## ALASKA MIGRATORY BIRD CO-MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

SPRING MEETING - TELECONFERENCE

MAY 4, 2020

## Members Present:

Ryan Scott, Alaska Department of Fish and Game Eric Taylor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Gloria Stickwan, Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission Priscilla Evans, Chugach Regional Resources Commission Brandon Ahmasuk, Kawerak Cyrus Harris, Maniilaq Association, Kotzebue Taqulik Hepa, North Slope Region, Barrow Coral Chernoff, Sun'aq Tribe of Kodiak Jennifer Hooper, Association of Village Presidents Gayla Hoseth, Bristol Bay Native Association Peter Devine, Aleutian/Pribilofs

Executive Director, Patty Schwalenberg

Recorded and Transcribed by: Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2 Anchorage, AK 99501 907-243-0668 - sahile@gci.net

```
Page 2
                      PROCEEDINGS
 2
 3
               (TELECONFERENCE, Alaska - 5/4/2020)
 4
 5
                     (On record)
 6
 7
                     CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Good morning,
                This is Ryan Scott with the Alaska
 8
 9
     Department of Fish and Game, Division of Wildlife
     Conservation. Thank you for joining us all this
10
     morning for our spring AMBCC meeting.
11
12
13
                     It's obviously a little bit unorthodox
14
     compared to what we've done in the past and what we all
     are pretty much used to at this point as far as having
15
     to call in and do teleconferences and videoconferences.
16
17
     I appreciate everybody taking time for this this
18
     morning.
19
20
                     For Patty, I want to say especially
     thank you very much for organizing this and putting all
21
     the documentation together and making it possible for
2.2
     us to get together. Cheryl as well with the Fish and
23
     Wildlife Service. Thanks for all the work on that.
24
25
                     So I'd like to call the meeting
26
     officially to order. I have on my computer 8:41 a.m.
27
     Today is Monday, May 4, 2020. Now I'd like to take a
28
29
     moment of silence for folks that aren't able to join us
     and just to put some thoughts out there with all of our
30
     partners and our friends and our families in this
31
32
     trying time.
33
                     (Moment of silence)
34
35
                     CHAIRMAN SCOTT: All right. Patty, I
36
     quess we're now to the roll call before we get to
37
38
     introductions. If you could call the roll, I'd
39
     appreciate that.
40
                     MS. SCHWALENBERG: Certainly. Alaska
41
     Department of Fish and Game.
42
43
44
                     CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Here.
45
46
                     MS. SCHWALENBERG: U.S. Fish and
47
     Wildlife Service.
48
49
                     MR. TAYLOR: Here.
50
```

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

		Page 3
12345678901121111111111111111111111111111111111		MS. SCHWALENBERG: North Slope Borough.
		MS. HEPA: Here.
	Conference.	MS. SCHWALENBERG: Tanana Chiefs
		(No response)
	Association.	MS. SCHWALENBERG: Bristol Bay Native
		MS. HOSETH: Here.
	Islands Associa	MS. SCHWALENBERG: Aleutian Pribilof
		MR. DEVINE: Peter Devine here.
	Village Council	MS. SCHWALENBERG: Association of Presidents.
		MS. HOOPER: Here, Jennifer Hooper.
	Kodiak.	MS. SCHWALENBERG: Sun'aq Tribe of
		MS. CHERNOFF: Here.
		MS. SCHWALENBERG: Kawerak.
	Brandon.	MR. AHMASUK: Hi, Patty. This is
	Maniilaq.	MS. SCHWALENBERG: Thanks, Brandon.
		MR. HARRIS: Hello. Cyrus here.
	Resource Commis	MS. SCHWALENBERG: Ahtna Intertribal sion.
		MS. STICKWAN: Here. Gloria Stickwan.
	Resources Commi	MS. SCHWALENBERG: Chugach Regional ssion.
		(No response)
1		

1 MS. SCHWALENBERG: Mr. Chairman, we 2 have a quorum.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Great. Thank you very much. Thank you everybody. Moving down the agenda the next item is introduction of Council member staff and Pacific Flyway Council representation.

Eric, do you want to start.

MR. TAYLOR: Sure. Thank you, Ryan. This is Eric Taylor with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and I'll echo Ryan's appreciation for everyone's patience and tolerance and flexibility to attend the spring meeting by teleconference.

 All of us have incurred I'm safe to say substantive changes in our personal and professional lives. This is yet another example of where we're having to evolve into doing something differently than the past.

Thank you very much.

I'm glad to be here and I'm glad so many folks have been able to join us.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Eric.

Gayla, are you on?

MS. HOSETH: Good morning, everybody. Yes, Gayla Hoseth, Bristol Bay Native Association, Director of Natural Resources. Good to hear everybody.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Patty, do you have a list you want to run through or did you just need the three of us at this point?

MS. SCHWALENBERG: I think just the three of you is fine. I'm wondering if -- I can read off the names that everyone said and then if anyone is not on the list we could do it that way or if you just want to go through all the people.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yeah, I'll just real quickly reintroduce myself and then I think if you take a crack at the list that you have, that might be a little bit more efficient for us. Folks who don't hear

their names let us know when we get to the end.

Again, my name is Ryan Scott. I work for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and I'm down in Juneau. Thanks again for everybody's time. I look forward to seeing everybody in the spring and the fall. It's unfortunate that we are where we are, but we do want to be safe and we want to keep our families and friends and our communities safe. We're doing the best we can.

Again, thank you and good morning. So, Patty, let's go through the list that you have and people that we didn't catch there we'll just ask them to speak up when we get towards the end.

2.2

MS. SCHWALENBERG: Okay. So I have Eric Taylor, Ryan Scott, Gayla Hoseth, Patty Schwalenberg, Brandon Ahmasuk, Coral Chernoff, Peter Devine, Cyrus Harris, Cheryl Graves, Rory Stark, Joanne Bryant, Liliana Naves, Nathan (Hile) -- I don't know your last name, the transcriber -- Karen Pletnikoff, Jennifer Hooper, Taqulik Hepa, Gloria Stickwan, Brittany Sweeney, Todd Sformo, Todd Sanders, Crystal Leonetti, Julian Fischer, Jim Fall, Bryan Daniels, Tamara Zeller, Dave Rippeto, Dave Safine, Heidi Kritz, Will (Wiese) -- and I didn't catch your last name, and Aaron Moses.

Those were the names I caught.

 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Nicely done by the way. Good job. Thank you. You got more than I did. So for everybody listening out there Patty just went through a list of names that folks had provided quick introductions and to let us know you're on the line. This will get clunky and I realize it, but I think if you didn't hear your name please let us know that you're on the line at this point and the organization that you're representing.

MR. MATHEWS: Good morning. This is Vince Mathews with Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

MS. STICKWAN: I don't know if you called my name. This is Gloria.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.\ FROST\colon$$  Hi, this is Chuck Frost with the Fish and Wildlife Service, Migratory Bird

Management from Anchorage.

MR. WIESE: This is Will Wiese. You called me but didn't have my last name Wiese, W-I-E-S-E, with Fish and Wildlife Service in Kaktovik.

As I mentioned earlier, Nora Jane Burns is not on the call right now, but would like to call in later when we get to the North Slope Borough egging proposal. So I'll likely text her later and she'll call in later.

MR. SIMON: Jim Simon with Tanana Chiefs Conference and the Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. I think I just heard somebody beep in.

MS. STICKWAN: This is Gloria. I accidentally hit the button again. Sorry.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: No worries. I do it all the time. Thank you, Gloria. For Patty and folks listening, I think that given this is a large teleconference. Obviously we have a lot of participants. When we have the meeting notes done, we just want to pay attention to the folks that we have listed as attending to make sure we didn't miss anybody. I think we've got a pretty good handle on it, but it is challenging in the way we're doing this.

 I guess a couple other things I'll just mention. Jason Schamber is on the line as well from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Todd Sanders indicated he was on the line, the Pacific Flyway Council representative. Thank you guys both for being there.

At this time do we have any other guests and members of the public that would like to just identify yourself and let us know you're there and that will help us when we get down a couple steps here to public comments so we don't forget anyone. So other guests and members of the public that haven't already identified themselves.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Hearing none. 2 Patty, I think we're at item number five, review and adoption of the agenda. 3 4 5 MS. SCHWALENBERG: That's correct. 6 emailed that out to everyone so everyone should have 7 it. 8 9 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: So Council members I hope and make the assumption that you had a chance to 10 look at the agenda. It's truncated by quite a bit in 11 efforts to fit it into a teleconference context. 12 folks have any questions, if you'd like to do any 13 agenda modifications, additions, deletions, things like 14 that, this is the time. If not, we'll be prepared to 15 adopt the agenda for our teleconference. 16 17 18 MS. HOSETH: Mr. Chair. This is Gayla 19 Hoseth. I move to adopt the agenda. 20 21 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Gayla. Do 2.2 we have a second. 23 24 MR. DEVINE: Aleutian Pribilof, second. 25 26 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. So we have a motion to approve the agenda. It's been seconded. 27 28 discussion. 29 MS. HOSETH: Mr. Chair. 30 This is Gayla If I could make an addition to the agenda, 31 Hoseth. 32 somewhere on the agenda, for AMBCC grants. Maybe that would be good right after new business or right under 33 new business. 34 35 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: We will 36 Sure. Okay. do that. 37 38 39 MR. DEVINE: I second that addition. 40 Thank you. 41 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: 42 MS. HOSETH: Mr. Chair. I think that 43 44 would be E. 45 46 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yes, I think that's 47 accurate -- or is it D? We'll put it under new business. 48 49 50

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

Page 8 (No comments) 2 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. I'm going to 3 ask for unanimous consent of the agenda including the 4 5 changes. All those in favor please say aye. 6 IN UNISON: Aye. 7 8 9 Patty, did you get all CHAIRMAN SCOTT: 10 that? 11 MS. SCHWALENBERG: 12 Yes. 13 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Normally I 14 would say throw something at me if I screw something up 15 or if I miss a step. Let me know when I do that. 16 17 not a matter of if, it's just when, I'm sure. 18 19 Thanks again everybody for hanging in We're now to public comments. At this 20 there with us. time if members of the public and any other comments 21 that we need to include in the transcript please let us 22 know. When you speak, please state your first and last 23 24 name so we make sure that we capture who's speaking at the time. I'll open the floor to public comment. 25 26 27 Thank you, Mr. Chair. MR. SIMON: 28 Mr. Chair. 29 30 31 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yes, please. 32 MR. SIMON: Jim Simon with Ahtna 33 Intertribal Resource Commission and Tanana Chiefs 34 35 Conference Hunting and Fishing Task Force for the record. I'd like to just touch on two different things 36 as we begin the meeting. I wanted to point out that in 37 2018 the Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission pointed 38 39 out an error in the regulations. Then, as you know, in 2019 the regulations were not produced, so stickers for 40 2019 were put on the 2018 regulations package and in 41 reviewing the 2020 regulation package that error in the 42 Ahtna Region is still presence. 43 44 45 In short, on Page 12 there is a note 46 under the Upper Copper River region, which, by the way, 47 includes Cantwell, which is not on the Copper River. The Copper River Basin communities listed above are 48 also eligible to hunt in Game Management Unit 2 using 49 50

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

the Interior Region seasons. See page 8.

The closure of June 1st through July 31st is incorrect. The interior closure is June 15th to July 15th. So that represents a continued dramatic curtailing of subsistence bird hunting in the Ahtna Traditional Use Territory. This has been identified in your previous meeting transcripts as well as Regional Council meetings.

So I'm hoping that that can be fixed finally. This error has always been in the regulations since they were first established and the Ahtna Traditional Use Territory communities would be very appreciative of this error being corrected.

2.2

The second comment pertains to the tribal consultation letter sent out by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding ravens and the incidental take of migratory birds. For tribal consultation webinars that were to take place the following two days after that letter was posted and I would respectfully request the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to provide more advance notification of such tribal consultation opportunities.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Jim.

Other public comments.

MS. HOSETH: Mr. Chair. This is Gayla Hoseth. I just wanted to see if anybody knows why the error in the Ahtna Region wasn't fixed in the book and it's been like that since it printed. I know that we had some turnover in staff with Donna leaving. So how could we get that fixed.

MR. TAYLOR: Hi, Gayla. This is Eric Taylor with Fish and Wildlife Service. Thanks. I tried to jump in there, but wasn't able to. Jim, thank you for pointing it out. I cannot explain why the error is still there. The regulations book did go through a pretty thorough review from everybody on the Council, but nonetheless the errors are still there.

We do have yet another printing coming out this summer and we'll make sure that that's

corrected. What I would like to do is make sure that when we get the corrected version that we get you on the phone to make sure that everything that you're concerned with is corrected.

So thank you for pointing it out. We'll make sure it's corrected in the second printing here for the 2020 regulation.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Eric. Appreciate you looking into that. Jim, thanks for bringing it back to our attention as well. Any other discussion on this item.

MS. HOSETH: Mr. Chair. This is Gayla again. I was just curious why wasn't the raven conversation on our agenda? Kind of overlooked that this morning. I guess would that be in U.S. Fish and Wildlife's report?

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Eric, can you respond

MR. TAYLOR: Yeah. This is Eric Taylor with Fish and Wildlife Service. Gayla, that should be covered by Todd Sanders on his Pacific Flyway report.

MS. HOSETH: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Other public

comments.

to that.

(No comments)

 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Hearing none. We'll close public comments at this point. Obviously though if something comes up, folks just let us know and we'll make sure we get it on the floor for discussion.

The next item we need to address is adoption of Council action items from our September 2019 meeting. Patty, correct me if I'm wrong. We're just going to approve the notes, is that accurate?

MS. SCHWALENBERG: Yeah, all the actions taken at the September 18-19, 2019 meeting. We need approval of those. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yes, ma'am. Thank you. Again this came out -- the notes came out in the packet that was emailed last Thursday. I hope folks had a chance to take a look at it. If there's any additions, corrections that we need to make, please let us know now.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Hearing none. I guess we're looking for a motion to adopt the minutes from the September 2019 meeting.

MR. SIMON: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yes.

2.2

MR. SIMON: This is Jim Simon. I'm not sitting in for Tanana Chiefs Conference, who is absent today, but I did want to bring to your attention as a member of the public that I believe that there is at least one typographical error in these actions from the 2019 meeting and I believe that it pertains to you, Mr. Chairman, that you are not Mr. Dale, that you are Mr. Scott, and that would be under the motion to adopt spring action item per Emperor Goose Conservation Management Plan. It indicates seconded by Mr. Dale and I believe that would be Mr. Scott.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yeah, unless Bruce called in from Mexico, you're probably right. Thanks, Jim. Good catch.

 $\,$  MS. HEPA: I'd like to make a motion to approve the action items from the September 19, 2019 meeting with the corrections so noted that it should read Mr. Ryan Scott.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. And I apologize, I don't recognize everybody's voice quite yet. The person making the motion to approve just so we get your name on the record, please.

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$  HEPA: That was a motion by Taqulik. Good morning.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hi, Taqulik. Good morning. We have a motion to approve with the corrections noted by Jim Simon. I need a second.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair. This is Eric 2 Taylor with Fish and Wildlife Service. I second. 3 4 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Eric. we have a motion to approve the minutes and it's been 5 I guess we'll call for a vote. Patty, I 6 seconded. should have asked you this before. Do you want to do 7 that, the roll call votes, or do we just want people to 8 9 indicate yea or nay? 10 MS. SCHWALENBERG: Well, we initially 11 called this for an Executive Committee meeting, so 12 13 actually we only need three votes. 14 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Right. 15 16 guess with the Executive Committee if you would please 17 indicate your vote. 18 19 MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair. This is Eric Taylor with Fish and Wildlife Service. I approve, aye. 20 21 2.2 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Gavla. 23 24 MS. HOSETH: Yes, I approve. 25 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: And I too approve. 26 Okay. Item number 8 on our agenda is the beginning of 27 28 our old business discussions. The first item is 29 Council committee reports. The first one is the Technical Committee report by Julian Fischer. Julian, 30 are you in a good spot to provide that? 31 32 MR. FISCHER: Yes, Mr. Chair, I am. 33 just want to make sure I am coming in loud and clear. 34 35 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: I can certainly hear 36 37 you very well. Thank you. 38 39 MR. FISCHER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the Council. My name is Julian Fischer, 40 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the current chair of 41 the AMBCC Technical Committee. 42 43 44 The Technical Committee is made up by one U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service employee, myself, 45 two Alaska Department of Fish and Game employees, and 46 five Council members or their support staff and the 47 Executive Director of the AMBCC. 48

The Technical Committee serves the Council by reviewing current regulatory proposals, identify aspects that require clarification for use by the entity that was submitting the proposal to address as desired and for the Council to discuss prior to voting. The Technical Committee does not provide our recommendations for or against a proposal. That authority lies with the Council.

