's already been
34 two years and then it's another two years and then
35 thinking about administrative changes at the State and
36 at the Federal government, because that's putting you
37 probably into new administrations and it just -- I --
38 if this is something that's important, which the RACs
39 have said this is important and they want it, I don't
40 see that delaying is the best way to accomplish it.
41 But, I agree, there's a lot of details that people at
42 the table just don't have.

43
44 Thanks.

45
46 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Charlie.

47
48 MR. BROWER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. At
49 this time I would make a motion to approve Wildlife
50

0184

1 Proposal WP24-01 with modification by OMC -- OSM.

2

3

MR. WOODS: Second that motion.

4

5

6

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Charlie made a motion to accept, there's been a second on the floor. The floor is open for more discussion. Come on, go for it.

8

9

10

11

MS. BOARIO: Can I ask a question of the Solicitor during this time, during discussion?

12

13

14

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: This would be the time, we're under discussion.

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

MS. BOARIO: Okay. Lisa, what is the mechanism in place to, I'm trying to think, to prevent the resale into International markets, right, like so in my mind, the back up safeguard of the State sealing is, you know, if you think this is hard for us to figure out right now and then you add in CITES to people who are like oh I'm just trying to sell my hide and make a living and continue and the two parties aren't really aware of CITES and there's unintentional sale -- or I mean intentionally selling but not aware of CITES, if it's not -- I don't know, I'm just trying to figure out like is there an unintentional aspect to the CITES component here?

MS. DOEHL: Through the Chair. And Member Boario. I'm not an expert on CITES first of all. Second of all, this proposal, which would be codified in regulation informs people that the sale would only be domestic and that I believe it says that the International sale -- well it says -- I thought somewhere it says -- okay, under the customary trade permit, it says, providing the hide is purchased within the United States for personal use and not to be resold. So presumably the person, at least the person who harvested the bear and sells it is supposedly aware by these regulations of that requirement. As far as anyone who buys it and tries to resell it in International trade, I mean they have an obligation to be aware of CITES just like we're all supposed to be aware of all laws of the United States but whether that's realistic or not, I'll leave it, I can't say. But does that answer your question.

MS. BOARIO: Yes, enough.

0185

1 MS. DOEHL: Okay.

2

3 MR. CHEN: Mr. Chair.

4

5 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Glenn.

6

7 MR. CHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We
8 still are uncomfortable with adopting this regulation
9 as it's now. There are a lot of details that still
10 need to be worked out. These could present
11 vulnerabilities to subsistence users should they
12 inadvertently try to harvest a bear prior to all these
13 details being worked out and so forth. We do have a
14 wildlife meeting coming up next April, it's nine months
15 away, postponing this until then -- postponing action
16 nine months until next April would be a reasonable
17 amount of time to work things out but not stretch
18 things out so far that it goes on to the interminable
19 future. So just a sense that I will be voting in
20 opposition on the motion.

21

22 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
23 Glenn. Greg.

24

25 MR. RISDAHL: Yeah, I guess I'm going
26 over Kevin's thoughts here. You know, the State
27 supported the original proposal, conclusion by OSM, if
28 we just kept it to the units with two bear harvest
29 limits -- to the units with a two bear harvest limit,
30 that would be the easiest thing of all. And then if we
31 wanted to further pursue this process we could work out
32 some of the details but, here, you would have a
33 regulation in place that allowed subsistence -- Federal
34 subsistence users to do the same thing they're doing
35 through the State program. It would be, from the way I
36 understand it, there's really no difference at that
37 point. But then we could work out some of these other
38 details where maybe we could get a Federal permit that
39 really just required people to -- you can hunt them and
40 we have an OMB permit, which is basically you get one
41 and you go in and you get it tagged and then you can do
42 what you need to do, basically sell it within the
43 Continental U.S., or whatever. It's just a thought
44 because I mean we're kind of going back and forth here,
45 there's a lot of things we don't know, but if -- I
46 think if we went along with what the State suggested at
47 this point we would have a season, that would be a
48 start.

49

50

0186

1 Anyway, just a thought. I don't know
2 if there's something I'm missing here.

3
4 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And then -- no,
5 I thought that was a good point because -- and then I
6 heard if -- I mean is there a potential that the
7 Federal Board puts a two bear limit in and then State
8 recognized it, is that what I heard, would recognize
9 our two bear limit for that region?

10

11 MR. MULLIGAN: So that would be the
12 difference. If you put in a two -- the easie -- for
13 the record, the easiest thing for the person to do is
14 to go to the Board of Game to put in for a two bear
15 limit. It would be faster and I would say easier. No
16 offense, but our process tends to move a little faster
17 and if something like you guys did on your end, there
18 could be reason for them to submit an ACR out of cycle
19 in order to bring that up. I can't say that
20 definitively but because of what happens over here, the
21 Board could choose that that would be something they
22 would bring up on their side in order to bring it up to
23 a two bear limit, bring it in alignment and Bob's your
24 Uncle.

25

26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I'm trying to
27 look past you for a second, Lisa.