The two regulatory proposals were submitted to the AMBCC in December 2019. The Technical Committee began their review of these proposals on 25 February, 2020 and we met via teleconference to discuss the proposals on 17 March, 2020.

The discussion during the meeting as follow-up input from committee members was used to produce a Technical Committee report. That report was finalized and submitted to the Executive Director on 6 April, 2020.

 This oral presentation is a summary of that final Technical Committee report. I believe Patty sent out both the notes from the Technical Committee meeting as well as the final report with other materials for this AMBCC meeting today.

The first proposal was submitted by Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission and the proposal seeks to amend the process by which residents of included areas can invite their immediate family members that reside in excluded areas to participate in the spring/summer hunting of migratory birds.

The current process for invitation was approved by the AMBCC in 2013 and it remains in effect to this day. The process requires the local village or Native council writing a letter to the AMBCC Executive Director authorizing an invitation for an otherwise ineligible hunter to assist an immediate family member residing in an eligible area in spring/summer harvest of migratory birds. The AMBCC Executive Director then informs law enforcement with names of authorized hunters.

Proposal 2020-01 seeks to amend that current process by providing an alternative method of invitation. Specifically, the proposed alternative procedure is to allow tribal council or their

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

authorized tribal representative to issue a permit directly to an invited immediate family member without the requirement to inform the Executive Director of the AMBCC.

The authors of the proposal state that the regulation should be adopted to reduce burden on Federal agency staff and to better fulfill the intent of a Migratory Bird Treaty Act amendment. Specifically by more meaningfully involving Alaska Native tribes and co-management and promoting tribal sovereignty regarding authorization of tribal citizens.

In its review, the Technical Committee noted three technical documents that were specifically relevant to the proposal. Federal Register 50 CFR 92.5 outlines who's eligible to participate in the spring/summer subsistence hunt of migratory birds. Part D, published in 2014, describes the current requirement for a resident from an ineligible area to participate. The document describes the current process for invitation.

The second document Federal Register 50 CFR 92.4 defines immediate family members as spouse, children, parents, grandparents and siblings.

Third, the 1996 protocol to amend the 1916 convention protection of migratory birds between the U.S. and Canada recognizes the importance of hunters to assist their immediate families in meeting their nutritional and other essential needs or for the teaching of culture. Further, it states the requirement of a permit from the village council to permit such activity.

The Technical Committee identified eight items for the Council to discuss at the spring meeting. At its meeting on 17 March the Technical Committee reviewed the proposal submitted in December with applied statewide. Given that all regions were affected by statewide proposals, several issues in the Technical Committee we discussed reflected concerns by several regions about how the specific wording would apply to their region. Since that time the proposer has indicated that the Council can reduce the geographic scope of the proposal as it so chooses.

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

The first item that came up is as

follows: The Technical Committee noted that if the purpose of the proposal was to simplify the process for invitation, then the proposed locally issued permit option could replace the current procedure that requires a letter to the AMBCC.

So one item that the Council should discuss is to decide whether to retain the permit procedure, number one, which is the current procedure. That's the item that requires a copy of the letter of permission to be sent to the AMBCC Executive Director.

A second item that we discussed was that while the original proposal applied statewide, the proposer indicated on 18 March that they're open to keeping the proposal limited to their region only should the AMBCC prefer. The Technical Committee notes that three regions have sought amendments to the current process. So it might be appropriate for the Council to satisfy all the regions if a statewide proposal is desired.

The third item was really a word choice issue. The proposal replaces the term village council with tribal council. The Technical Committee noted that for the proposal to be accepted statewide the word council may not be relevant in all regions and suggested governing body might be more appropriate.

The Technical Committee sought input from the Department of Interior Solicitor's Office regarding the term village council, tribal council and governing body. Ken Lord, the Assistant Regional Solicitor, concluded that the terms village council, tribal council and governing body are all appropriate and could be combined for maximum flexibility. For example, the regulation could be worded in the following way. A letter of invitation may be sent by the tribal or village council or governing body, whichever is appropriate.

The fourth item that the Technical Committee discussed was that it noted that authorized tribal representative is unclear and suggested that titles of individuals authorized to issue permits be specified, such as tribal administrator, tribal employee, regional management body representative, et cetera, or to limit the authority to tribal or village council or tribal governing body.

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

The fifth item that the Committee discussed was regarding the information that should be included on the permit. So in the proposal a draft template was included and the committee noted that it lacked the name and the relationship to the immediate family member that resides in the eligible area.

So the Technical Committee highlighted the need for the Council to determine which of the following items should appear on an invitation permit: name of invitee and address of invitee, the Federal, State or Tribal government issued ID number, issue date of the permit, expiration date of the permit, the name of immediate family member that's offering the invitation and their relationship to the invitee, the name of immediate family member that's offering the invitation and their relationship to the invitee, the name or tribal village council or governing body, and the signature of the authorizing official and the signature of the permittee.

The next item was that the committee identified a need for a term life on the invitation permit. The committee members suggested a one-year, two-year, five-year length just to put some ideas out there, but doesn't have an opinion one way or the other on the length that the permit should be for, but encouraged the AMBCC to discuss that.

Next the Technical Committee did not recognize a need for invitation permits to be formatted identically across the state as long as the permits included the minimum information that the Council approved. However, the Committee encouraged the Council to state whether a standard format was necessary and, if so, the Council should identify who would design and distribute to village and tribal councils and tribal governing bodies.

 Lastly, the Technical Committee noted that the language and permit procedure one, referring to the Service's Co-management Council Coordination Office was unclear. Following the Technical Committee, the AITRC indicated that it was open to modifying the language to Service's AMBCC coordinator. So that last one is really just a simple clarification of a term.

For the second proposal, 2020-02, it was submitted by a resident of the village of Kaktovik

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

and seeks to allow egg collection during the 30-day closure in the eastern unit of the North Slope Region.

The proposal states that the current 30-day closure dates do not coincide with peak egg laying for Common eiders, thus gathering of Common eider eggs, an important traditional food source for residents of Kaktovik could not be conducted legally in most years.

The Technical Committee was unaware of any past proposals that have sought an exemption to the 30-day closure and recognized two issues associated with exempting egg gathering from an annual 30-day closure.

2.2

First, the U.S./Japan Treaty on Migratory Bird Conservation specifies that hunting avoid the principal nesting period and that nesting period was defined as 30-days in the Federal Register 50 CFR 92(d) and that's in the general overview of regulations. That's the process that's happened in all regions since the beginning of AMBCC.

Second, if the 30-day closure was eliminated and the spring/summer subsistence hunt would exceed the 124-day limit where the hunt is specified in the U.S./Mexico Treaty, that together with three other international treaties allows for the legal subsistence hunt in Alaska during spring and summer.

 So for these reasons the consensus of the Technical Committee was that the proposal is in conflict with the protection of birds and eggs during the principal nesting period season and season length requirements.

While Proposal 2020-02 appears to be in conflict with the international treaties, the Technical Committee noted that the problem that it's trying to resolve will be met by a proposal that the AMBCC passed unanimously in spring 2019. That Proposal 2019-02 sought annual flexibility in selecting the 30-day closure dates in the North Slope region that reflect current nest timing conditions with input from village residents.

The regulation passed unanimously in the AMBCC. It was supported by the Pacific Flyway

Council and the Service Regulations Committee and it's currently in the Federal Register and open to public comment for 30 days. The final rule is expected to be published this summer of this year.

Mr. Chair, that concludes the summary of our Technical Committee report. If there's any questions, I'd be open to taking them at this time.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Julian. Good report and good information. Thank the Technical Committee for getting together on these two proposals. Is there any questions for Julian.

MS. SCHWALENBERG: Mr. Chairman. This

 is Patty.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Go ahead, Patty.

MS. SCHWALENBERG: I just wanted to note that Priscilla Evans from the Chugach Region has dialed in, so she's on the line now. One point in your report, Julian, you said something about AITRC wanting to reduce the administrative burden on the agencies but it actually was to reduce the administrative burden on the tribal administrators. So I just wanted to make that point.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you for that, Patty. Welcome, Priscilla. Thanks for calling in this morning. Other questions for Julian. I'll just note that a little bit later on in the agenda we'll have an opportunity. We'll be taking both these proposals up for deliberation as well.

MS. HOSETH: Mr. Chair. This is Gayla Hoseth. I just had a question. I wasn't at the Technical Committee when it met. I wasn't able to call in to that meeting due to conflicting meetings, but I was just wanting to know which members of the Technical Committee were present when discussing these proposals.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Gayla. I think -- I'm scrolling rapidly back up to the top of the meeting notes that were provided to us and it says

Page 19 members present: Julian Fischer, Cyrus Harris, Jason Schamber, Jim Fall, Coral Chernoff, Patty Schwalenberg, 2 Kelly Krueger and Todd Sformo. 3 4 5 MS. SCHWALENBERG: And I believe Melissa Berns was also on the line. 6 7 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Yeah, listed 8 9 here it said members absent Gayla and Melissa, but if we need to correct that, we should do that. 10 11 MS. HOSETH: Mr. Chair. 12 This is Gayla. I don't have that document you're referencing. 13 there a meeting packet that got sent out? I've been 14 scrolling through my emails. Is there a big packet 15 that got sent out or are these all separate 16 17 attachments? 18 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: It looks like one.... 19 20 MS. SCHWALENBERG: I did not.... 21 2.2 23 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Go ahead. 24 MS. SCHWALENBERG: I'm sorry. I did 25 not include the list of committee members, but the list 26 of committee members are listed at the top of the 27 Technical Committee report. Then I sent out after the 28 Technical Committee meeting the Technical Committee 29 notes. The people at that meeting were Coral, Kelly, 30 Jason, Jim Fall, Cyrus, Todd Sformo, Julian Fischer and 31 32 I. 33 34 MS. HOSETH: Okay. Thank you. 35 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Other questions for 36 Julian. 37 38 39 MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair. This is Eric Taylor with Fish and Wildlife Service. Julian, there 40 was one correction I think toward the end of your 41 report relative to the proposed regulation being in the 42 Federal Register. I was notified on Friday that that's 43 44 delayed. They were expected to be published on the 1st and they were not. 45 46 47 So right now they are not in the I'm trying to get clarification. 48 Federal Register.

They are on the docket to be registered. They've been

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

approved by the Department of Interior and the next step is for the Federal Register to get them into the actual publication. Right now they're not in the Federal Register, but we expect them to very, very soon.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thanks, Eric, for that clarification. Other questions for Julian.

(No comments)

 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Hearing none. Moving down the agenda the second item under Council Committee reports, Outreach and Communication Subcommittee on Emperor Geese. Tamara Zeller. Are you online with us?

2.2

MS. ZELLER: I am. For the record, Tamara Zeller, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Migratory Bird Management. Thanks for having me speak. Good morning, everybody. So I'm just going to provide a quick overview of what we've been doing in regards to Emperor Goose.

Outreach efforts. As some of you may recall, in 2019 the Emperor Goose population index fell to a level that indicated we needed to consider additional conservation measures. In the fall of 2019, the AMBCC decided that they wanted to increase outreach and education efforts in accordance with the Management Plan. So I'm just going to provide an overview of what we've been doing.

 A group of us met late fall of 2019 to look at previous outreach and education plans for Emperor Geese. That team consisted of several members of the AMBCC, the State and Fish and Wildlife Service. So it's been a partnership from the beginning. We looked at the old plan and sort of redefined our goals and what we wanted to achieve. It came across that most folks were still happy with the current messages that were created in 2017 and we agreed to go forward with that.

A couple of things that evolved were I was able to secure a National Fish and Wildlife Foundation grant. Our previous efforts for Emperor

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

Goose outreach have been hampered by very little budget and staff capacity, so this grant will allow us to really give this effort -- you know, amp up our effort.

So that grant is in place. It includes a lot of projects that involve youth and elders. A culture camp, doing interviews, creating products that would resonate with villagers, doing interviews. As you can imagine, given the current situation with the pandemic, things have had to be adjusted. I'm trying to currently figure out how to do everything without actually going to villages. Which, as you know, is really critical to actually talk to people and see where they're at. So I'm currently working through that.

The other piece of the puzzle of the grant was to work with Audubon Alaska and Alaska Conservation Foundation to look at climate resiliency and other environmental factors around villages. We recognize that the apparent decline in Emperor Geese is due to many factors, environmental and biological.

The only thing we can control is harvest, so that's why we're asking subsistence users to consider voluntarily reducing their take of Emperors, but recognizing that there are other factors involved, but we don't have any control over those. Hopefully with Audubon's help and other partners we can start looking at some of that as well.

Then I've been also working with Yukon Delta Staff a lot. They've been great on getting some messages out. Part of the contract allowed us to hire a PR firm, International Data Systems, and they're a Native-owned, women-owned firm that specializes in a lot of media and I'm looking at messaging. So I've been working with them. They're currently doing interviews with folks across the state to try to really understand the points of views around Emperors and the cultural significance so that we can make this effort worthwhile for everybody.

So that's in the process. Yeah, just trying to really adapt strategy given restrictions on travel. I will end it there. I think Patty has been heavily involved and some other folks on the phone, so if they want to add anything, please do. I'll pause now for questions.

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Tamara. Other committee members certainly feel free to add anything that you'd like and other folks if there's questions about these efforts so far. I certainly recognize the challenges again of our current situation of getting boots on the ground in places and having those in person interactions which are extremely helpful and valuable.

Anyway, other committee members or general questions for Tamara.

(No comments)

MR. SIMON: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Please, go ahead.

2.2

 MR. SIMON: Yes, thank you. Jim Simon with Tanana Chiefs Conference and Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission. This may not be a question specifically for Tamara, but was wondering in the context of this discussion what is the status of the nonresident Emperor Goose hunt offered by the Alaska Board of Game.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: I guess I'll respond to that, Jim. When we met with -- folks on the phone are likely aware that the AMBCC submitted an agenda change request to the Alaska Board of Game to address the nonresidents hunter Emperor Goose season. The Board did not adopt that ACR, agenda change request, last November, so there was no action. It's status quo as far as that goes. The 25 permits are available and they have been awarded.

 That said, a large portion of the fall/winter harvest occurs in Game Management Unit 9 and 10. There are others as well, but that region is coming up for a Board of Game meeting in January of 2021. Proposals are due to Board support by May 15th. I believe that information had been relayed to Patty. If not, then I apologize for that. We have time.

 $\hbox{ If the AMBCC wants to submit a proposal for that Board of Game meeting, we just need to have it in by May 15th. I don't think it will be a huge } \\$ 

undertaking to get a proposal into the book. That would be a good place for it because it's relevant for those Game Management Units. So that's where things are as far as I know.

MR. SIMON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. To

 follow.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Please go ahead, Jim.

MR. SIMON: Yes, I'm wondering whether or not the Department of Fish and Game is doing a companion conservation education outreach with those nonresident hunters regarding the conservation concerns with Emperor Geese.

Thank you.

2.2

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Certainly. Yeah, thank you, Jim. To date the answer would be no other than getting the word out in general. Me specifically, one of the things I bring up a lot when we sit down and talk about regular story questions and concerns and dig into the biology of it. I'm concerned about where the Emperor Goose is at and headed. We've recently been notified that there won't be -- we don't anticipate any surveys for the summer, which will hinder -- well, it's just going to complicate how we go forward.

In essence, in answer to your question, no, there hasn't been any directed outreach to that group of hunters.

MS. HOSETH: Mr. Chair. This is Gayla Hoseth. I think that's really unfortunate that it's always put on us as the local users for conservation and education and really focusing on the rural residents and mainly the Native population. That same effort needs to go with the nonresidents that are coming here.

 I guess would now be appropriate to make a motion for AMBCC to submit a proposal for that May 15th deadline to submit a proposal for no nonresident hunting of Emperor Geese?

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Gayla. Yeah, I think that if there's a time to discuss that or adopt a motion, get a motion to develop a proposal for

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

the Board of Game meeting it would be good to do it now. That gives us a little bit of time to get it drafted and into the book. Myself or Jason Schamber we can work with Patty to get that done. Patty, I don't want to volunteer you for everything, but I'm hoping you could spearhead that if that's the wish of the Council.

MS. HOSETH: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I make a motion that AMBCC submits a proposal to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Board of Game, May 15th deadline regarding Emperor Geese for no permits issued to nonresidents.

MR. HARRIS: I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. We have a motion to develop a Board of Game proposal for the January 2021 Region 4 Board meeting. The gist of the proposal sounds like it will be to eliminate the nonresident season essentially for Emperor Geese and it's been seconded.