28

29 (Laughter)

30

31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Only, I'm just
32 trying to -- usually when we get to this part it's the
33 Board, you know, I'm not trying to be that way but I'm
34 trying to be that way.

35

36 MR. WOODS: I've been writing down, Mr.
37 Chair, for the record.....

38

39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Sorry, Lisa, so
40 go ahead Frank.

41

42 MR. WOODS: Frank Woods, Public Member.
43 I've been writing down pros and cons and there's a lot
44 more pros than cons. We could work out logistics, the
45 fears, the details. Once we get a regulation we're
46 going to have proposals to change that regulation,
47 right, it'll give time for the State to react and we
48 have action. So that's my stand.

49

50

0187

1 Thanks.

2

3

4 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And just for
5 the record we forgot to put the original language on
6 the record. I'm going to do that now just so we can
7 support WP25-01 [sic] with modifications that hides of
8 brown bears with or without claws attached may be
9 purchased with the United States for personal use and
10 not to be resold. The hunter must request an Office of
11 Subsistence customary trade permit and must return the
12 permit to OSM. Additionally, the modification
13 eliminates regulation requiring the skin of the skull
14 and claws of the brown bear hides to be retained at the
15 time of sealing in certain areas.

15

16 The regulation should read:

17 Utilization of fish, wildlife and shellfish, you may
18 sell the raw untanned or tanned hide or cape from a
19 legally harvested caribou, deer, elk, goat, moose,
20 muskox or sheep -- yeah, then it just goes on to
21 discuss it there.

22

23 And so as we discuss that in alignment,
24 I know part of our regulation also discusses claws and
25 then if we're sitting here discussing -- I've heard
26 some potential amendments to move forward so we would
27 have to do that if we were going to change the original
28 motion.

29

30 MS. LEONETTI: It's the full.....

31

32 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, it's the
33 full thing.

34

35 MS. LEONETTI:all that
36 regulation, so you could just say what's written on
37 Page 93.

38

39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And what's
40 written on Page 93.

41

42 MS. LEONETTI: Of the Board book.

43

44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Of the Board
45 book.

46

47 MR. ALBERG: Mr. Chair, Dave Alberg
48 with the Park Service. So if I could, maybe a question
49 for the Solicitor. If this is adopted with the OSM
50

0188

1 recommendations and the language that is struck out, or
2 language you were just referring to, portions of it,
3 does it put us at a place where the user is already --
4 there are individual users that may be vulnerable
5 legally already because it will take us some time to
6 get some of this other language we've been talking
7 about cleaned up? I would be interested, from the
8 Solicitor's perspective if I'm way off or if you see
9 that in the same way?

10

11 MS. DOEHL: Through Mr. Chair and
12 Member Alberg. I guess one of the things that this
13 motion provides for is that there be a customary trade
14 permit and since that will take a while to create and
15 set up, that does provide some time, both before
16 someone would be at risk and also someone could make a
17 motion to amend this to put a start -- you know, to
18 make the effective date after some kind of a scheme is
19 in place. But -- and also I am not particularly
20 comfortable speaking for law enforcement neither in
21 terms of what kinds of cases they would take on or not
22 take on and especially if it turned out that it was
23 State law enforcement. So I'm afraid I don't have the
24 information to answer the rest of that question.

25

26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I'm sorry,
27 Lisa, we really need you up here.

28

29 (Laughter)

30

31 MS. GREDIAGIN: Thanks. Through the
32 Chair, Lisa Grediagin. I just wanted to address the
33 suggestion of reverting to the original OSM conclusion
34 to just align with State regulations.

35

36 First of all, the State's position as
37 stated on Page 105 in your meeting books is that ADF&G
38 supports the proposal if it is modified to only allow
39 the sale of brown bear hides with claws attached in
40 areas where the Federal harvest limit is two bears
41 every regulatory year.

42

43 So anyway just to emphasize that, at
44 least, the written ADF&G position is that they would
45 support, you know, allowing the sale of hides where the
46 Federal harvest limit is two bears even if the State
47 harvest limit is one bear, but it's -- even if we
48 reverted to that you still run into the issue of the
49 State subsistence permit. For example, in Unit 23 the
50

0189

1 Federal regulation is two bears by State subsistence
2 permit, and, again, the condition of that permit is
3 that at the time of sealing the claws and the skin of
4 the head is retained. And so even if, you know, the
5 State's saying, oh, it's a two brown bear harvest
6 limit, we'll allow you to sell it they're still going
7 to keep the claws and skin of the head because it's by
8 State subsistence permit.

9

10 So, again, I really think the issue
11 here is the requirements of the State subsistence
12 permit.

13

14 Thanks.

15

16 MS. WESSELS: And if the Board modifies
17 the proposal to go back to what it was then you will
18 need to provide justification why you did not go along
19 with the Council's recommendation because the Councils
20 were voting on the proposals with the OSM amendment,
21 that's their last recommendation.

22

23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion's on the
24 floor.

25

26 (No comments)

27

28 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the
29 question.

30

31 MR. BROWER: Question.

32

33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been
34 called. Roll call.

35

36 MR. RISDAHL: Mr. Chair, could you
37 please read the motion in its.....

38

39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Entirety?

40

41 MR. RISDAHL: Yes, please.

42

43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All two pages,
44 you got it.

45

46 All right.

47

48 The OSM conclusion is to support WP25-
49 01 [sic] with modification, that the hides of brown

50

0190

1 bears with or without claws attached may be purchased
2 within the United States for personal use and not to be
3 resold. The hunter must request an Office of
4 Subsistence Management customary trade permit and must
5 return the permit to OSM. Additionally, this
6 modification eliminates regulations requiring the skin
7 of the skull and claws of the brown bear hides to be
8 retained at the time of the sealing in certain areas.

9

10 The regulation should read:

11

12 Subsistence taking of fish, wildlife,
13 and shellfish general regulations utilization of fish,
14 wildlife or shellfish. You may sell the raw untanned
15 or tanned hide or cape from a legally harvested
16 caribou, deer, elk, goat, moose, muskox or sheep. You
17 may request a customary trade permit to sell the hide
18 with or without claws attached of a brown bear legally
19 harvested under Federal subsistence regulation
20 providing the hide is purchased within the United
21 States for personal use and not to be resold. These
22 customary trade sales must be immediately recorded on a
23 customary trade permit and must be returned within the
24 timeframe specified on the permit. The hide must be
25 sealed, the seal must remain on the hide and the seal
26 number must be included in any advertisement of sale.

27

28 Subsistence taking of wildlife sealing
29 of the bear skins and skulls, you must keep a bear skin
30 and skull together until a representative of the ADF&G
31 has removed a rudimentary premolar tooth from a skull
32 and seal both the skull and the skin; however, this
33 provision does not apply to the brown bears taken
34 within Units 5, 9B, 9E, 17, 18, 19A and 19B, downstream
35 of and including the Aniak River Drainage and Units
36 21D, 22, 23, 24 and 26A and which are not removed from
37 the unit. If the skin or skull of a bear taken in
38 Units 9B, 17, 18, and 19A and 19B downstream of and
39 including the Aniak River Drainage is removed from the
40 area you must first have it sealed by an ADF&G
41 representative in Bethel, Dillingham or McGrath. If
42 you remove the skin or skull of a bear taken in Units
43 21D, 22, 23, 24 and 26A from the area are presented for
44 commercial tanning within the area you must first have
45 it sealed by an ADF&G representative in Barrow, Galena,
46 Nome or Kotzebue. If you remove the skin or skull of a
47 bear taken in Unit 5 from the area you must first have
48 it sealed by the ADF&G representative in Yakutat. If
49 you remove a skin or skull of a bear taken in Unit 9E

50

0191

1 from Unit 9 you must first have it sealed by an
2 authorized sealing representative.

3
4 That's for the record.

5
6 MS. LEONETTI: Okay, so roll call vote
7 on the motion. I'll start with Glenn Chen, BIA.

8
9 MR. CHEN: The BIA votes no.

10
11 MS. LEONETTI: Okay, thank you.

12
13 Dave Alberg, Park Service.

14
15 MR. ALBERG: Mr. Chair. The National
16 Park Service votes to support Wildlife Proposal WP24-01
17 as modified by OSM for all nine of the RAC regions that
18 supported it.

19
20 MS. LEONETTI: BLM, Kevin Pendergast.

21
22 MR. PENDERGAST: Thank you. BLM votes
23 to support WP24-01 as modified by OSM. Justification
24 is that I believe, based on everything I've heard today
25 and read that the RACs have weighed in loudly that they
26 want to be able to sell the hides. I feel like there's
27 a lot of bureaucratic hurdles that are going to need to
28 be cleared to be able to make that happen but, you
29 know, by supporting this I think if it passes we're
30 committing as a body to making sure that happens so
31 that people can adhere to those processes and be in
32 compliance. But on balance I think we've heard pretty
33 loudly that this is what folks want and desire. And
34 while I regret that the misalignment in process on the
35 State level, I think in principle, it aligns with the
36 State and that people will be able to harvest and sell
37 bear hides from both Federal lands and State lands.

38
39 Thank you.

40
41 MS. LEONETTI: Thank you.

42
43 Public Member Frank Woods.

44
45 MR. WOODS: Public Member Frank Woods,
46 in favor.

47
48 MS. LEONETTI: Public Member Ben
49 Payenna.

50

0192

1 MR. PAYENNA: I vote in favor.

2

3 MS. LEONETTI: Forest Service Greg

4 Risdahl.

5

6 MR. RISDAHL: The Forest Service is
7 going to support this but I also want to say that I'm
8 sitting in the same place as Kevin is of BLM, that
9 there are a lot of things we still have to figure out
10 and in order for this to work efficiently for
11 subsistence users we have a lot yet to do on this
12 because we are still relying heavily on the State no
13 matter how you look at it. So I'm supporting the
14 concept of it and -- but I would say it's in contingent
15 of getting the permission that we need from OMB and
16 looking into some of the way things are done for some
17 of other species that require customary trade permits,
18 so that's where we are.