Discussion.

MR. HARRIS: Cyrus Harris here, Mr.

Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Go ahead, Cyrus.

Thank you.

MR. HARRIS: Yes, there can be some language in there on non-Federally qualified subsistence users. What's your thought, Gayla?

MS. HOSETH: Yeah, I agree with that.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Other discussion around this.

 MS. PLETNIKOFF: Hi, this is Karen Pletnikoff with the Aleutian Pribilof Islands Association. I wondered if it's appropriate to -- like they're doing for -- like we are doing for our regions, do some education and outreach to the nonresident hunters about why we need to do this conservation effort.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: I think it's

Page 25 appropriate. Yeah, I would agree with that. 2 discussion. Patty, how are you feeling about putting together a Board of Game proposal? 3 4 5 Patty, are you still with us? 6 7 MS. SCHWALENBERG: Oh, I'm sorry. I must have put it on mute and answered and then took it 8 9 off mute. 10 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: No worries. 11 12 MS. SCHWALENBERG: I said that's no 13 problem. I can do that and I'll probably have you 14 and/or Jason take a look at it to make sure it's all 15 good before we submit it. 16 17 18 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Great. I guess we probably should vote as a Council on this. We have 19 a motion that's been seconded. We've had a couple 20 ideas or suggestions for language to be included in it. 21 The details can be worked out with the proposal. Yeah, 2.2 I would ask the Executive Committee then to -- yeah, I 23 need somebody to call for the question. 24 25 This is Gayla. Question. 26 MS. HOSETH: 27 28 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The question has been 29 called. Patty, can you poll the committee. 30 31 MS. SCHWALENBERG: Sure. Alaska 32 Department of Fish and Game. 33 34 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yes. 35 MS. SCHWALENBERG: U.S. Fish and 36 Wildlife Service. 37 38 39 MR. TAYLOR: Yes. 40 MS. SCHWALENBERG: AMBCC Native Caucus. 41 42 MS. HOSETH: Yes. 43 44 45 MS. SCHWALENBERG: The motion passes, 46 Mr. Chairman. 47 48 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Perfect. appreciate that. Thank you, Eric and others, for 49 50

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

weighing in on that. Patty, after the meeting in the next day or so either I or Jason or maybe both of us will give you a call and we can help you walk through that.

As I recall, having looked at the agenda change request last November, the majority of what we're going to need is probably already in there. It's been written up and we'll be able to help get that put in place.

For members of the Council, just an FYI. The Board proposals are due May 15th. That's a change from most years where they're due May 1st given the pandemic situation. We're being a little bit --we're giving folks a little bit more time there. The meeting is scheduled for January of 2021 in Wasilla at the present time. So be looking for that in the near future.

MS. HOOPER: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. HOOPER: Hi, this is Jennifer Hooper. I had a quick question. I was just wondering with the review of the ACR by the Board of Game last fall, did they give any indication why they were not going to support it and allow it to come forward in their process?

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thanks, Jennifer. I'd have to go back and look at the teleconference notes. As I recall, there were two things. One was that they knew that they had a Region 4 Board of Game meeting coming and that an ACR is intended to take things out of cycle. Recognizing that we'd be dealing -- addressing proposals for maybe the most appropriate region for the fall/winter hunt they felt like the timeline was going to work.

The other question that comes up, and it's been something we've discussed as a Committee and a Council before, the total number of permits that are issues are 25. When we look at biologically the Board took that into consideration and didn't feel that 25 was -- continued harvest of 25 birds would be a biological emergency, which is one of the factors that ACRs are considered on. So those are the two things

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

that I recall specifically.

MS. HOOPER: Thanks. I was just curious if there was anything any different.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: No, it was a good question. Thank you. Anything else on Emperor Geese outreach and communication as well as development of a Board of Game proposal?

MR. HARRIS: Good morning. Cyrus

12 Harris here.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Go ahead, Cyrus.

Thank you.

2.2

MR. HARRIS: Regarding the Emperor Goose Management Plan it's very unfortunate that we're unable to get a count in the spring due to the COVID-19 pandemic I understand. Without those numbers it's a hard decision to try to make, but making an effort on the hypothesis that's been taking place would be a step on what we just discussed on the non-Federally subsistence users closure.

Just speaking my mind.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Cyrus. I think that very much so needs to be a part of that proposal making that very clear. I'm not sure where in -- and I don't know if we want to get too deep into this, but Emperor Geese are often -- at least since I've been involved, have been a fairly prominent discussion topic.

 Eric, Jason, maybe Julian, I don't know, can one of you guys provide just a very quick synopsis on what folks are thinking as far as what are we going to do without a survey.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair. This is Eric Taylor with Fish and Wildlife Service. We've got the three people on the call today that will help steer that direction. Jason Schamber is the chair of both the Pacific Flyway and the AMBCC Emperor Goose Subcommittee. Julian Fischer is head of our Waterfowl Section for the Fish and Wildlife Service and Chuck Frost is a biometrician with our Waterfowl Section.

So I know discussions have been underway. I'll let Jason chime in here, but I know Jason is trying to call an Emperor Goose Subcommittee meeting. Folks were not available prior to this meeting to meet, but I think Jason has proposed to hold that meeting later in May for the very discussions that I think were raised.

What are the options or alternatives to generate a 2020 population estimate for Emperor Geese knowing that due to the current Coronavirus pandemic the Fish and Wildlife Service has currently shut down all field work, including aerial surveys, one of which is the Yukon Delta Coastal Zone survey whereby we use that survey to produce an estimate or an index for Emperor Geese.

So I'll ask Jason or Julian perhaps to give an update other than what I've provided. Jason, any additional comments?

MR. SCHAMBER: Thanks, Eric. This is Jason Schamber, Alaska Department of Fish and Game. I don't have anything in addition to what you've just mentioned other than we're awaiting three or four folks that have not responded to do the polls so that we can set a subcommittee meeting for later this month. So as soon as I receive a full complement of responses from the subcommittee, then I can go ahead and schedule that and alert folks to when that meeting will take place.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay, great. Julian, did you have anything you wanted to add as well?

MR. FISCHER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Julian Fischer, Fish and Wildlife Service. No, I think Eric covered it. I will add though that I think it's very important for the Emperor Goose Subcommittee to meet and discuss this as a committee rather than have other sub-plans developed before we meet as a co-management body.

There's all sorts of ways that you can come up with an estimate for the number of Emperor Geese this year if a survey is not done based on modeling. The management plans that were developed, the Pacific Flyway and then the AMBCC for Emperor Geese, do not specify how to deal with the situation when we don't have an estimate for the current year.

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

We are in the process as a subcommittee moving towards updating the plan. Well, I guess the Coronavirus came one year too early, but it certainly highlights the need to come up with a plan that everyone agrees to in the event that a future survey might be cancelled.

That's all. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Julian. Yeah, it's one of the myriad of challenges we're all facing for sure. Okay. Thank you, Eric and Jason and Julian for just a quick update and kind of letting us know where things are headed at least. I guess it's likely we will hear from the subcommittee maybe not until next September. We can have some additional discussion on that or check in and see -- you know, there's a product of those meetings as they occur when they get wrapped up that we certainly want to share with the Council as a whole.

I think that concludes old business. Patty, am I tracking still correctly?

MS. SCHWALENBERG: Yes, you are.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: All right. So that's going to bring us to new business. I want to do a time check with folks and see if we're -- we've been going at it about an hour and 15 minutes or so. If anybody needs a short break or could we tackle maybe one more topic with Todd Sanders and then take a short break before we get into proposals. What's the wish of the Committee?

MS. SCHWALENBERG: Let's go one more.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. That works for me too. All right. Sounds good. Thank you, everybody. With that we will move into item 9 on the agenda under new business. The first topic is U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Headquarters briefing by Todd Sanders. Are you with us, Todd?

MR. SANDERS: I'm here. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members of the Council. I am Todd Sanders with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Migratory Bird Program at Headquarters.

I wanted to announce a new Director for the Fish and Wildlife Service since the last AMBCC meeting and then briefly talk about two issues. One is defining the scope of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and also addressing Common Raven conflicts. Then I'll briefly mention current hunting regulation issues.

So first of all, yes, Fish and Wildlife Service does have a new director, Aurelia Skipwith. Aurelia was confirmed by the Senate in December and currently serves as our new Director and shares the same priorities as the Department of Interior.

Regarding the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and defining the scope, the Fish and Wildlife Service has been working to define the scope of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act since at least 2015 and particularly related to incidental take. Most recently we published a proposed rule. We also published a notice of intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement. Both of those in early February.

 The notice identified specific information that we were seeking in the development of an Environmental Impact Statement. We also held four webinars for the public in March. The proposed rule included a paragraph to be added to our regulations that clarified the scope of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. It was a very short paragraph that specifically said that the Migratory Bird Treaty Act prohibitions apply only to affirmative actions that have as their purpose the taking or killing of migratory birds, their nest or their eggs.

We suspect the next step in the process will be the publication of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement and that will have at least a 45-day public comment period. After that time then there could be a Final Environmental Impact Statement with the response to public comment. Then a Record of Decision could follow as early as 30 days after that and there could be some final regulations associated with that as well.

At this point we just want to confirm that we'll continue to keep the AMBCC informed about any opportunities to provide public comments on the Draft EIS when it's available.

The next issue has to do with ravens

and addressing conflicts associated with ravens. Ravens have increased in abundance in some areas in the western United States in association with anthropogenic changes across the landscape. Ravens are intelligent birds and they're able to exploit the additional resources associated with municipalities and agriculture.

Increased raven abundance has resulted in increased complaints and concerns. Specifically there have been increased impacts to imperiled species. That includes Greater Sage-Grouse, the Desert Tortoise and even the Western Snowy Plover. Other impacts include human health and safety and also agriculture.

2.2

 So the Fish and Wildlife Service is working through a formal framework with stakeholders trying to address the conflict and develop a management strategy. We've held six webinars for stakeholders including the public and tribes in February and March. We've been requesting information to better understand the conflicts and management options. We've accepted information through an online portal through at least March.

Our tribal liaisons have sent a letter to the tribes inviting government-to-government consultation. I know a few tribes in Alaska have responded and we're working through those consultations now. The core team responsible for working through this conflict with the Service will continue to gather and review information throughout this spring and summer with the goal to help inform possible management options.

We recognize that it's a complex issue that may require short and long-term solutions and multiple scales. If the resultant effort and management strategy calls for any regulatory actions or changes that would be proposed for public comment and that may require development of an Environmental Impact Statement.

So I expect this work will continue. It started in early 2018, specifically February, and my guess is it will continue for potentially at least a couple more years to work our way through this complex issue. Again, we'll keep the AMBCC informed about any opportunity to provide additional public comment.

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

Lastly, I just wanted to mention a couple issues with the hunting regulations. We're currently working to publish our final regulations for the 2020 fall/winter hunting season. There aren't many changes from last year, but just a couple to mention. The most significant is in regard to Emperor Geese in Alaska and that's the quota has changed from 1,000 Emperor Geese down to 500.

Also Scaup and Pintail are well below the long-term averages nationally, 28 percent below for Scaup, 42 percent below for Pintail. This has resulted in reduced bag limits. Bag limits as small as one or two birds a day for these species. These Scaup and Pintail restrictions however do not impact Alaska. It does apply to all other states.

2.2

Finally, is the Coronavirus impact. As we look forward to regulations for the outyear, that is for next year, you already heard some about this this morning, but because of human health and travel restrictions in the United States and Canada we are unable to complete some of our surveys this spring and summer. This includes the May Waterfowl Survey. It's a national survey. Also many or most of our surveys in Alaska.

This missing data will impact use of some of our harvest strategies for informing harvest management decisions for the 2021 hunting season. This impacts not only our general duck season also season for duck species of concern, like Canvasback and Pintail, but also the Emperor Goose season which you've heard about this morning.

 In most cases we expect to be able to predict spring 2020 waterfowl abundance from long-term datasets and habitat information. We work with the Flyway Council and the AMBCC this spring and summer to identify ways to address this issue. So we'll continue to work together. I know the Emperor Goose Subcommittee is planning to meet as soon as possible and there will be continued dialogue with the Councils and we will provide information as that becomes available.

Thank you, Mr. Chair and the Council.

That concludes my briefing.

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Todd. Questions for Todd and the Service.

MR. SFORMO: This is the other Todd.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Go ahead, Todd.

 MR. SFORMO: This is Todd Sformo, North Slope Borough. I was just wondering since the scope of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act has been kind of redefined. I didn't get the language down, but affirmative actions related to hunting are only the ones that are going to be looked at by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

What about the other action that may lead to decimating numbers of birds? Is that being examined by Fish and Wildlife in a different way or is this just going to be an exemption or it's just allowed and there's really no discussion of it?

Thanks.

MR. SANDERS: Yeah, Todd. So what I've provided was the language that's being proposed and this language is a short paragraph that would be added to our regulations that would clarify the scope of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. That paragraph as proposed indicates that the Migratory Bird Treaty Act prohibitions apply only to affirmative actions. So those are actions that have as their purpose the taking or killing of migratory birds or nests or their eggs.

So the Fish and Wildlife Service works with stakeholders and public in a number of different ways. Not only through regulations but also consultation through, for example, Environmental Impact Statements or environmental assessments and other consultation. What we try and understand impacts of actions on migratory birds so we can try to make recommendations through that process.

 We also have best management practices, so we try and identify the best management practices for a number of issues and we make that information available to the public. Those documents are available online and we continue to develop those.

So there's a number of things here.

One is clarifying the scope of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Again, that's been a work in progress since at least 2015. The perspective has changed with the administration and we continue to receive guidance from the Department of Interior as we move along, but there are other ways that we can continue to protect and conserve migratory birds and I mentioned a few of those.

If Eric or others want to offer any other information, please do. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Thank you for that, both of you. Anything else? Specifically Eric. You identified anything you want to add to that?

2.2

MR. TAYLOR: No, Mr. Chair. Thank you. This is Eric Taylor with Fish and Wildlife Service. Todd, there was one addition to your report that I was wondering if you could provide an update to the AMBCC and while it pertains to the fall/winter season, it does include a change in how the regulations are set for our regions. It was a decision by the Service Regulations Committee just a short time ago. So I was wondering if you or Jason could just provide a quick update relative to that change.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$  SANDERS: Are you referring to the zone and split change?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I am. Sorry. I should have been specific. Go ahead.

MR. SANDERS: Yeah, so that regulation would not take effect, but that allows the State of Alaska to make a minor change to their zone split configuration, but that would not take effect until 2021 season. So we could talk more about that at that time. Essentially the change that we're talking about allows the State to split their season in the Southeast Zone, I believe it is.

Jason, if you want to provide any clarification, please do.

MR. SCHAMBER: No clarification, Todd. Thank you. This is Jason Schamber, Alaska Department of Fish and Game. As Todd mentioned, that allows us to have the option of selecting a split season for the

Southeast Zone.

 However, there is a step that we would have to go through before we were able to take advantage of that option, which is to go before the Board of Game at the Southeast Region meeting, which takes place in 2022. The earliest that that change may be implemented would be the fall of 2022.

Eric.

MR. TAYLOR: Thanks, Jason. This is

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yeah, thank you, Jason and Todd, for a little bit more information on that. Any other questions for Todd Sanders.

2.2

 MS. HOSETH: Mr. Chair. This is Gayla Hoseth. I just had a recommendation or encourage people on the phone for your tribal councils to participate with the government-to-government tribal consultation. Our tribe ended up talking with our government-to-government consultation for about two-and-a-half hours on the discussion of ravens and how important raven is to indigenous people.

So I encourage tribal members to take advantage of the government-to-government tribal consultation and have a meaningful dialogue that --meaningful conservation in regards to ravens. So I just wanted to put that out there.

 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Gayla. I would second that. Not only on the raven discussion, but as we get a little farther into the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, refining it and changes in language, not only for us as a Council, I think we need to stay engaged in that, but as far as other regional entities as well. I encourage you to dig into that as well and provide information to the Service or to the AMBCC so we can incorporate that as well.

MS. HOSETH: Mr. Chair. I think it's really important to put out there. I think only two tribes have participated in the state of Alaska. So with the 227 Federally recognized tribes we have, it's important that we get that word on the record. We should probably put this on the agenda item for discussion if we can at our fall meeting.