19

20 Thank you.

21

22 MS. LEONETTI: Thank you.

23

24 Public Member Charlie Brower.

25

26 MR. BROWER: Support Proposal WP25-01
27 [sic] with modification.

28

29 MS. LEONETTI: Thank you. 24-01, yeah.

30

31 MR. BROWER: 24-01.

32

33 MS. LEONETTI: Yeah, got it.

34

35 MR. BROWER: Excuse me, 24-01,
36 correction.

37

38 MS. LEONETTI: Thank you.

39

40 Fish and Wildlife Service, Sara Boario.

41

42 MS. BOARIO: The Fish and Wildlife
43 Service opposes. We appreciate and support the efforts
44 made by OSM, the RACs and the Board members to find a
45 way to support subsistence users in their efforts to
46 sell a bear hide from a subsistence hunt, and I'm glad
47 to hear the State say there are no conservation
48 concerns, however, we have heard a number of other
49 concerns around the table and from the State of Alaska

50

0193

1 since this proposal has been submitted that are not yet
2 completely addressed. I agree with the BIA's previous
3 comments and feel like more details need to be worked
4 through on the front end of this process, not while
5 we're working through the OMB Paperwork Reduction Act
6 effort, and the RACs could contribute to developing
7 those details in the coming months.

8

9 Additionally, the Fish and Wildlife
10 Service delegates our CITES authority to the State of
11 Alaska and, although, they are neutral, due to their
12 continued concerns and statements around the sealing
13 process, the conditions of the State subsistence permit
14 and the potential implications for hunters and
15 harvesters, including unresolved questions around
16 enforcement and prosecution, the Fish and Wildlife
17 Service opposes.

18

19 Thank you.

20

21 MS. LEONETTI: Thank you.

22

23 Public Member Ray Oney.

24

25 (No comments)

26

27 MS. LEONETTI: Ray, are you there, if
28 you are muted, you may have to press star, six to
29 unmute.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 MS. LEONETTI: We can come back to Ray.

34

35 Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

36

37 MS. PITKA: I vote to support this
38 proposal in deference to the Regional Advisory Council
39 recommendations. 90 percent of the Regional Advisory
40 Councils want this and their lengthy discussions at
41 each of the Regional Advisory Council meetings, along
42 with the lengthy discussion we had last April, I feel
43 like I'm very informed on this one and the people from
44 the regions want it. It's now up to the Federal
45 government to make that happen with the permit system.
46 I have a lot of faith that the Federal government can
47 make that happen.

48

49 Thank you.

50

0194

1 MS. LEONETTI: Thank you.

2

3 I'll come back to Public Member Ray
4 Oney, if you're online you can speak up.

5

6 MR. ONEY: Yes, can you hear me
7 Crystal?

8

9 MS. LEONETTI: Yes, I can hear you, go
10 ahead.

11

12 MR. ONEY: Okay, thank you. I am in
13 support of WP24-01 with modifications by OSM.

14

15 MS. LEONETTI: Okay, thank you.

16

17 And, lastly, Chair Tony Christianson.

18

19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support in
20 deference to the RACs.

21

22 MS. LEONETTI: Thank you.

23

24 Mr. Chair, the motion passes.

25

26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
27 Thank everybody for that work and trying to vett out
28 that tough little situation. Appreciate the State for
29 your input there and apologize for going down rabbit
30 holes there. We're just trying to figure this out, so
31 we appreciate it.

32

33 We'll take a five minute break and come
34 back for the next agenda -- I think we have one agenda
35 item left and don't forget we also have Executive
36 Session following so we have one more agenda item and
37 then we have to go reconvene our Executive Session so
38 five, 10 minute break and we'll come back.

39

40 (Off record)

41

42 (On record)

43

44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
45 welcome back to the meeting here. We're just going to
46 invite Robbin, she has the next agenda item, I believe
47 is correspondence to the Board.

48

49 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

50

0195

1 Members of the Board. I will be presenting an update
2 on Board correspondence to and from the Councils.

3

4 You've been given some handouts, you
5 should find a package of tables like this. Another
6 package of the USDA Interior response letters to other
7 Councils that came through at the end of last year, the
8 beginning of this year, and also a new letter to the
9 Board from Southeast for your awareness.

10

11 So this update is a standing agenda
12 item at -- oh, yes?

13

14 (Pause)

15

16 MS. LAVINE: Hello, testing, can you
17 hear me -- no?

18

19 (Pause)

20

21 MS. LAVINE: And, now, and, again, can
22 you hear me?

23

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE ONLINE: I can hear
25 you fine.

26

27 MS. LAVINE: Oh, very good, thank you.
28 All right, folks, so this is a recent, you know, I
29 think last year and a half, this has been a recent
30 standing agenda item at all Board meetings, it's an
31 effort to track communications by the Councils to the
32 Board or through the Board and it's made some
33 difference over time. All correspondence from the
34 Councils is shared with the Board year-round by OSM as
35 soon as the finished letters are approved by the
36 Council Chair. So you should all have received the
37 letters as they were produced throughout the year.
38 There were a whole bunch of new ones that came through
39 this spring.

40

41 They're also reviewed by the ISC. Any
42 letters to the Board or the Chair will be reviewed by
43 the ISC at a regularly scheduled meeting. We have --
44 we go through kind of like a validation like process,
45 what actions are required and we look at three
46 categories, are these letters informational only, and
47 then we just review and discuss; do these letters
48 require a transmittal, which means we're sending them
49 outside the Program to the Secretaries or someone else

50

0196

1 and then we also ask, are they requiring Board action
2 or response. When we discuss these letters, the
3 reasons for discussing them at the ISC is so that the
4 InterAgency Staff Committee who's support Staff to the
5 Board is up to date on all these communications and can
6 discuss these letters or these communications with you,
7 the Federal Subsistence Board.

8

9 Because this is a new process we're
10 still getting up to speed. So today I will only focus
11 on Council's requesting the Board elevate
12 correspondence to the Secretary. So you should have
13 before you tables describing Council letters asking the
14 Board to elevate or forward concerns so that's the
15 first -- that's on the first page, and if you flip the
16 page you'll see tables, Council correspondence to the
17 Board, Board letters to the Secretary and Council
18 correspondence to Board agencies. The highlighted text
19 indicates pending actions and the bold text indicates
20 the correspondence from the Councils since the last
21 meeting. So you'll see at the end of each section
22 you've got this kind of cream colored, those are the
23 most recent letters that came through and the dates on
24 which they were mailed.

25

26 So we'll be focusing on the two first
27 pages of the table's handout.

28

29 Some of these issues you've really
30 already discussed yesterday with the annual reports and
31 replies. These are issues that have long been of great
32 importance to the Councils, there are three of them.
33 One is letters on D-1 lands. The other are letters
34 regarding fisheries management. And the last group is
35 for compensation. At our Board meeting in February,
36 these three issues had such great importance to the
37 Councils they wrote a lot of joint letters through the
38 Board to the Secretaries, they were discussed with the
39 Secretary when she came in person in 2003 -- 2023, and
40 they were forwarded to the Secretaries for their notice
41 and in some cases the Board had additional concerns to
42 add. There's a package that you have of the Secretary
43 of the Interior, or the Assistant Joan Mooney, and
44 you'll see that she responded to a lot of these, the
45 last Administration responded to a lot of these letters
46 basically on their last day in office and it's great
47 that we've got that response and such strong response,
48 a number of letters, but it was from an outgoing
49 Administration. So a lot of the Councils want us to
50

0197

1 forward the same group of letters and, in fact,
2 potentially some new ones to the new Administration.
3 And we did discuss forwarding ANCSA -- let me see, BLM
4 D-1 lands, ANCSA D-1 lands in February and we did
5 discuss forwarding on all of the joint letters,
6 specifically the ones about either ANCSA or fisheries
7 management issues or Council compensation, and at that
8 time the Board said, yep, we should forward them, we're
9 revisiting this now and asking for your direction.
10 There have been a lot of changes that have taken place
11 on the Board, within the current Administration in
12 state and in D.C., and so we are touching base with you
13 if the intent is still to forward all of these letters,
14 we have a new group of them as you'll note. So for the
15 D-1 lands, we would have some joint letters from before
16 that we would send and brand new ones, and I would
17 imagine that the response from the current
18 Administration would be different than from the last on
19 that particular issue.

20

21 So I'm going to pause and I will ask
22 the Board to respond to request to elevate the ANCSA D-
23 1 withdrawal letters, both new and past, to the current
24 Administration.

25

26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Robbin -- oh,
27 go ahead.

28

29 MS. PITKA: I was going to say we
30 should still send those letters, you know, they still
31 require a response from whichever Administration that
32 we're sending those issues to for the issues on the
33 ground to go up.

34

35 Thank you.

36

37 MR. PENDERGAST: Thank you. Kevin
38 Pendergast. I'm a little confused as to what the
39 question is or what the problem is we're trying to
40 solve with respect to these 17 D-1 letters, in
41 particular, from BLM's perspective. But they were sent
42 to -- who were they originally addressed to and what is
43 our decision on the Board?

44

45 MS. LAVINE: They were originally sent
46 to the Secretaries of the last Administration
47 requesting that the D-1 lands.....

48

49 MR. PENDERGAST: Right, so they were

50

0198

1 addressed to the Secretary?

2

3 MS. LAVINE: Right.

4

5 MR. PENDERGAST: So why do we need to
6 resend them?

7

8 MS. LAVINE: Because there's been a
9 change in Administration and in a change in direction
10 from the Administration on how to address D-1 lands.

11

12 MS. WESSELS: Yes, these letters are
13 the new letters, the previous letters were sent by the
14 Board, they were forwarded from the Councils, the
15 Council sends letters to the Board, the Board forwarded
16 them to the previous Administration. These ones, as
17 you can see the date of the letter is this spring. The
18 Councils were concerned because they heard that the D-1
19 land protections will be eliminated so four of them
20 wrote new letters to the Board asking the Board to
21 forward it to the Secretaries so the Board is free to
22 decide whatever.