Page 36 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yeah, I absolutely 2 agree with that suggestion. 3 4 MR. SANDERS: I want to confirm, Gayla, that there was a document prepared by the AMBCC 5 documenting the value of ravens. I know that the core 6 team has received that information. 7 8 9 MS. HOSETH: Okay. Thank you. 10 MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair. This is Eric 11 12 Taylor. 13 14 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Please go ahead. 15 16 MR. TAYLOR: I was wondering if Crystal 17 Leonetti is still on the phone. If Crystal could just kind of give -- given Gayla's point, which is a good 18 If Crystal could kind of refresh all of our 19 memories in terms of, at least mine, the schedule or 20 process that if a tribe was interested in having a 21 government-to-government consultation, how they go 2.2 about doing that or if there's a schedule that's been 23 preestablished already. 24 25 26 Crystal, could you comment to that, 27 please. 28 29 (No response) 30 31 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Crystal, are you still 32 with us? 33 34 (No response) 35 MR. TAYLOR: It does not appear to be 36 the case that Crystal is still on the phone. So what I 37 will do is follow up with Crystal and ask her to 38 39 provide Patty an update in terms of that process and then get it out to all Council representatives and 40 perhaps we can increase the communication on that. 41 42 43 Thank you. 44 45 MS. BRYANT: This is Joanne Bryant and 46 I work closely with Crystal. She has an appointment at 10:00, but she will get back on. 47 48 49 MR. TAYLOR: Thanks, Joanne. That 50

Page 37 would be great. I'll try to alert her to the question. 2 3 Thank you. 4 5 MS. BRYANT: All right. Thank you. 6 7 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: We'll see where we're at when she gets back on, but towards the end of the 8 9 day we'll have an opportunity for Council and Staff comments and that may be a good opportunity for that as 10 well. 11 12 13 Any final questions of Mr. Sanders 14 before we move on to the next agenda items. 15 16 (No comments) 17 18 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Hearing none. That is going to bring us to the 2021 regulatory 19 proposals that we need to discuss. At this point I 20 would suggest maybe a 15-minute break before we get 21 into these. I suspect quite a bit of discussion with 2.2 the next two items. That's going to get us close to 23 our stop time. Does that work for everybody, say 15 24 minutes, and be back at 10:20? 25 26 27 Sounds good, Mr. Chair. MR. TAYLOR: 28 29 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. 30 31 MS. SCHWALENBERG: Mr. Chair. 32 Everybody should just stay on. 33 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: If folks would just 34 35 stay on the phone call, put yourselves on mute, and that way we'll try to avoid losing people and having to 36 have everybody call back in. We're not going to be 37 away for that long. Take 15, please, and we'll be 38 39 back. 40 (Off record) 41 42 (On record) 43 44 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Welcome back, 45 46 everybody. It's 10:20 and we're continuing to work 47 through the spring AMBCC agenda. So far we've completed up to the first topic under new business. 48 this point we will move right into AMBCC regulatory 49 50

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

Page 38 proposals for 2021. The first proposal is 2020-01. 2 Change in invitation regulation by AITRC. So I would entertain a motion to adopt the proposal and then we'll 3 move into discussion. 4 5 6 MS. HOSETH: Mr. Chair. This is Gayla. 7 I move. 8 9 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. We have a 10 motion to adopt Proposal 2020-01. I don't think we need.... 11 12 13 MS. EVANS: Second. 14 15 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: .....a second at this 16 point. Go ahead. I'm sorry. I stepped on somebody. 17 Go ahead. 18 19 MS. EVANS: No, I was going to second, but I think you were saying you don't need a second. 20 21 MS. SCHWALENBERG: Point of order. 2.2 23 get it to discussion you have to have a second. 24 25 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you. So we need that second. 26 27 28 MS. EVANS: This is Priscilla Evans. Т 29 second the motion. 30 31 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. From the 32 Committee I guess I'll ask for unanimous consent to the motion and then we'll move into discussion. 33 concerns with moving into discussion. 34 35 MS. HOSETH: Mr. Chair. This is Gayla. 36 You don't have to ask for unanimous consent. We just 37 38 go right into discussion. 39 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Gayla. 40 right. To start the discussion we did hear from Julian 41 on the Technical Committee report and I guess I'm 42 curious. Do folks want to actually hear the proposal 43 44 again for any clarification? Do we need that step? 45 46 MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair. This is Eric 47 Taylor with Fish and Wildlife Service. I think it

48 49 50 would be helpful to hear the proposal again, please.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Patty, could you read the proposal for us.

MS. SCHWALENBERG: Sure. Proposal 2020-01 and it's proposed by the Copper River Migratory Bird Regional Council by Karen Linnell through the Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission in Glennallen.

What problem or issue are you trying to address? Federal regulations found in 50 CFR 92.5 outline who is eligible to participate in spring and summer subsistence migratory bird hunting opportunities. Permanent residents of tribal communities and villages within eligible subsistence harvest areas are eligible to participate in the spring and summer subsistence migratory bird hunting opportunities.

2.2

 Immediate family members living in excluded areas as defined in 50 CFR 92.4 are also eligible to participate if they are invited by their respective tribal council to return to assist an immediate family member with meeting nutritional and other essential needs and for the teaching of cultural knowledge related to ancestral, customary and traditional bird hunting.

The existing process for tribal councils to invite immediate family members however does not work well in some regions likely due to overburdened tribal administrative staff. This also likely explains why only two formal invitations to hunt have been submitted to the AMBCC throughout the history of migratory bird co-management in Alaska.

 The Copper River Migratory Bird Regional Council and AITRC seeks to more fully utilize the process outlined in letters of submittal ratifying the Canadian and Mexican protocols by amending 50 CFR 92.5(d) to provide the option of utilizing a tribally-authorized and certified invitation to hunt permit issued by authorized tribal representative through the Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission.

This amendment will not change anything associated with the existing regulations regarding the process of certifying and authorizing Invite through letters of invitation, but would provide the additional option for a region or an individual tribe to utilize

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

a tribal permit to certify and authorize an invited immediate family member to assist in providing nutritional, cultural and educational training regarding customer in traditional ancestral hunting and uses of migratory birds.

The Canadian and Mexican protocol amendments and letters of transmittal to the U.S. Congress from the U.S. Secretaries of State include the following description of the process to authorize invited hunters: "In recognition of their need to assist their immediate families in meeting their nutritional and other essential needs or for the teaching of cultural knowledge to or by their relatives, Natives residing in excluded areas in Alaska may be invited to participate in the customary spring and summer migratory bird harvest within the designated subsistence harvest areas around the villages in which their immediate families have membership.

2.2

Such participation would require permission of the Village Council and an appropriate permit issued through the management body implementing the protocol. Immediate family includes children, parents, grandparents and siblings." (Letter of Submittal regarding ratification of the Canadian protocol, Secretary of State Warren Christopher May 20, 1996)

 The proposed regulatory change would bring Federal regulations into alignment Migratory Bird Treaty protocol amendments given that only federally recognized Alaska tribes are able to certify and authorize an invited hunter is a tribal citizen of said tribe with an immediate family member residing in the respective eligible tribal community.

 How should the new regulation read? 50 CFR 92.5(d) would be amended as follows: (d) Participation by permanent residence of excluded areas. Immediate family members who are residents of excluded areas may participate in the customary spring and summer subsistence harvest in tribal communities subsistence area with permission of the tribal council rather than village to assist indigenous habitants in meeting their nutritional and other essential needs or for the teaching of cultural knowledge using one of the following procedures:

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

(1) A letter of invitation may be sent by the tribal council to the hunter with a copy to the Executive Director of the Co-management Council who will inform law enforcement and the Service's AMBCC Coordinator within two working days. The Service will then inform any affected Federal agency when residents of excluded areas are allowed to participate in the subsistence harvest within their federal land; or

(2) A permit may be issued by the tribal council or their authorized tribal representative to the invited hunter certifying that the permit holder is an immediate family member authorized to assist eligible family members in hunting migratory birds in the tribe's subsistence harvest area.

2.2

To what geographic area does this regulation apply? The proposed regulatory change would apply for this region only by providing an alternative method of certifying and authorizing invited hunters living in excluded areas to return home to assist in migratory bird hunting. This proposed regulatory change could also be considered statewide by the AMBCC if they so choose.

The intent of this proposal is to provide the option for federally recognized tribes in the Ahtna Traditional Use Territory or the Upper Copper River Region as defined in 50 CFR 92.5(a)(2)(i), or some other region (if statewide), to issue tribal permits certifying invited hunters as immediate family members of permanent residents of eligible subsistence harvest areas rather than submitting letters of invitation to the hunter and Executive Director of the AMBCC that then must be further shared with Federal enforcement officers and land managers.

What impact will this regulation have on migratory bird populations? The proposed regulatory change likely would have no impacts on the status of migratory bird populations or the subsistence harvest levels of migratory birds in Alaska. This regulatory change will not increase the extent of nutritional, cultural or educational needs of the eligible subsistence harvest areas given that invited hunters are only authorized to assist immediate family members who are permanent residents of eligible communities in fulfilling their needs.

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

How will this regulation affect subsistence users? The proposed regulatory change would simplify the process of inviting tribal citizens living in excluded areas to return home to their tribal community to assist immediate family members in meeting their nutritional and other essential needs and for the teaching of cultural knowledge.

Invited hunters would simply have to carry their permit with them along with their hunting license rather than have to worry about whether the appropriate Federal land manager or enforcement officer had received the notification of their invitation by another Federal agency. A permit would also be smaller and less cumbersome to carry than a letter of invitation.

2.2

Invited hunters would not have to worry about whether State of Alaska enforcement officers or land managers would question their eligibility given that current regulations do not require notification of State of Alaska agencies regarding invited spring and summer subsistence bird hunters.

 Why should this regulation be adopted? The proposed regulatory change should be adopted to provide alternative methods of authorizing invited bird hunters in addition to tribal letters of invitation. The proposed regulatory change would also reduce the burden on Federal agency staff and to better fulfill the original intent of the bird treaty amendments by more meaningfully involving indigenous Alaskan Native tribes and the co-management of subsistence migratory bird hunting and promoting tribal sovereignty and self-determination regarding the authorization of tribal citizens.

 Please see attached draft permit template. During the development of this proposal it was suggested that the names of the eligible permanent residents of a tribal community in an eligible subsistence harvest area also be listed on the permit. However, in many cases the number of qualifying immediate family members makes the suggestion untenable given the available space on the permit.

Tribal certification and authorization that the permit holder is a qualified immediate family member and is invited to return home to help family

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

members hunt birds in spring and summer should be sufficient given that existing letters of invitation processes do not require this level of detail.

Then the proposer attached a draft copy of what the permit would look like. That's the end of the proposal, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Patty. I apologize. Thanks for reading it all the way through. I don't know that, at least on the next one, we'll need all the detail, but thank you for doing that.

So the Committee has heard the proposal. We also have consideration of the Technical Committee report. We'll open the floor to discussion.

MS. STICKWAN: Hello. This is Gloria.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Gloria. Go

ahead.

Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: I was at a mandatory training for my job and I was not able to participate in the discussion when this proposal was discussed at the Copper River Migratory Bird Council meeting. Jim Simon was there, so if he could speak to this proposal. For me that would be good.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Thank you,

Jim, do you have some comments.

MR. SIMON: Hi, Mr. Chair. Thank you very much. Jim Simon for the record. I believe that the executive director of Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission is on the line as well and I would like to defer to her comments. Upon her request, if there is additional information needed, I'm happy to get back on.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Thank you, Jim.

Karen, do you have some comments?

MS. LINNELL: Yes, sir. I did submit a

letter on April 29th to Patty Schwalenberg in answer to the Technical Committee's issues. Then I'd just like to remind this Council that AITRC does have a contract with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to assist the Copper River tribes in their management of the Migratory Bird Co-management application.

So in answer to the question brought forward by the Committee, village council versus tribal council, including both terms in the regulation would be appropriate for the reasons that were stated.

2.2

Request to specify titles of individuals who are able to serve as authorized tribal representatives. The tribe's office already they're delegates. The tribal council president isn't necessarily the one that's going to be doing all the work. So the council is already designated as an individual, but we are looking at AITRC to be a designee and that could be done via the resolutions that have been already submitted that allow us to manage the migratory bird program or through a formal resolution if you so desire.

And then to the issue requiring personally identifiable kinship or familial details on that hunt. There's already an invitation system under which the tribes can invite back a family member to hunt in order to meet eligible tribal members nutritional needs and to convey cultural aspects to it. This merely is a supplement to that system, creating a more formal administration for the Ahtna Regional tribes so that we can effectively out-source that invitation management.

AMBCC should not need any information from this system that is not required in the invitation system that you already have in place. In other words, we shouldn't be required to provide more information than the letters of invitation already have. Nothing in 50 CFR 92.5 suggests that the letter of invitation must include any type of kinship information. Only that there must be an immediate family relationship.

Invitation to the hunt permit length. We felt that it was a little more restrictive than the current letter of invitation. However, after consulting with our board, our co-management council, they agreed that there should be a term length and that

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

term length should be two years only because people move and things change and we want to make sure that we're still in compliance. So we'll put an expiration date on those permits.

And then as far as this being eligible to other regions, it's an option. If the other region should choose to get involved, they can.

I just want to give an example of some of the things going on. I live in Glennallen. My father lives in Gakona. He's 85 years old, but I can go out and get, if invited through this permit system, I would be able to go and hunt for him and get him birds so that he can have that delicacy during the spring season. We were talking about it this weekend, but I can't go out and get it for him at this point because I live in Glennallen. I'll need this invitation to participate in that hunt with him.

2.2

We also had an elder who recently moved to Anchorage for medical reasons. He has grandchildren that live in Chistochina and for him to be able to come back and pass down that knowledge to his grandchildren is a key component that his grandkids are going to be missing. So having this ability to issue that permit for him so that he might come home and share his knowledge with his grandchildren is an important part of this tradition.

I'll just hand it back over to Jim because I'm fumbling over things. This is the first time I'm participating in your meetings. So the lingo and the vocabulary, the process that you have is new to me. I apologize for any fumbling that I'm doing.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Karen, no need to apologize. I fumble enough for all of us, so I appreciate the company.

MS. LINNELL: Jim, did I miss anything or do you want to add to this?

MR. SIMON: Thank you. Through the Chair. This is Jim Simon for the record. I do not have anything to add at this time, but will be happy to help address any questions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Jim.

Questions of Karen or Jim or other discussion.

MR. TAYLOR: Hi, Karen. This is Eric Taylor with Fish and Wildlife Service. Thank you for summarizing the proposal and many of the points that the Technical Committee raised. I was just wondering in your own words how would the permit that's being proposed, the permit process, be less burdensome?

I know your proposal mentioned that the current process is burdensome both to tribal villages and also to Federal agencies. I'm just wondering in your thoughts why the permit process would be less onerous or more efficient than the invitation letter.

2.2

 MS. LINNELL: Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission works very closely with all of our tribes, but not only that we're intimately familiar with who lives in our communities. We participate in community events in our villages. We go to funerals and potlatches and we have kids that play ball together. We have community ball games where all the villages get together and participate in softball and things.

 So we're intimately familiar with who's living in our communities and if not a simple phone call would suffice. At least the administrators have that time to answer a phone call. Not so much to draft a letter and pull things together and things like that. So we're not looking to -- we're just trying to simplify things as much as possible for both the invitee and the tribal councils.

MS. STICKWAN: I would like to say something here. Gloria Stickwan, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Go ahead, Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: I know for Tazlina as well as I'm sure in other villages we have high staff turnover. People change in the administrator. Because it changes it makes it harder for the new administrator to come on board and to be able to know who's on the list, who's not on the list, where the letter went to that was mailed.

Whereas AITRC is more -- they have

 Thank you.

constant personnel working there and they would have this permanent letter from our village saying these are people that are tribal and they're allowed to hunt and their families can come back to hunt. It would simplify it for us in that way because of high turnover staff.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Gloria. Thank you, Karen, as well. Other questions. I guess I have a few, but I want to make sure that we get everything out there.

MS. HOSETH: Mr. Chair. This is Gayla.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Go ahead, Gayla.

15 Thank you.

2.2

MS. HOSETH: Hi. I wanted to thank Karen for her time and effort to put this proposal in and then also to advocate for the Ahtna people of how important it is for our tribal members and our extended family members living in urban areas to come out for bird hunting with our families that live here. It's really important.

For things to be so stringent of what's required of this permit just seems -- I wasn't a part of that Technical Committee discussion. I had other meetings. But I just wanted to make that clear for the record that I was not at that Technical Committee meeting.

We also -- Yaquillrit Kelutisti Council here at BBNA submitted a proposal last year for the invitation requirement and that went to committee, so that hasn't even been acted upon yet. I think it's important that we address these concerns for the invitation.

 Right now when we look on Page 3 of the Regulations Booklet it's very simply stated in there of what's required. We don't need to make this be a cumbersome process for anybody and to provide all of the information. I think all of the information the Technical Committee was suggesting. I would like to have us consider bringing this to the Invitation Committee along with the other invitation proposals that are in the docket waiting to be acted on.