23

24 MR. PENDERGAST: I see. So -- but they
25 were sent to the Board and.....

26

27 MS. WESSELS: Yes, because the
28 Councils.....

29

30 MR. PENDERGAST:so the Board's
31 decision is whether or not to forward them on?

32

33 MS. WESSELS: Councils cannot
34 communicate directly with the Secretaries.....

35

36 MR. PENDERGAST: Thank you.

37

38 MS. WESSELS:that's per Board's
39 policy.

40

41 MR. PENDERGAST: Okay, thanks.

42

43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And kind of the
44 Board policy that we have is if it's outside of our
45 scope of work here, right, we just elevate the concerns
46 of our RACs to the appropriate, which is our boss, so
47 that he's aware of the situation so then we're not just
48 sitting on our hands when we take things that are
49 affecting subsistence.

50

0199

1 MR. PENDERGAST: Well, and if it's
2 helpful, I mean obviously the 17 D-1 issue is squarely
3 in BLM's portfolio, it's something we've got to deal
4 with under the Executive Order as well so this is
5 something the Secretary is very aware of and we've
6 received multiple letters direct and that we've
7 forwarded on so it's not going to be a new thing, just
8 for folks awareness.

9
10 MS. WESSELS: Yeah, and I just wanted
11 to add that, you know, Councils represent the public
12 and so in a way it's like a public comment, it's just
13 that they cannot write directly to the Secretary
14 because they are appointed by the Secretary.

15
16 MR. WOODS: Are we going to do it one
17 letter at a time, one issue, D-1, or are we going to do
18 as a whole, because I went through the letters of D-1
19 and then it goes into different topics; how do you want
20 us to handle this?

21
22 MS. LAVINE: Mr. Chair. The response
23 letters that you have were from the past
24 Administration, they're just for your information,
25 right, on these particular issues. And so the response
26 letters that I've handed you are -- you don't need to
27 make any decisions on them, they're just for reference.

28
29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So really what
30 we're hearing, is just, are we going to forward the
31 letters at the request of our RACs, which I think we
32 should, and move them forward so the new Administration
33 is abreast of what we're dealing with at the regional
34 level and that we're supporting our RACs in
35 communicating with our boss about issues that are
36 affecting subsistence, and that's what we have before
37 us and I support that concept.

38
39 MR. PENDERGAST: So is there a motion
40 needed or what?

41
42 MR. WOODS: So moved.

43
44 MR. PENDERGAST: Second if we need it.

45
46 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: A motion been
47 made to accept that we do exactly as we're recommended
48 to support the RACs and to forward the old letters and
49 the new letters so that they're abreast of the
50

0200

1 situations and can we get a response from the new
2 Administration. We have a motion and a second on the
3 floor, any further discussion.

4
5 Yes.

6
7 MS. BOARIO: Just to clarify, is the
8 motion just about the D-1 lands letters or this is --
9 okay, so we'll do each topic separately, okay, thank
10 you.

11
12 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Good question.
13 Any other discussion, this is about D-1. Yes.

14
15 MS. PITKA: Not really a question, but
16 just when we make motions can we please state what the
17 motion is rather than just state motion because --
18 thank you, just to keep the record clear.

19
20 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All in favor
21 say aye.

22
23 IN UNISON: Aye.

24
25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Opposed, same
26 sign.

27
28 (No opposing votes)

29
30 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion carries,
31 D-1.

32
33 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
34 next slug of letters is fisheries management and
35 bycatch. We have a few new letters in that category
36 and I think there was also discussion about if
37 forwarding these new letters that the Secretaries in
38 this new Administration be aware of the correspondence
39 that went before. So I'm looking, again, for your
40 approval or thoughts on forwarding these. And part of
41 the reason why we're having this discussion other than
42 just like transmit them, forward them on, is that we
43 typically just forward all the letters on with a
44 transmittal letter, like a cover letter, right and
45 basically just describing this -- the contents.
46 Sometimes we add our own, the Board adds their own
47 comments if they wish. I would suggest that -- and
48 that's why we're having this discussion. But I would
49 suggest that it's a pretty simple transmittal at this
50

0201

1 point in time.

2

3 So I'm looking for a motion to forward
4 on fisheries management and bycatch letters.

5

6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The floor is
7 open for a motion.

8

9 MR. RISDAHL: Mr. Chair. I'll make the
10 motion to forward on the fisheries management issue
11 letters to the Secretaries.

12

13 MR. WOODS: Second that motion.

14

15 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion been
16 made and seconded. Any further discussion.

17

18 (No comments)

19

20 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the
21 question.

22

23 MR. BROWER: Question.

24

25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All in favor
26 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 unanimous, thank you.

37

38 MS. LAVINE: And last is Council member
39 compensation. We don't have any new letters on this
40 but this is a standing issue of concern and I believe
41 the response from the previous Administration was
42 supportive but to continue this discussion with the new
43 Administration. And so basically we would be
44 reinitiating, forwarding on the prior letters from all
45 10 Councils to get a response from the new
46 Administration.

47

48 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

49

50

0202

1 MR. WOODS: I would make a motion that
2 we forward on the letters from the previous
3 recommendations to the current Administration.