I know that BBNA has one and I think

there's another one. Patty and I were trying to figure out which other region submitted an invitation proposal. If you have a proposal holding, let us know. I think there's two. If we can have an Invitation Committee meeting and then recess this meeting, not close on this meeting, because we have until August for the Pacific Flyway Council meeting to act.

If we're able to have an Invitation Committee meeting, discuss all of these things and address all of these proposals that need to be acted on and then meet again here in May possibly to take action on these invitation proposals is what I would recommend so that we can address Ahtna's concerns, BBNA's concerns and also -- because right now the invitation -- the letters aren't being done and we want to make sure that people are not criminals for participating in our traditional lifestyle.

2.2

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you for that, Gayla. Just to put a little on the record here too. I think we all want to see this work and for all the reasons that have been expressed this morning and moving forward, however we choose to do that, I'm very supportive in getting this sorted out for folks to where they're comfortable with it.

Gayla, just to make sure I'm clear on your suggestion, the suggestion would be to table this discussion and then convene at an Invitation Committee meeting to -- and I'm going to insert a word -- to discuss this on a much larger scale rather than just Ahtna or BBNA. Would we look at it from all the regional councils? Is that the intent?

MS. HOSETH: No. We have proposals -there's a number of proposals that have gone to
different committees. We have like the fall and winter
dates that we had in there for years now. For us to
act on these proposals I want us to be able to act on
-- it would be on the proposals that we have currently
in there for invitation requirements.

So if Ahtna was wanting to do a permit system, BBNA -- we were proposing for tribal ID cards to just be present. I don't think there should be a timeline on how long this invitation is for. People are coming back to their traditional homeland to participate to help immediate family members hunt

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

birds. 2 So it would be not to table this, to 3 move these into the Invitation Committee for discussion 4 with all of the invitational proposals that are sitting 5 in there. When we get to the end of our meeting here 6 today, that we do not adjourn, that we recess, and then 7 we reconvene let's say at the end of this month or the 8 9 first -- probably the first week in June would be best, and then we take action on these invitation proposals. 10 Because we still have time in order for the Pacific 11 Flyway Council in August. 12 13 14 So that would be my suggestion. put that in a form of a motion if we wanted to have 15 more discussion. 16 17 18 MS. STICKWAN: I have a question. is Gloria. 19 20 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Go ahead, Gloria. 21 2.2 Thank you. 23 24 MS. STICKWAN: I was wondering who's on 25 the Technical Committee. 26 27 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Good question. Ι 28 wondered the same thing. 29 MS. HOSETH: Gloria, this is on the 30 Invitation Committee. Maybe, Patty, you have that. 31 32 MS. SCHWALENBERG: Yeah. The Technical 33 Committee.... 34 35 MR. SIMON: Mr. Chairman. I think I 36 37 can help. 38 39 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay, one second. Patty, do you have something to add there? 40 41 42 MS. SCHWALENBERG: I was just saying I can look up the committee list if you want to know 43 44 who's on the Invitation Committee. 45 46 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: I think at some point 47 that would be great. We'll go ahead and continue the discussion. I apologize, I didn't recognize the voice 48 of the gentleman who suggested they could help us here. 49

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

1 MR. SIMON: Yes, chairman of the 2 Invitation to Hunt Committee, Jim Simon.

you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Go ahead, Jim. Thank

MR. SIMON: Thank you. I recently in 2019 was appointed to be the chairman of the Invitation to Hunt Committee. I previously served on the Invitation to Hunt Committee beginning in 2004. Those experiences, sending a proposal to the Invitation to Hunt Committee is the place where proposals go to die from my experience.

I did try to call for an Invitation to Hunt Committee this past fall, but that was not able to happen, which is why the Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission working with its regional co-management council for birds submitted this proposal as a step forward in the process.

I'd just like to also remind the Council that beginning in 2004 with the Invitation to Hunt Committee process it took 10 years and two proposals from the Fairbanks Native Association to actually get the allowed Invitation to Hunt Program in regulation.

 I do not believe we can wait another 10 years in order to make further advancement in this program given that the program has been in existence for 16 years and there are only two letters of invitation in the state.

So while I support the intent of the discussions from the chair of the Alaska Native Caucus with the Alaska Migratory Bird Co-Management Council, I think that deferring and putting this to committee is likely, if we look at institutional history, will mean no further action.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Jim.

MS. LINNELL: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Go ahead.

Phone: 907-243-0668 Fax: 907-243-1473

MS. LINNELL: This is Karen Linnell. 2 3 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Please, Karen. 4 you. 5 I oppose waiting another 6 MS. LINNELL: month even. You have the whole week here that's been 7 planned for a migratory bird meeting and that got --8 9 you know, it turned into this teleconference. If those committee meetings were to happen, the Caucus would 10 have met the day before. We're not having a caucus 11 today. This is somebody coming from the outside 12 13 looking in. I'd rather have some sort of action or if 14 you're going to postpone it 15 16 As far as other proposals that were 17 submitted, I believe I had heard of Bristol Bay's last year when we were writing this, but I didn't know that 18 no action had been taken on it at all. So I'd much 19 rather see some action myself and get this taken care 20 21 of. 2.2 23 MS. STICKWAN: Hello. This is Gloria, Mr. Chair. 24 25 26 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Go ahead, Gloria. 27 Thank you. 28 29 MS. STICKWAN: At our last meeting it was recommended that we write from the council Native 30 Caucus, it's in the minutes as well, that they said 31 32 they wanted this to be a regional proposal. So we went back and made it regional. Now they want to look at 33 the three regions that submitted a proposal. 34 35 sounds like now it's going to try and become a statewide proposal is what it sounds like. 36 37 38 How's that going to change it for us? 39 We're going to have to go back to our committee and say this was deferred and now we're going to -- this was 40 changed or, you know, could be changed and now we're 41 going to reconsider again and go back to our council. 42 And we did what we're supposed to do when we made it 43 44 into a regional proposal as the Native Caucus wanted. So I'd like to see this move forward. 45 46 47 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Gloria. 48 49 Eric, do you want to weigh in here?

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Eric Taylor with Fish and Wildlife Service. I think it's fair to say all of us want to reach a resolution to this. I'm appreciative of Gayla's comment that there are alternatives out there that have been considered for this topic that have been tabled.

I'm certainly appreciative of Jim Simon's comment that it's difficult at times to call -- for a chair to call people together. People are often busy. It can be a frustrating and unrewarding process to be a chair and trying to move something forward.

And I understand Gloria's point that effort has been put in from her region to try to move something forward that mitigates or avoids perhaps frustration or delay.

2.2

 This is a complicated topic. I think it's probably fair to say that there's some regional differences among tribal villages and tribal councils on how best to address this. Speaking from my point of view it would be nice to adopt a statewide process that's consistent that we can all get behind. That is going to require a bit more discussion.

I do think it's important to know who sits on the Invitation Committee to make sure that for those regions that are interested in weighing in on this that they have a voice at the table.

Finally, I agree that this should not linger. I'm not for sure if a committee meeting could be pulled together like Gloria recommended perhaps in the next week, but I do agree that I think this could be done in the next month and in time for the Pacific Flyway Council to consider it.

Substantive effort has been put into this by the Technical Committee and I applaud their five-page in-depth report. The Solicitor has been involved. All of you I think have had at least some say in this.

So I understand the level of frustration. I understand the level of interest. My recommendation would be to put in the Invitation Committee. I would ask for Patty to refresh our memories on who sits in on that committee and get a

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

commitment from those individuals so that if Jim sends out a poll or contacts people, that they give a commitment to attend and that's a priority.

I think I can speak for Julian Fischer who chaired the Technical Committee and put a substantive amount of effort in. They too would like to see this reached to a resolution.

So those are my thoughts, Mr. Chair.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Eric. Patty, do you have the list of folks that we could identify and continue this conversation along those lines?

2.2

MS. SCHWALENBERG: Yes, I do. The Invitation Subcommittee is comprised of Jim Simon as the chair with the following members: Jason Schamber, Rory Stark, Taqulik Hepa, Peter Devine, Gayla Hoseth, Gloria Stickwan, Randy Mayo and Coral Chernoff. We also have included Ken Lord and Anna Crary as the two legal advisors in case we ever need them.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Patty.

MR. SIMON: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Please go.

MR. SIMON: Jim Simon. One of the challenges I experienced in the fall in trying to organize an invitation to hunt committee is that I don't have the contact information for the list of those committee members. So that would be helpful to get.

 Also I will take off my Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission hat at this time and put my Tanana Chiefs Conference hat on now. This has been discussed by the Interior Regional Bird Co-management Council and we are 100 percent opposed to a permit requirement for the invitation to hunt procedure.

Thank you. 1 2 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Thank you, Jim. 3 Further discussion or questions. 4 5 6 MR. AHMASUK: Hi, Ryan. This is 7 Brandon. 8 9 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thanks, Brandon. 10 Please go ahead. 11 12 MR. AHMASUK: So I'm going to have to 13 agree with Gayla. There's easier ways to do this. Just like for the handicraft issue that we spent years 14 on, you know, we came up with the regulation, just a 15 tribal ID card. That's one way of going about it. 16 17 18 For our region, having a permit system in place and/or giving tribal council approval also may 19 not work for our region. Some of our villages are very 20 small. There could be disagreements amongst a 21 community where a tribal member may not get permission 2.2 to come back if they're on the wrong side of the 23 24 argument. 25 So there are easier ways to handle 26 this. For Kawerak right now I'd have to say that we 27 wouldn't be in support of a permit system for our area. 28 I mean if other areas are wanting to do that and I 29 believe it was already spoken that it be a regional 30 proposal, we'd be fine with that. Certain areas, if 31 32 that's what they want to do, that's fine. 33 34 The other area, I'm going to have to 35 disagree with Eric having a statewide. You know, how practical is this for other regions. So for the Bering 36 Strait Region we have one U.S. Fish and Wildlife 37 38 Service law enforcement officer from St. Michaels, 39 Stebbins, Shishmaref, Gambell, to Unalakleet. How practical is this. 40 41 42 Anyway, those are my comments for now. Again, Kawerak, I believe we'd be against a permit 43 44 system. We'd be more for having just a tribal ID card. Something easier for out here. 45 46 47 Thank you. 48

Computer Matrix, LLC 135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501

49

50

Phone: 907-243-0668 Fax: 907-243-1473

CHAIRMAN SCOTT:

Thank you, Brandon.

Other comments, questions. 2 MS. LINNELL: This is Karen Linnell. 3 So from the sounds of it other regions weren't 4 interested in this. To move things forward, this is 5 something that we're moving to get the ball rolling. 6 This is not to preempt or to stop the tribal 7 identification piece. If that ever happens, I'm sure 8 9 our tribes would be more than happy to go that route as they do have tribal IDs. At this point, this is our 10 attempt to get the ball rolling and it is a regional 11 proposal. 12 13 14 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Karen. 15 16 MR. AHMASUK: Ryan, this is Brandon. 17 18 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Go ahead, Brandon. 19 Thank you. 20 MR. AHMASUK: The one thing I forgot to 21 mention was all of these harvest whatnot out here 2.2 anywhere where we're highly dependant upon this, it was 23 all originally set up for us in a customary and 24 traditional manner. Permits, all this extra other 25 stuff, you know, it's not customary and traditional. 26 27 28 Again, I'm not trying to take away from 29 a regional proposal. Again, if that's what they want, that's what they want. I think we do need to keep that 30 in mind when we're thinking about a lot of this stuff 31 32 is -- you know, keeping it customary and traditional, but when you start adding stuff little by little you 33 start getting away from that. 34 35 Anyway, thank you. 36 37 38 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Brandon. 39 Good point. Appreciate you mentioning that. 40 MR. FISCHER: Mr. Chair. Julian 41 42 Fischer. I have a question, please. 43 44 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Go ahead, Julian. 45 Thank you. 46 47 MR. FISCHER: Julian Fischer, Fish and Wildlife Service. So just in studying this proposal a 48 little bit more and hearing the reading of it again, I 49 50

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

just wanted to note that it calls for a change to the current process as well as an addition of a new process.

Specifically, the current process which involves a letter of invitation from the village or tribal council going to the Executive Director of the AMBCC, under this proposal that option would become optional. So it would be a change to the current process.

I bring that up just so that if the Council decided to vote on this particular proposal, it would result in a change for the letter option for one region and not the others. So the other regions if they continued with the current process, they would submit a letter inviting a hunter to participate, but the Director of the AMBCC would not be informed with the exception of the one region.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Julian.

MS. LINNELL: I don't believe it was our intent to change the other regions in the invitation letter. This is optional. Our region can do the permit or the letter.

MR. FISCHER: This is Julian. The only thing I was pointing out is that the proposal submitted by AITRC called for a change in the letter of invitation being sent to the AMBCC. Instead it would just go directly to the invited hunter. That was written when this was a statewide proposal. I'm just curious if that would still remain in the revised proposal if it was just one region only.

 $\label{eq:CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Karen, do you want to respond to that?} \\$ 

 MS. LINNELL: The invitation letter goes to the individual invited to hunt. A copy goes to the AMBCC Coordinator, correct, as it is now?

MR. FISCHER: That's the current process, but the wording of the proposal is it replaces the word will be sent to Executive Director and replaces it with may be sent to the Executive Director.

MS. LINNELL: That's not our intent to change any of the current process except for to our region.

MR. FISCHER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yeah, thank you, Karen, for clarifying that. Rory, are you still on the line with us?

MR. STARK: Yeah, Ryan, this is Rory Stark with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hi, Rory. Thank you. I have a quick question in a broad stroke if you will. Are there issues that we're aware of as far as people taking advantage of the ability to be able to return home and hunt for others?

2.2

 I think I've heard just about everybody say that we're all in support of that and we're trying to work through the details and how to crack that, but I'm curious about are there actual problems that we're trying to fix here rather than some technical issues we need to work through.

 MR. STARK: Right. So as Brandon mentioned, we don't have a lot of enforcement officers out, especially currently. Things have -- you know, for a number of reasons we don't have as many field officers out as we used to. However, when we did have more and when we did do more field contacts, one of the primary violations we found in the spring hunt was that folks from excluded areas, i.e. Anchorage and other towns, would come out and hunt during the spring hunt. Many times those folks would not have immediate family members in those areas. So that was one of the -- when we were looking at past violations, that was one of the more prevalent violations.

Did that answer your question, Ryan?

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: It does, yeah. Thank you very much. So I guess I -- you know, we definitely have some differing opinions on this topic and how to move forward. Gayla or Eric, do you guys have anything else to add? I'm probably going to be looking for some procedural help here to get us going again.

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

MS. HOSETH: Mr. Chair. This is Gayla. I understand all sides that are coming at this. It's really difficult for us to have such a short timeframe to have discussions. Whereas if we were in Anchorage for the week, we would be able to have conversations with one another and actually have an Invitation Committee before our meeting to take action on this proposal.

That's why I think it's really important that we -- this isn't going to be in effect until 2021, so there's no reason to rush to take action right now. I don't want it to die going to Invitation Committee. I think that we need to have an Invitation Committee discuss this proposal if it wants to be regionally for the Ahtna Region.

2.2

The one that is sitting in the Invitation Committee right now is a statewide proposal and maybe there could be ors that are added onto either a letter or a permit or a tribal ID. It just needs to have further discussion in committee. That committee is an invitation also for people to participate on these committees.

But that would be my recommendation and that we come back and we recess our meeting and we take action on it because these aren't going to be in effect until 2021.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Gayla.

MS. LINNELL: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Oh, go ahead, please.

MS. LINNELL: Thank you for that, Gayla. I would be okay with that, but should the committee not move forward by this June date, that I don't want things to get held up and stopped. Jim had said there's a history of it getting to that point and then it just stays there or doesn't move forward.

So if we can say that for our region and our regional we agree to it that this is a regional proposal, that by that June meeting if the AMBCC Invitation to Hunt Committee does not meet, the Ahtna proposal will move forward as it is written with the

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

 Eric, can....

exception of the clarifying language that we just had discussion on, that this won't change anything in the invitation to hunt at this point.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Karen. So

folks who were listed on the Invitation Committee, I don't remember all the names and I apologize for that, but the lion share are on the line right now. Just thinking about your own personal calendars and what you have going, would that work to get a group together under the leadership of Jim in the next few days, I guess, or the next week or so so we can keep this moving.

13 movin

I am in 100 percent support of both Karen's and Jim's statements that we don't want to see this die and just languish there.

I'll start with you, Jim. What do you think? Do you have time to call a committee meeting?

MR. SIMON: I have only time available on Friday this week.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you. Well, that makes it pretty clear.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$  DEVINE: Mr. Chair. This is Peter Devine, Aleutian Pribilof Region. I am available this week.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Peter.

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$  CHERNOFF: This is Coral Chernoff. I'm available anytime.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Coral.

MS. HEPA: This is Taqulik. I'm available, but any time after 10:00 a.m. on Friday. I have something earlier in the morning.

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$  STICKWAN: This is Gloria. I'm available after 10:00 in the morning on Friday.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay.

MS. EVANS: This is Priscilla. I am after 10:00 a.m. Friday morning.

1 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Perfect. Thank you, 2 Priscilla.

MS. HOSETH: Mr. Chair. Maybe we could do a Doodle poll and if we could see what time works for everybody. I know that with all the COVID stuff that everybody is working on our schedules are pretty tight. I understand the importance of getting this done, but if we did a Doodle poll and if that was something we wanted to do, if we were going to recess this meeting and come back, we also need to figure out what date would work out best to bring this back.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yeah, I agree. Very good point. Eric, your thoughts.

MS. LINNELL: Well, just in listening to the conversation that just happened with a lot of the Committee members they said they're available Friday after 10:00. You know, I guess it would be just as to when the AMBCC is going to reschedule to resume the meeting.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yeah, I agree with that. Eric, you were going to say something.

MR. TAYLOR: Rory Stark sits on the Invitation Committee. I'll let Rory explain his availability or not.

MR. STARK: Yeah, this is Rory Stark with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Law Enforcement. I'm available on Friday after 10:00 or anytime.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. So I guess I feel like I've heard from the majority of the Invitation Committee members, including the Chair. Thank you, Jim. At this point I would make a suggestion that we -- and I don't want to mess up the wording here.

I need to know do we actually need to table this discussion and then when we get to the end of today we would recess with a date certain that we need to figure out very quickly when to come back for this proposal discussion after the Invitation Committee has met.

MR. DEVINE: Mr. Chair. This is Peter.

I believe when something is tabled it cannot be brought back, so it would be just recess. I would suggest recess until Monday.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Peter.

MS. LINNELL: You can table to a time certain the end of this meeting. And then because this meeting is going to be recessed and resumed it would still be part of that.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yeah. Eric and Gayla, how are you feeling about this course of action?

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair. This is Eric Taylor with Fish and Wildlife Service. I'm comfortable with that recommendation.

2.2

MS. HOSETH: Yeah, Mr. Chair, this is Gayla and I am as well. We don't have to meet in June. We can meet sooner than June. I was just saying by June before everybody gets busy this summer. So if people are free to reconvene on Monday, that would move us to acting on this proposal. If we reconvene in the next couple weeks. It doesn't have to be June. I was just putting it out there that we don't want to go beyond June to bring it back.

 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: I appreciate that very much. I think in the spirit of making sure that we do continue forward, we'll try to meet -- the AMBCC will try to meet relatively soon. I don't know that it necessarily needs to be Monday and potentially that's when I would think you're suggestion of putting a Doodle poll out or having Patty poll the Council to see when we can reconvene.

So this would be -- again, I apologize. I need some procedural help on this. Patty or whoever else can help us out here. I think we should leave this discussion that we're having and Jim, if you will call an Invitation Committee meeting for Friday, I would appreciate that. Then we will determine as a Council when we can regroup. We won't adjourn today. What we'll do is recess. I'm not sure what we need to do technically with this discussion, if anything, or if we just take a motion to do that.

Patty, maybe you could help us out

here.

MR. SIMON: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Go ahead, please.

MR. SIMON: Thank you. Jim Simon. I think it's important for the Executive Committee to actually charge us with a duty. My reading of it right now is to resolve the 16 years of effort by the Council and Invitation to Hunt Committee Friday afternoon or late morning. I don't know how any of those conversations will alter the desires of the Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission where you can't do anything there without a permit. I do not see that changing.

2.2

I'm pretty sure that the Ahtna Region has no interest in requiring this permit system to be implemented statewide. We've heard clearly there is opposition to that. We've heard clearly that the Fish and Wildlife Service keeps bringing up a statewide approach to this. That's not going to work.

So I would like some clear delegation of responsibility and what it is you're charging the Invitation to Hunt Committee to achieve by the close of business on Friday.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: That's a fair statement, fair request. Again, Patty, any recommendations on how we leave this topic with the intent of time certain picking it back up?

MS. SCHWALENBERG: From what I understand the proposal by Bristol Bay Native Association or BBNA's migratory bird committee is still at the Invitation Committee level. Gayla, correct me if I'm wrong. We want the Invitation Committee to look at that proposal and see if it can be integrated into the Ahtna proposal feasibly.

As AITRC suggested, it could be either a region or statewide proposal. I'm thinking it would be -- it's people's choice or region's choice what they want to do, but we could work -- the committee would then work with the BBNA proposal and the Ahtna proposal

to see if there is some way to get both proposals passed.

The third proposal that Gayla and I were trying to think of actually was not a proposal. It was a verbal issue identified by Tanana Chiefs and that was people that live in the urban areas that have been invited to go to a different community to hunt because their community is cost prohibitive to get to their own community. So that was another issue that was brought up. It was not brought up in the form of a proposal.

MS. HOSETH: Mr. Chair. This is Gayla. Right when you asked me, Patty, my call dropped, so I missed everything you said. If you were directing a question towards me, I apologize.

2.2

MS. SCHWALENBERG: I actually was just clarifying that we want the Invitation Committee to take the Bristol Bay proposal and see how it can be integrated into Ahtna's proposed regulation, is that correct?

MS. HOSETH: Yeah, I think that we should if we have invitation proposals that are sitting in Invitation Committee. I think there was a BBNA one and there was also another one that maybe there isn't. Maybe it's just this one. But if things have sat in this committee as Jim has stated and it hasn't moved anywhere, there's quite a number of proposals that are in different committees that aren't moving anywhere.

 I was just trying to say if we're going to make a regulatory change for an invitation requirement when we also have submitted a proposal that needs action as to whether or not it's going to be decided upon, I think that that is a fair process for all the regions across the state.

 $$\operatorname{CHAIRMAN}$$  SCOTT: Thank you, both Patty and Gayla, for that.

MS. STICKWAN: I have a question.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. STICKWAN: I'm kind of wondering

Gloria.

about Mr. Taylor's concern about -- is it okay to have a statewide and regional proposal with a permitting process as well as a letter that's not going to stop if it's in the Committee? That's my question.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: I don't think I can answer that very well at this point. It does occur to me as we've been discussing this and going back and forth on it, as an executive committee we can vote on this and see where it goes and then bring it back at another proposal time as well. Again, I definitely want to be cognizant of Karen's comments as well as Jim's comment.

I also recognize we're asking a group of people to tackle a subject that has been lingering for many, many years. I don't know that that's fair to that group as well as all the other entities and individuals who have submitted proposals to address this topic and concern. It feels like we're trying to rush it a little bit.

MS. STICKWAN: I guess you didn't understand my question. Is it okay with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for us to have a regionwide proposal as well as a statewide proposal? A regionwide to have a permitting process and for other regions to have a statewide if we so choose with different regulations. Is that something that U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and State of Alaska will agree to?

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you for clarifying, Gloria. Eric, do you want to respond to that.

MR. TAYLOR: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Gloria. You know, ideally, I think from an accounting standpoint it would be nice or preferable to have a consistent way for regions to invite members from excluded communities to participate in the cultural and traditional hunts of an included area.

As has been pointed out by several individuals, that may not be possible with differing opinions among regions. I'm certainly aware of that. To answer your question, yes, Gloria, it would be possible for a region to have a different way of accounting and processing letters of invitation or a

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

permit process.

please.

So I'll ask Rory relative to law enforcement and trying to address the problem of people that are not following the letter of the current process to see if Rory has any thoughts on a regional approach that differs among regions.

Rory, could you comment to that,

MR. STARK: Sure, Eric. This is Rory Stark with Fish and Wildlife Law Enforcement again. From an enforcement perspective the most important thing is being able to identify who is eligible pursuant to that familial requirements, i.e. has immediate family members in those included areas.

2.2

Our concern if we have a bunch of different processes for doing that would be that it would be very hard to vet the different procedures and find out who actually was eligible and who wasn't. A tribal ID card for instance wouldn't tell us if they had an immediate family member in that area and were eligible to hunt. That would be basically unenforceable for us.

Obviously the big concern here is that anybody who lives in an excluded area, Anchorage, Soldotna, wherever, these rural areas is for the benefit of the rural residents there and it might greatly increase the scope of the hunting there and be a resource impact on some of the different things; you know, Emperor geese, that sort of thing.

From a law enforcement perspective, a uniform and consistent process would certainly be the easiest for us and the least burdensome when we contacted people in the field to determine if they were eligible to be hunting because they had an immediate family member there.

That being said, the permit or letter or whatever it is I'm sure we could work on that where it wouldn't need to have information that would make people feel uncomfortable. If there was a way that we could vet that with some responsible village or tribal entity that was issuing those permits and there was an affiliation back to the management authority, which is

the AMBCC.

From my perspective, some uniform process that was as small a burden as possible on the hunters and on the village councils, but also allow for us to make a determination that people were eligible to be hunting would be the best if possible. So I think my take on it is if there's some way to make the process flexible enough and yet have it uniform throughout the state, it would certainly be easier for us to enforce that regulation.

MS. LINNELL: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yes, ma'am, please.

2.2

MS. LINNELL: This is Karen Linnell. Just speaking to that. The individuals that are going to be coming out to enforce aren't going to be coming from one office to an area that they're not familiar with. Out here it would probably be the BLM office and ranger who is familiar with the area and will be familiar with our process.

Much like in Bristol Bay area it will be somebody that's assigned to the Bristol Bay area who is familiar with that process. Not one individual traveling from Anchorage out to all these different areas. So once the process is established then that office in the Bristol Bay area or up in the TCC area or here in Copper River will be familiar with the process that's in that area.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Karen.

MR. SIMON: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yes, please.

 MR. SIMON: Thank you. Jim Simon for the record again. I think that this is an example of sending proposals to die. You know, the situation is we have records built that illegal, not invited hunters who may be eligible is a major enforcement problem in Alaska. The Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission has provided a solution to that problem for the Ahtna Traditional Use Territory.

With respect to the other regions who

are interested in simplifying this process, it has already been determined in the Technical Committee analysis of the Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission's proposal that even having a permit does not require the information that enforcement wants, such that a BIA identification card will not be approved. Is that correct from the Fish and Wildlife Service's standpoint? Then I have a follow-up question.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Jim. Rory or Eric, do you want to respond to that.

MR. STARK: Go ahead, Eric.

MR. TAYLOR: I was going to defer to you, Rory, in terms of your experience relative to contacting hunters that are not eligible to be in areas. So could you comment on -- Jim has requested clarification that a tribal card by itself would not be sufficient relative to your office in terms of enforcing this regulation. Is that correct?

MR. STARK: This is Rory with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Law Enforcement again. Did Eric phrase your question correctly, Jim?

MR. SIMON: Yes, I believe so.

MR. STARK: Okay. The problem with the tribal card, tribal affiliation it doesn't show that you have an affiliation or an immediate family member in the area. The transmittal letter is fairly restrictive and that it is just immediate family defined as parents, grandparents, siblings and children, that sort of thing.

So there's no way from looking at a tribal affiliation card that we can get that information and determine if somebody is legal to be hunting there. That makes it more difficult and burdensome for everybody because then we have to vet through the process before we know if they're actually legally hunting pursuant to the transmittal letter and the treaty.

Does that answer your question?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$  SIMON: Yes, Rory. Thank you. That is my point, so why I question the encumbrance of

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

the Ahtna Traditional Use Territory's proposal with the BIA identification card.

My follow-up question is, okay, there's like a dozen or so Fish and Wildlife Service staff on this call. You have an enforcement problem, you have a current letter of invitation procedure that is obviously not working if you have this enforcement problem. What is the Fish and Wildlife Service's proposed solutions to this generational problem?

Thank you.

MR. STARK: This is Rory again. I think this is probably better answered by Eric, but I can just opine. That's sort of why we're looking for a more -- you know, something that's flexible and simple and uniform so that we can address the problem consistently throughout the state instead of having a hodge-podge of different processes throughout the regions. We're hoping to make it easier for everybody, but obviously that may not be possible.

I think the idea would be if we get together in the Invitation Committee we can talk through this and come up with some ideas that might be flexible and simple enough and give us the required information that this process can work more or less or with slight variations for every region.

That's my thought and I'm more than happy to be called into that discussion on the Invitation Committee, but I do think it takes maybe a little more discussion before we just give up entirely on the idea that there might be some process that works maybe with slight variations for all these different areas instead of having every single one have a different process.

 That being said, certainly we do try and put enforcement officers who are familiar with the area in each area, but we are still limited in staff that sometimes we have different people going out to different areas and consistency for hunters and for law enforcement officers would certainly be very helpful.

That's my take on it. Maybe.....

MR. LINNELL: Mr. Chair.

MR. STARK: I'll just defer that to Eric now. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yeah. I'll come back to you, Karen.

Go ahead, Eric.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Jim brings up a reasonable point is that we have a process in place that for whatever reason, be it outreach and education that people are unaware of it, be it that it's too onerous to the person that wants to hunt in an area that they have a direct family member or due to individuals that just do not want to follow regulation.

2.2

It's difficult, Jim, for me to answer that question. I'm not a social scientist and it's difficult in terms of trying to provide you an answer on any regulation whether it's exceeding the speed limit down the Glenn Highway in Anchorage or not following the letter of invitation to allow you to carry on a traditional hunt.

It's a question worthy of discussion. As Rory said, that would be yet another topic for the Invitation Committee to say why isn't the current process working. Furthermore, I would like to understand if it's a document that's being asked to be completed, what the difference is between a permit for example and a letter of invitation? They're both documentations.

 So, Jim, I can't answer your question, but I do think it's worth discussion both by the Invitation Committee and then also to bring forward a recommendation on how to improve the process. Whether it's to keep the regulation in place that we have and do a better job at outreach and education or request that law enforcement try to do a better job in terms of determining people that should not be in an area hunting or whether it's a revised process of the current letter of invitation or whether it's an alternative or whether individual regions -- something works better for one region than another.

So that's a long answer, in essence, that I can't provide a specific reason why the current regulation is not being followed.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Eric. Karen, did you have a comment?

MS. LINNELL: Yes. This cookie-cutter approach that we're trying to put forward doesn't work. Being at the Department of Fish and Game you know that there are multiple permits and approaches to wildlife management across the state. For moose you can have a registration hunt, you can have a draw permit, you can have a Tier II and it works in those specific areas for those specific resources. It could be because of resource concern.

Here it's a way to address the permitting process. So it's not that difficult to include that in your book that says in Copper River region that you'll be -- you would need an invitation if you are not Federally qualified yourself or from one of these communities that you would need the invitation to hunt or permit. For the other regions you can have it in there this is what it takes.

So, again, I don't buy that cookie-cutter approach of the Ahtna Traditional Use Territory. It's the size of Ohio. Bristol Bay is different than Copper River Basin. TCC region is different than our region. Even though part of their region is our neighbors they're still different than we are. So to assume that you're going to get one approach and have one line item fix that is I think dreaming.

I think that this is an approach to fix something in the Copper River area. We're not preempting other regions from trying what we're doing or putting in a proposal to address their concerns and dealing with it in another way. I'm sorry that the other regions' permits have been stuck in limbo-land for 16 years or however long it's been, but this is an attempt for AITRC to address an issue for the Copper River region.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Karen. Well spoken. We have been on this topic for a long time and I think that it speaks to how complicated it is, the different aspects to it. I appreciate all the background given as well as far as how these proposals

have been around and had some challenges moving forward.

I recognize there's been a couple recommendations on what to do next. I also want to acknowledge that -- you know, Gloria mentioned that Ahtna went back and did what they were asked to do and came to us with a regional proposal.

I would also recognize too that coming from the State of Alaska perspective, Karen is absolutely right. We use different tools for different situations. We would find it difficult if not impossible probably to apply one system across the state versus looking at different regions, different species and, frankly, just different needs of the hunts that we can talk about.

2.2

So that said, I think we need to -- you know, I think we do need to move on. We had entertained an idea of trying to get the Invitation Committee to jump and address, as Jim so eloquently put it, a problem that's been around for 16 years in the span of just a few days. I think that's asking a lot.

So I kind of think we should address the proposal head on as presented to the Council. Gayla or Eric, if you guys have some thoughts on that, I would appreciate that.

MS. SCHWALENBERG: Can I just interrupt for a second, Mr. Chair. This is Patty.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Please, Patty.