4
5 MR. RISDAHL: I'll second that motion,
6 Mr. Chair.

7
8 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
9 guys, and this is in regards to the compensation for
10 our RAC members.

11
12 MR. WOODS: Yes.

13
14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So this motion
15 would be to reflect that we forward the letters from
16 the RACs to the appropriate people about the RAC
17 compensation. Any further discussion.

18
19 (No comments)

20
21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All in favor
22 say aye.

23
24 IN UNISON: Aye.

25
26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Opposed, same
27 sign.

28
29 (No opposing votes)

30
31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion carries
32 unanimous to forward the compensation letters.

33
34 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
35 next agenda item is our 2026 Board meeting dates. We
36 want to confirm the first two and discuss options for
37 the next summer work session. Included on the last
38 page of your detailed agenda is a list of competing
39 meetings around the same time that we are holding the
40 FRMP work session. So if you want to take a look at
41 that, I would just like to point out that I think until
42 last week the final action on the Bering chum salmon
43 bycatch management meeting was scheduled for the fall
44 and it has just recently rescheduled for the same
45 timeframe that we are holding the FRMP that the Alaska
46 Forum on the environment is being scheduled, and before
47 that, they are back to back meetings in January and so
48 I -- we've been taken to task for having meetings that
49 overlap with others, we're trying to get ahead of the
50

0203

1 game, and we're not going to be able to satisfy
2 everyone. So if I -- I would just like to confirm that
3 you approve of February 4th and 5th although it's
4 likely going to be a one day meeting but we're going to
5 hold those two dates just in case our agenda expands.

6
7 (Laughter)

8
9 MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair. Are you doing
10 one by one or are you doing it as a block?

11
12 MS. LAVINE: Well, we could move on to
13 the next and then we could -- well, let's do the first
14 two, confirm them and then let's discuss the summer
15 work session. So the next wildlife regulatory meeting
16 we scheduled for the 3rd week in April, that's going to
17 be a full week and it kind of -- it fits in with
18 everything else, we're not overlapping horribly with
19 anything else. So that would be our wildlife
20 regulatory meeting scheduled for April 20th through
21 24th.

22
23 So now looking at all of the conflicts,
24 the meeting conflicts that we have at the end of your
25 detailed agenda and then looking at the dates that
26 we've selected, I would just like Board confirmation.

27
28 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: It looks good
29 to me.

30
31 MS. LAVINE: Excellent. So then we
32 proceed, the summer work session. This year we held it
33 earlier than we have in quite some time and what we're
34 hearing is that it's too early so July 22nd and 23rd
35 might be one that we cross out and then we might look
36 at July 29th and 30th or August 5th and 6th and I'm
37 curious to know what might work better with your
38 schedules and your rhythms outside of the office.

39
40 Thank you.

41
42 MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

43
44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead,
45 Charlie.

46
47 MR. BROWER: Is there a way we can
48 change the summer session, this is right in the middle
49 of our subsistence activities, that part of July and
50

0204

1 first week of August, or the second -- yeah, first week
2 of August, is there a better date. I mean summer is
3 our active hunting.

4
5 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Brower.
6 Our challenge is trying to approve the annual report
7 replies and the Council nomination packages in time,
8 first the annual reports, to prepare them for the fall
9 meeting cycle for the Councils, and then the
10 nominations need to be made early enough so that they
11 are approved in D.C., in time for the next cycle, the
12 next year basically. And the further we push that
13 back, the more challenging that becomes.

14
15 MR. PENDERGAST: So I just want to note
16 for folks, maybe newer to the Board, of which I'm one
17 but I happen to know this and Robbin's probably going
18 to kick me under the table but annual report replies
19 are not required, so I don't see that as a real
20 schedule driver, I mean if they happen, great, but it's
21 not a necessary part of the process, it's just
22 something OSM and the Board have chosen to do. So I
23 think I would rather defer to schedules and rhythms in
24 terms of scheduling.

25
26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And just to
27 kind of put context to that, though, this is that same
28 work session, so we are in that day, yeah.

29
30 MR. PENDERGAST: Right, I just -- I
31 mean.....

32
33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, so it's
34 not just us doing annual reports, it's deliberation on
35 where we can fit other work items into it.

36
37 MR. PENDERGAST: And that's the other.

38
39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, but a
40 little later for me as well as we noticed last week,
41 middle of July was tight for us, I know, but then it
42 pushes Charlie Brower into his season so it's kind of a
43 Catch-22. But the later away from that is better for
44 me.

45
46 MS. WESSELS: Yeah, I just wanted to
47 add, though it doesn't specifically said in ANILCA that
48 there needs to be a reply to the annual reports but it
49 says that the Board shall consider the report and the
50

0205

1 Councils develop their new annual reports during their
2 fall meetings so they really need to hear the answers
3 from the Board before the fall meetings, what does the
4 Board think on this or that item that they brought up.
5 So the replies, they need to be ready before the fall
6 meetings and, you know, also during the work session
7 there is executive session paired together so the
8 packet for the Secretaries need to be prepared as soon
9 as possible so the Secretary and the White House have
10 enough time to review them before everybody's
11 appointments expire in December 2nd. And specifically
12 for me since I'm making so many presentation during the
13 work session and executive session, like out of these
14 days, 22nd, 23rd, you probably most likely will have me
15 but not after that. But don't base your decision on
16 this because we'll find somebody, most likely Brooke.