MS. SCHWALENBERG: I just want to clarify. The Invitation Committee was established in 2004 along with all the rest of the committees. They didn't meet because they didn't have anything to consider. When we got the first invitation proposal in 2012 or 2013 we met.

Thinking that this is already in regulations in the protocol, it shouldn't be a big deal, but Office of Law Enforcement told us, no, you have to have a regulation in place. That's when the process started to try to figure out what's the best way to let law enforcement know that these people that

are being invited have actually been invited.

So it was not 16 years or 13 years or 10 years. I just wanted to clarify that.

MR. SIMON: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Go ahead, Eric.

MR. SIMON: This is Jim Simon. I appreciate Patty's comments on that. You know, Patty is -- very few of you were around in those days. Patty was one, Randy, Jim Fall. I'm very interested if Jim Fall might help us with some of his wisdom.

2.2

(Background noise)

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair. This is Eric Taylor. I was wondering if they could put their phone on mute, please.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: It's not me. I'm not sure who it is. Okay.

MR. SIMON: Let me just rephrase. So I appreciate Patty's comments. I respectfully disagree. Having been on that committee starting in 2004 timeframe. It was chaired by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. There were repeated requests to hold the meeting in order to establish this process. As I said earlier, eventually that did happen in 2013-2014 timeframe.

The issue here I believe is that we need the Fish and Wildlife Service to be proactive in solving their enforcement problem and to come up with solutions to this ongoing issue rather than this issue being kicked down the road until another regional co-management body which exists to provide regionally-specific regulations.

I'm quite concerned with the repeated request for a statewide one-size-fits-all. Is the next thing going to be that the actual seasons in each region have to be made uniform across the state. We're talking about the core essential feature of the

co-management of migratory birds here. Regionally-specific, based on the recommendations of those regional co-management bodies.

You have a viable proposal in front of you that with some tweaks I'm sure the Council can come to agreement to pass this proposal. If necessary, perhaps the proposal should -- and I have not reviewed this with the Ahtna Region, but perhaps there should be a sunset on it. Let's try this as an experiment to see how it works in the Ahtna Region. Then Gloria, myself and others can report back to the Technical Committee group.

That will also give the Fish and Wildlife Service with all of your vast resources and staff that are available for this call to be able to put your heads together and come up with some recommended solutions to this instead of just relying on the regions themselves to fix this co-management problem.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Jim. Eric, Gayla, any additional comments on this.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair. This is Eric Taylor. The Technical Committee went through a great amount of effort trying to get clarification and they've asked the Council to discuss the points they've brought forward. I realize that we're pushing up on 12:00 o'clock, but I would like at least a better understanding in mind before I would be asked to vote on this proposal. Jim mentioned the proposal would be tweaked. I'm not for sure what that means at this point.

There are two points. I would like to go through the Technical Committee's concerns to make sure those are addressed before the Executive Committee is asked to vote on this.

MR. LINNELL: Mr. Chair. Did you not get my -- did he not get my letter in response to all this?

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Karen. Your letter was included in the packet that went out

last week.

please.

MR. TAYLOR: This is Eric Taylor again. Yes, I did read your letter. I guess I would like to make sure that everyone is aware of the concerns that were brought forward or the discussion points that we make sure. And I guess I would like to also ask Jim what he means by tweaking the proposal at this point.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$  SIMON: Mr. Chair. Would you like me to respond to that?

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Sorry, Jim. Yes,

2.2

MR. SIMON: Yeah, I think that from my assessment -- and, again, this is where I really need to hear from Fish and Wildlife Service. From my assessment the last remaining issue is the familial information included on the permit. I appreciated Jim Fall's comments in the Technical Committee meeting as reflected in the notes. That is very likely necessary if that is to be included that it should be the list of eligible immediate family members in the village that that invited hunter is eligible to do.

I don't know, so you'd have to ask the Technical Committee, but from my reading of the information and the ongoing dialogue, that seems to be the remaining concern. There's been a lot of discussions about the original proposal being statewide in intent. The only aspect which sort of surprises me because the intent of the proposal was to add the option in the statewide regs to be able to have a regionally specific permit proposal.

So that was the only intent, as Gloria has characterized, from the last Native Caucus and discussion about the other regions' resistance to having such a permit requirement and would rather stay with the letter of invitation or strive for some other alternative way of ensuring regulatory compliance with the Invitation to Hunt Program.

So the tweak I think is negotiating what the Service will agree to be the fields on that permit. I know Karen is ready to speak to what she feels is confidential information that is not specifically required, but I think that is the

remaining issue to be addressed in what I referred to as some final tweaks.

Hopefully I answered your question.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Eric, do you want to respond or anything to add?

 MR. TAYLOR: Thanks, Jim. I think Jim raised up the point that the only thing that has to be decided is that what information is on the permit. Is that correct? I think you were going to ask Karen to speak to that. Am I right in that, Jim?

2.2

MR. SIMON: Yes, I believe. I don't know if Karen is willing to have those names on the permit within their proposal, but it's something that — and one of the points that might help to clarify that is the kinship information defining what the immediate family relationship currently included on the two letters of invitation that exist in Alaska presently. I've never seen those, so I don't know that.

If those are currently required, if that information is currently required in the letter of invitation, then that at least sets a precedent that any other alternative invitation to hunt procedure should provide that same level of information. The perception is that the Service is now requiring additional information beyond that required in the letter of invitation and only the Service or the AMBCC Staff can address that point.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Karen, are you at a point to respond to some of that or would you like to hold off?

MS. LINNELL: Well, I'd like to know what's on the current letters of invitation. Do they list the family members or do they list all that information? Our tribes believe that's their sovereign right to say that they are inviting these people and that they are qualified. They're saying that these people are invited to hunt.

To ask that of another government or their agent I think is not necessary. We're saying it's true and we should be taken at our word. Until you see some abuse, there's no reason for this type of language. It's assuming that there's going to be abuse. So that's where we're at with this. I'd like to know if this information is on the current letters of invitation.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you. Eric or Rory, could you guys respond to that.

MR. STARK: This is Rory with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Law Enforcement. I think I'd have to defer to Patty on that. I don't have copies of the letters. I think Patty may have copies of the letters.

2.2

MS. SCHWALENBERG: Yes. Like I stated earlier we received two letters early on right after the regulation was published. One was just a letter written by a tribe that listed the members that they said were eligible to come back and hunt. The other letter was a form letter that was drafted by the AMBCC and it did include the name of the person inviting and the relationship.

MS. LINNELL: Mr. Chair. My question

 is....

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Go ahead, Karen.

 $$\operatorname{MS.\ LINNELL:\ }\ldots.$  if the enforcement doesn't have the letters, how are they enforcing it?

MR. STARK: This is Rory Stark with Fish and Wildlife. I just don't have them in front of me right now. I'm sorry. I'm pretty sure Patty did.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Well, thank you, Karen and Rory and others who have continued to comment on this. So I guess I'm going to ask the Executive Committee members again what is your desires as far as this proposal. We have heard several suggestions. I'd like some input from that. I think we've got to get going on some additional things here.

 $$\operatorname{MS}.$$  HOSETH: Mr. Chair. This is Gayla. If we wanted to move on this proposal, I mean we could

do that. We haven't had a chance to have a Native Caucus and I would poll the Native Caucus numbers if they support this proposal and then that would determine the vote for Native Caucus.

I see on the proposal on Page 2 with how the new regulations should read. Number 1 there where it says a letter of invitation may be sent by the tribal council to the hunter with a copy to the Executive Director. I think that the language should stay the same as what is in the book and it will be will be sent and then the or, or have the permit, but that would be my take on it for my vote, but I would want to definitely poll the Native Caucus before voting, casting the Native Caucus vote.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Gayla.

MS. LINNELL: Mr. Chair. This is Karen. And I'd agree to that. Our intent was not to change the current process.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you. Eric.

MR. TAYLOR: Thanks, Mr. Chair. I'm going to build off Gayla's question because I'm trying to -- I read the proposal and read the Technical Committee's report and I was going to ask Jim or Karen to clarify or help me understand. So the proposed permit process is being put forward to I think address the question that Jim wants addressed. That is to make a regulation that actually works and I applaud that.

My question is in the current process invitation a copy of the letter sent to the AMBCC Executive Director. The proposal doesn't really clarify. Is the intent of the proposal to also send copies of the permit to the AMBCC Director?

MS. LINNELL: Yes, for a list.

MR. TAYLOR: All right. Thank you. I have to ask this question. I'm struggling here. I'm trying to understand, Jim or Karen, how a permit is going to be more efficient or less onerous when it seems like the same requirements are being put forward in the sense that a person -- there has to be communication between....

1 MS. LINNELL: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: One second, Karen. Go

ahead, Eric.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm just trying to seek clarification on how the permit differs from the letter of invitation in the sense that it's still a piece of paper that has to be filled out by both entities and a copy has to be sent to the AMBCC Executive Director who forwards it on to the Fish and Wildlife Service's Office of Law Enforcement.

Is a permit perceived to be less burdensome than a letter of invitation or is it something easier to understand or easier to process or exactly what?

2.2

MS. LINNELL: This would centralize the processing here. Again, as Gloria had said, there's turnover. Just recently for at least two of our tribes there's been three administrators. That turnover underneath them and in being able to pull this through, educating them on the process. Because I'm handling these -- you know, AITRC has a contract to help our tribes with the migratory bird process. So that's one burden off of their hands.

As far as your interest in this, it doesn't matter. This is what our tribes are saying they would like to have and this is what we're putting forward.

MR. SIMON: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Please go ahead.

 MR. SIMON: Thank you. Jim Simon for the record. I have a different way of responding although it's consistent. The eight Ahtna tribes have established the Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission as an intertribal agency in order to relieve the burden on tribal administrative staff to fulfill those functions.

So that is why it sounds peculiar that a permit is actually fixing an overburden problem because typically in fish and wildlife management we think about it in the opposite fashion, that a permit

is more encumbering.

In this particular case, because of why the eight villages have formed the Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission, it would alleviate -- and that's why there are no letters of invitation from the Ahtna Region up to this time. Hopefully there have not been any enforcement actions as a result of that.

The tribes of the Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission as well as the Alaska Native landowners that are also on that board of directors and part of that commission want to ensure regulatory compliance and the continuing conservation of migratory birds.

2.2

This is a solution that will likely work in the Ahtna Region because of its longstanding, multi-year experience with community hunt permit administration and reporting requirement. This is right up the Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission's alley in their growing capacity to do this and expand their existing program.

That may not exist in other regions of the state and we're not suggesting that they should have that kind of capacity because they're different and that's why we think that this is a solution that will work for the Copper Basin and the Upper Susitna Valley.

To solve a problem that is of mutual concern to the Co-management Council, the State Federal and Tribal interest to ensure compliance with what I view as problematic definition of immediate family member for Dena'ina people in the Interior where uncles and aunts are not included and they are definitely immediate family members.

 We can't encumber all of the problem with the invitation to hunt program in one proposal. We have to take this one step at a time and this particular issue and this particular proposal 2020-01 is designed only to solve the Ahtna Traditional Use Territory's problem.

My prediction is there will never be one solution that serves all of the co-management regional bodies in the state. We need to take one step

at a time. You know, the fact that Tanana Chiefs Conference is quite concerned because of the role of marriage as well as the customary and traditional relationships with other communities.

You'd be surprised at how many Interior communities have eaten muktuk from the North Slope, bowhead whale. You know, there are relationships that require some future exploration of whether or not you can only be invited to return to your actual member tribe and not your wife's member tribal status. That's a very big concern of the Tanana Chiefs Conference.

But you cannot encumber the Ahtna Region's proposal to just deal with making sure invited hunters are legal and have the proper documentation with putting everything that's concerning tribes across Alaska with respect to the Invitation to Hunt Program on one proposal. That is an unrealistic and unwise approach.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Jim.

MS. HEPA: Mr. Chair. This is Tagulik.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Go ahead, Taqulik.

MS. HEPA: Yeah, I was just going from the North Slope's perspective. I want to give support to Gloria, to Karen and to Jim for their comments. I also support the comments to say that I like the proposal because every region is different. If the Ahtna Intertribal organization from that region have come up with a way forward that would work for them, I say that we adopt this proposal with the modified language that was mentioned earlier to make sure that we're not changing the current process that is in place now.

So I from the North Slope I give my support to this proposal with the minor modification.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Taqulik. Appreciate that. So, Gayla, you mentioned that you'd like to poll the Native Caucus. I guess I need some

indication how long do you need to do that?

MS. HOSETH: I mean it's just a matter of a vote, how we would vote, Mr. Chair. I guess it would be whether or not if we're going to take action on this proposal if we're taking action as written in the proposal or if there's going to be an amendment to the language.

 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yeah, I agree. Thank you. Eric, where are you on your comfort level of understanding the responses that Ahtna provided to the Technical Committee and some of the language changes we've heard on the phone?

MR. TAYLOR: Thanks, Mr. Chair. Eric Taylor with Fish and Wildlife Service. The first thing is kind of a scary note. This call only has 15 minutes left. We were supposed to end at 12:00 and I've got about 12 after 12:00. So we need to probably move fairly quickly on this especially since we have another proposal.

I am at a point where the only -- the three changes that I see or clarifications are -- one is that the letter of invitation will be sent to the AMBCC Executive Director as opposed to the word may. I think Karen and/or Jim have agreed to that.

Also that copies of the permits will be sent to the AMBCC Executive Director, who will then forward them on to the Office of Law Enforcement. Similar to the current process that we have for the letter of invitation.

Third, to clarify in the letter that the AMBCC Director receives that the permit would have a two-year expiration date. I think those are my three requests. I don't know if that requires a friendly amendment to the proposal or what's the proper procedure. Those are the three clarifications that I need.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Eric. I

48 guess....

Page 82 MS. LINNELL: Mr. Chair. I'm not sure 2 of the process, but can I make those amendments? 3 4 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: I'm not sure either, 5 Karen. Patty, do we need the Executive Committee to do that or is the proposer okay with that? 6 7 MS. SCHWALENBERG: If the proposer is 8 9 okay with the amendments, the amendments can be just stated in the motion. 10 11 MS. LINNELL: I would say that a list 12 of the permittees will be sent to the Executive 13 Director that can be forwarded to Enforcement. But 14 keeping the language the same and having the two-year 15 expiration is fine. 16 17 18 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. 19 20 MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair. 21 2.2 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Go ahead. 23 24 MR. TAYLOR: Karen, when you clarify that a list, so the list would just be the names of the 25 individuals or what do you envision in terms of being 26 on that list? 27 28 29 MS. LINNELL: The list would include the person invited to hunt and which location they're 30 from. Basically it's the same information that's on 31 32 the permit. 33 MR. TAYLOR: 34 Thanks. I'm going to ask 35 Rory Stark to clarify to make sure that our Office of Law Enforcement is comfortable with what information he 36 would receive in order to make sure this regulation is 37 38 clear. Rory, could you weigh in, please. 39 MS. HOSETH: Mr. Chair. Just for 40 clarification maybe we could read into the record how 41 the regulation will read and then that might save time 42 if that would be enforceable with Rory. 43 44 45 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: I think that's a great 46 idea, Gayla. Patty, are you able to read in just those 47 sections where the language would be amended. 48

49 50 MS. HOSETH: Mr. Chair. For the

record, I think it should be read entirely of how the new regulation will read so everybody is on the same page of understanding.

fine.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Fair enough. That's

MS. SCHWALENBERG: Okay. So I am going to be reading from the proposal how the new regulation should read?

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. SCHWALENBERG: And then the changes that we discussed. So if I miss anything or mischaracterize anything, please somebody speak up.

2.2

Starting with (d) Participation by permanent residence of excluded areas. Immediate family members who are residents of excluded areas may participate in the customary spring and summer subsistence harvest in tribal communities subsistence area with permission of the tribal/village council or whichever is appropriate to assist indigenous habitants in meeting their nutritional and other essential needs or for the teaching of cultural knowledge, and this is in addition, using one of the following procedures:

(1) A letter of invitation will be sent by the tribal/village council to the hunter with a copy to the Executive Director of the Co-management Council who will inform law enforcement and the Service's AMBCC Coordinator within two working days. The Service will then inform any affected Federal agency when residents of excluded areas are allowed to participate in the subsistence harvest within their federal land; or

(2) A permit may be issued by the tribal council or their authorized tribal representative to the invited hunter certifying that the permit holder is an immediate family member authorized to assist eligible family members in hunting migratory birds in the tribe's subsistence harvest area.