17
18 (Laughter)

19
20 MS. WESSELS: Who will be doing it
21 instead of me so that's all I want to say.

22
23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I'm sure she
24 can handle it like Rhonda handles it.

25
26 (Laughter)

27
28 MS. PITKA: August 5th and 6th works
29 for me. Yep.

30
31 MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

32
33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Charlie.

34
35 MR. BROWER: I don't have much problem
36 with those dates. If I need to attend by
37 teleconference I can, if I need to come down I will so
38 I'll go with the flow.

39
40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So right now
41 I'm hearing 4th and 5th is probably a date that's
42 better for Frank, that's good for Dave, and I'm not
43 seeing agency people saying it don't work, that works
44 for me, so the 4th and 5th, thank you.

45
46 MS. LEONETTI: 5th and 6th.

47
48 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: 5th and 6th.

49
50

0206

1 MS. LAVINE: 5th and 6th.

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: August.

4

5 MR. BROWER: August 5th and 6th.

6

7 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: August 5th and
8 6th, thank you. Holy, Brooke just took a deep breath.

9

10 MS. WESSELS: Yeah, so Brooke is just
11 doing the annual reports.

12

13 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you guys
14 for that presentation. At this time this concludes the
15 public section of this meeting. Rhonda has something
16 to say.

17

18 MS. PITKA: Yeah. So I'd like to make
19 a motion to request a meeting with the Secretary of the
20 Interior during AFN week.

21

22 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
23 Rhonda, for that. I know we needed to get that on the
24 record, we discussed it all week, and so we do before
25 we adjourn here, have a motion by Rhonda to.....

26

27 MR. BROWER: Second.

28

29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON:and we
30 have a second on the floor to extend an invitation to
31 the Secretary to come, to have audience so we can take
32 the list we have here and the letters we have and
33 create a summary and give a face to face feel for the
34 Program especially in light of where we're at with
35 review. I think it's a good opportunity to see our
36 boss.

37

38 MR. BROWER: Question.

39

40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All in favor
41 say aye.

42

43 IN UNISON: Aye.

44

45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Opposed, same
46 sign.

47

48 (No opposing votes)

49

50

0207

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion carries
2 unanimous to support forwarding our request for
3 audience. Thank you.

4
5 MS. PITKA: I'd like to also make a
6 motion for a letter of apology for delayed responses to
7 the Regional Advisory Councils.

8
9 MR. WOODS: Second.

10
11 MR. BROWER: What's the motion?

12
13 MS. PITKA: A motion for a letter of
14 apology to the Regional Advisory Councils for our
15 delayed responses in the replies that we've been
16 getting.

17
18 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We have a
19 motion and been seconded, and under context of that I
20 would hope that we just add in there some of the -- you
21 know, the staffing concerns and other situations we
22 discussed here just so they could get a clear picture
23 of where the Program is in its entirety, you know,
24 because we are their support mechanism and so having an
25 understanding of context too, that makes sense, for our
26 Staff as well so appreciate that.

27
28 All in favor say aye.

29
30 IN UNISON: Aye.

31
32 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Opposed, same
33 sign.

34
35 MR. PENDERGAST: Oppose.

36
37 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: One in
38 opposition, Kevin.

39
40 MS. DOEHL: And what about the one
41 person, Ray Oney.

42
43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Ray, how do you
44 feel? Ray, do we have your concurrence online? Thank
45 you for that Lisa. Star, six, partner.

46
47 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: He's skinning a
48 brown bear.

49
50

0208

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Oney, Ray
2 Oney, are you online, can you star, six? Maybe we lost
3 him.

4
5 MS. PITKA: He may have been trying to
6 get back in.

7
8 MR. BROWER: Is he online?

9
10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, Ray, are
11 you still online?

12
13 MR. ONEY: Yes, I am, I got
14 disconnected but I'm back on.

15
16 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. We were
17 just making sure you heard the discussion of us
18 supporting requests for audience with the Secretary and
19 to request an apology letter be written to the RAC
20 Boards with some substance about the Program, we were
21 just making sure that we had your concurrence and
22 support on those.

23
24 MR. ONEY: Yes, I give support.

25
26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank you
27 for that. For the record Ray supports. Any other
28 Council comments.

29
30 (No comments)

31
32 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The floor is
33 open for adjournment.

34
35 MR. WOODS: Move to adjourn.

36
37 MS. PITKA: I'll second. This is
38 Rhonda Pitka.

39
40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, all
41 in favor say aye.

42
43 IN UNISON: Aye.

44
45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Same sign,
46 opposed.

47
48 (No opposing votes)

49
50

0209

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
2 Meeting adjourned. Thank you all for your good work
3 and getting through this, we'll meet you over there in
4 the other room.

5
6 (Off record)

7
8 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

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

0210

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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 24th day of July 2025;

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

Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 09/16/26