It further goes on to say that this is a region-only proposal. Were there other changes? Oh, and then the addition of what Karen had added that a list of invited hunters will be sent to the Executive

Page 84 Director of the AMBCC. 2 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: As well as the sunset 3 4 date for two years. 5 6 MS. SCHWALENBERG: Right. 7 MS. LINNELL: Right. 8 9 MR. SIMON: Clarification question. 10 11 12 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Go ahead. 13 14 MR. SIMON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Simon. The two-year sunset, is that actually the 15 permit term limit or is that referring to establishing 16 17 this regulation and then it would disappear in two years? Just to clarify the record, please. 18 19 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: 20 That's a good The way I read it and have thought about it 21 question. would be that the regulation, if the sunset clause 22 isn't removed, would end after two years. 23 24 25 MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair. This is Eric Taylor with Fish and Wildlife Service. 26 27 28 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Go ahead, Eric. 29 MR. TAYLOR: I guess I would 30 respectfully disagree. I interpreted this that the 31 32 two-year expiration refers to the permit to the individual that the regulation becomes part of the 33 record and permanent and that two years refers to just 34 35 the permit because the person -- the status may change or their relative in the AMBCC may change, but I 36 interpreted this as per the permit and not the 37 38 regulation. 39 40 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yeah, thanks. definitely.... 41 42 MS. HOSETH: Mr. Chair. This is Gayla. 43 44 Yeah, the permit would expire in two years and I don't think we should do a sunset clause on this proposal. 45 46 47 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: I don't have a strong feeling either way. Karen, did that mesh with what 48 49 your original intent was? 50

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

MS. LINNELL: Yes, sir. That the permit would expire in two years.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, ma'am, for clarifying. Rory, are you in a position to speak to if this would meet the law enforcement requirements?

MR. STARK: This is Rory Stark with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Law Enforcement. Yeah, I think with the addition of sending a list to the Executive Director to Patty or the Executive Director of the AMBCC that would make it so we could make sure that only the permits that were actually issued by the tribal representative and sent back to the AMBCC as well were the ones out in the field so that somebody doesn't create their own permit. So, yeah, I think that would work for us.

2.2

 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Thank you, Rory. Appreciate it. So with those amendments discussed by the Executive Committee as well as the author of the proposal, I'll go on record as saying that I will likely vote in the affirmative for this. I appreciate all the discussion.

I also just want to recognize that there are lots of things going on around the state as far as different status of these kinds of requests and these kinds of proposals. Both Jim and Patty, thank you for weighing in on the Invitation Committee. That's something I would like to continue to have conversations about once we get through the proposal we have before us.

In terms of the next step, I guess I get a sense we're just about ready to vote on it. Gayla, do you need some additional time and do you have the information you need to poll the Native Caucus?

MS. HOSETH: Mr. Chair. I don't need additional time. Maybe, Patty, if you could just call out the regions and then that would determine Native Caucus vote.

MS. HOSETH: This is Gayla. Question.

Page 86 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The question has been 2 called. Any additional discussion. 3 MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair. This is Eric 4 5 Taylor with Fish and Wildlife Service. Sorry, I'm a little bit lost here. Gayla asked I believe for a poll 6 of Alaska Native representatives prior to a vote on 7 this proposal. Am I correct in that, Gayla? Could you 8 9 clarify, please. 10 MS. HOSETH: Through the Chair. 11 yes, I'd like Patty to poll the Native Caucus and then 12 that would determine the Native Caucus vote when we 13 14 vote on this proposal. 15 16 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: And I got us out of 17 sync and I apologize for that. I had every intention to make sure that happened before the Executive 18 Committee voted. 19 20 Patty, could you poll the Native 21 Caucus, please. 2.2 23 24 MS. SCHWALENBERG: Aleutian Pribilof 25 Islands Association. 26 27 (No response) 28 29 MS. SCHWALENBERG: Peter or Karen. 30 31 (No response) 32 MS. SCHWALENBERG: They might have 33 gotten kicked off. People are getting kicked off 34 apparently because we have so many people on the call. 35 Association of Village Council Presidents. 36 37 38 MS. HOOPER: Support. 39 40 MS. SCHWALENBERG: Chugach Regional Resource Commission. Priscilla just had to jump off 41 42 the line, but she does support. Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission. 43 44 45 MS. STICKWAN: This is Gloria. Are we 46 supporting for Native Caucus or on the proposal? 47 48 MS. SCHWALENBERG: The proposal.

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

```
Page 87
                     MS. STICKWAN: I support the proposal.
 2
 3
                     MS. SCHWALENBERG: Kawerak.
 4
 5
                     MR. AHMASUK: Hi, Patty. This is
 6
     Brandon. Just so I'm clear it's for Karen's region and
 7
     Gloria's region only. Not statewide, correct?
 8
9
                     MS. SCHWALENBERG: That's correct.
10
                     MR. AHMASUK: Okay.
                                          Support.
11
12
13
                     MS. SCHWALENBERG: Maniilag.
14
                     MR. HARRIS: Support.
15
16
17
                     MS. SCHWALENBERG: North Slope Borough.
18
19
                     MS. HEPA: Support.
20
                     MS. SCHWALENBERG: Sun'aq Tribe of
21
     Kodiak.
2.2
23
                     MS. CHERNOFF:
24
                                    Support.
25
                     MS. SCHWALENBERG: Bristol Bay Native
26
27
     Association.
28
29
                     MS. HOSETH: Support with the amended
     changes.
30
31
32
                     MS. SCHWALENBERG: Okay.
                                               Thank you.
33
34
                     CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Patty.
35
     Thank you everyone for weighing in. Gayla, you have
     the information you needed?
36
37
38
                     MS. HOSETH: Yes, I do, Mr. Chair.
39
     Thank you.
40
                     CHAIRMAN SCOTT:
                                      Thank you.
41
42
                     MS. STICKWAN: Mr. Chair. We were
43
44
     going to meet to talk about this proposal in the
     Invitation Committee. Are we still having that
45
     committee meeting on the phone Friday?
46
47
                     CHAIRMAN SCOTT: I think we're moving
48
     to a place where you won't have to do that. I would
49
50
```

Page 88 say the plan is not to have that at this point. 2 So the question has been called. 3 Patty, would you poll the Executive Committee, please. 4 5 6 MS. SCHWALENBERG: Yes. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 7 8 9 MR. TAYLOR: Support. 10 MS. SCHWALENBERG: Alaska Department of 11 12 Fish and Game. 13 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: 14 Support. 15 16 MS. SCHWALENBERG: And the AMBCC Native 17 Caucus. 18 19 MS. HOSETH: Support. 20 21 MS. SCHWALENBERG: The proposal passes, Mr. Chairman. 2.2 23 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Patty. And 24 thank you, Gayla and Eric. I know that that was a lot 25 of information and a lot of time and a lot of good 26 discussion. I really appreciate everybody's time. 27 I stated earlier, I don't think this issue is going 28 29 away. I will probably ask Patty to at least have another agenda item in the fall where we can talk about 30 how to approach these as they come up and try to get a 31 32 handle on different invitation requests and issues. 33 34 So that said we are at 12:28 p.m. 35 Eric, are we going to get kicked off at 12:30? 36 MR. TAYLOR: There's a risk of that 37 38 happening, Mr. Chair. I can try to contact my 39 administrator and see if we can change the call or we can just continue and see what happens. 40 41 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Thank you, 42 Eric. Under new business, continuing on, if folks are 43 able to hang in there and we can try to get through 44 these last couple things. The next proposal we have is 45 2020-02, allow egging during closed season. 46 47 I recall during our Technical Committee 48 report that there was some information that the 30-day 49 50

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

closure, due to action taken by the AMBCC previously, it had not been published yet, but that was going to be variable. So I guess I'm curious. Do we need to go through this proposal knowing that that's coming? We also had some sideboards about treaty concerns and season lengths.

Patty, do you have any insight on that?

MS. SCHWALENBERG: Yes. Vince Mathews I believe might be on the line. We have a proposal that was submitted that is requesting to allow egging during the closed season. Julian and Eric, you may have to help me out with the publishing things that are going on at the Service. I'm not exactly sure what's publishing when anymore.

2.2

The regulation that passed last year from the North Slope Borough to allow the floating 30-day closure similar to what's going on in Association of Village Council Presidents region, the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta area, and that was passed, but it has not published. If it had published, the North Slope Borough believes they could have accommodated this person's need to gather eggs by floating the date into a period where it would accommodate her needs, but it has not published.

We asked the proposer if they would be interested in withdrawing the proposal since this will be resolved once the new regulation does publish, but they did not want to withdraw the proposal. They wanted to wait to see the actual regulation in writing to ensure that they were not doing anything illegal.

So, from what I understand -- and, again, Eric and Ryan, Cheryl, you guys can correct me if I'm wrong, but I think we have to vote this proposal down because it's asking to do something that's not currently in regulation, but that should be resolved once the regulation publishes.

too.

Eric, can you shed some light on that

MR. TAYLOR: Yeah, sure. Mr. Chair. Eric Taylor with Fish and Wildlife Service. Patty, you described everything accurately. This proposal has to do with egging on the North Slope region and the

situation is that with conditions that have changed on the North Slope, like throughout Alaska, subsistence users are finding themselves in difficult positions because birds are nesting at different time periods, both in the long term where seasons have gotten warmer over the past few decades, but also that we've seen a greater frequency of what we would consider outliers in the sense that we've had some very early seasons and some very late seasons.

This has long been recognized, as Patty mentioned, on the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta and consequently there is the Association of Village Council Presidents along with the Fish and Wildlife Service Refuge Manager are able to assess the phenology or the timing of nesting and then set the closed period such that it protects the principal nesting period and provides the conservation that we all want for the birds and current with ensuring access to birds when subsistence hunters need them.

Patty described that the North Slope Borough had in 2019 submitted a proposal to adopt a similar process that the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta uses and it's been in regulation with the AMBCC. That is to allow villages on the North Slope to work with the Department of Fish and Game and the Fish and Wildlife Service

to set appropriate levels when it's warranted.

If it's not warranted, if it's a quote/unquote normal year, then the regulation that's in place would still be the dates that we would follow. If it's a particularly early year or a particularly late year, then the North Slope Borough would work with the two agencies and set the appropriate closure period.

That proposal passed the AMBCC. It was supported by the Pacific Flyway and it passed the Service Regulations Committee. So, in essence, the proposal should be in place this year. Unfortunately there's been a delay in getting the Federal Register process underway for several reasons. I just got a note from our Policy Department that's in charge of the Federal Register process.

As I mentioned earlier in the call, the approval process has gone through the Department of

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

Interior after the Service Regulations Committee and the language has all been written in the correct format. It's been submitted to the Federal Register and it's waiting on the docket at the Federal Register to be published.

I had hoped in talking to our headquarters that it would have been published last Friday, if not today. I just have a note today that said it's not published. So in essence we're waiting for that approved regulations to publish. Then there's a 30-day comment period. So let's just assume that it publishes tomorrow on the 5th of May. There's a 30-day comment period. I have to respond to comments and those get reviewed by the Solicitor's Office and finally the final regulations are published.

2.2

It's my hope that that process can be completed by early June if not mid June, but I can't guarantee the group that at this point. Patty, you're right. The regulations that we have approved would take care of this and if the dates are incorrect because of a season or they're just incorrect because birds have changed their phenology, then it gives the North Slope Borough the flexibility to have the closed dates that allow both conservation and access to the Common Eiders.

I'll be happy to try to address any questions. Rory, if you would like to render an opinion, that would be helpful as well.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Before we get into this too far, you guys, given that Patty did reach out to the author and they were not interested in withdrawing the proposal, I think we have to put it on the table. We really need to have these discussions in that context.

So I would entertain a motion to adopt Proposal 2020-02.

MR. WIESE: Mr. Chair. This is Will Wiese in Kaktovik. May I comment?

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Please.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$  WIESE: I'm Will Wiese and I'm the Arctic Refuge Ranger in Kaktovik and I worked with the

author of this proposal on this proposal. I actually worked with the tribal council on this proposal. There was interest from several people in town about egging.

When some people found out that the closure started June 20th, there was concern that their traditional egging takes place in late June and even early July and that's where this proposal kind of grew out of.

The author of the proposal signed on to it really because the tribal council up here had planned to adopt the proposal or a similar proposal, but just couldn't make the deadline to submit.

After talking to those people again since learning of the flexibility in dates that passed last year, I think that seems to satisfy most people's desire to make sure that they can egg during the traditional time.

However I do want to point out that I think one kind of misconception is that this is a change in phenology and that's why a change is needed. When I think in reality the perception is some people hear that egging always took place in that late June time period for Common Eiders. Common Eiders tend to nest later than the other birds that they're gathering eggs from.

So it sounds like the proposal -- last year's -- the change that's coming should address this issue, but it might be a recurring thing that every year the season dates need to float further to accommodate Common Eider egging because typically initiation of nests doesn't even occur on average until somewhere in that 17th, 18th of June range. So there aren't Common Eiders until the season is closed as it currently sits.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you. Lots of discussion about shifting dates and bird arrival and nesting. It certainly will be something that we address going into the future as well, no doubt. Again, I think though because of where we are structurally we need to -- you know, before we go too far, much further with this, we should adopt the proposal for discussion.

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

Page 93 MS. HEPA: This is Tagulik. I'll 2 second that proposal or the motion. 3 4 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: I would love to say 5 that's great, but I'm not sure that we actually had a 6 motion yet. 7 8 MS. SCHWALENBERG: No, we don't have a 9 motion yet. 10 MS. HEPA: So what I understand is that 11 we have to vote it down, so we would make a motion to 12 13 approve the proposal and then we'll vote it down. 14 I'd like to make a motion to support the proposal. 15 16 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Do we have a second. 17 MS. HOOPER: This is Jennifer. I'll 18 19 second. 20 21 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. We have a We have Proposal 2020-02 before us. 2.2 second. Discussion. 23 24 25 MS. HEPA: For discussion, this is Taqulik. 26 27 28 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Go ahead, Taqulik. 29 MS. HEPA: I appreciate the proposer 30 for submitting the proposal and as it was stated 31 32 earlier that I support the concept as written of what they were trying to do and because of the proposal that 33 was passed last year and that will be published later 34 35 this summer that that would meet the needs and concerns of in particular the Native Village of Kaktovik. 36 37 38 So I am not going to vote in favor of 39 this proposal knowing that new regulations will come out later this summer and we will work with the 40 community, in particular with the eggers, to identify 41 the date for the proper 30-day closure. 42 43 44 Thank you. 45 46 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, ma'am. 47 Additional comments on Proposal 2020-02. 48 49 MS. HOSETH: Mr. Chair. This is Gayla. 50

I would ask the same for Patty to poll the regions on this and that will determine the Native Caucus vote. 2 3 4 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Gayla. 5 I'll make sure I do that in the right sequence this time. My apologies for the last proposal. 6 7 Just to put a little bit more on the 8 9 I will not be supporting the proposal, reason record. being that based on the actions taken by the AMBCC last 10 year. I think we're at least addressing the underlying 11 concern and the need for folks and by having some 12 13 additional flexibility built into the closed period I'm hopeful that we will address the concerns that the 14 author put into the proposal. 15 16 17 At the same time I will recognize that 18 this is a topic that we heard quite a bit on already with different migration timing and nesting timing. 19 certainly recognize that we will likely be visiting 20 this topic again. 21 2.2 23 Thank you. 24 25 MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair. This is Eric 26 Taylor. 27 28 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Go ahead, Eric, please. 29 30 Thanks. 31 MR. TAYLOR: I appreciate the 32 comments by Taqulik. The proposal is not consistent 33

with the protection of bird eggs and the regulations that we currently have in place. I appreciate Taqulik working with the villages in the eastern unit to determine if indeed that date that's currently closed, June 20th to July 19th needs to be changed in the future.

38 39 40

34 35

36

37

Again, I'm optimistic that we can get these regulations proposed on the Federal Register and get this in place. I just wanted to make those points.

42 43 44

41

Thank you.

45 46 47

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Eric. Patty, can you poll the Native Caucus as Gayla suggested.

AK MIGRATORY BIRD CO-MANAGEMENT COUNCIL 5/4/2020 SPRING MEETING Page 95 MS. SCHWALENBERG: Yes. Association of 2 Village Council Presidents. 3 4 MS. HOOPER: I wasn't really too sure 5 at their spring meeting did not take action on this and I would defer to the North Slope Region and either take 6 no action myself or align with what their vote is. 7 8 9 MS. SCHWALENBERG: Okay. Aleutian 10 Pribilof Islands Association. 11 MR. DEVINE: Aleutian Pribilofs votes 12 13 no. 14 MS. SCHWALENBERG: Bristol Bay Native 15 16 Association. 17 18 MS. HOSETH: No. 19 20 MS. SCHWALENBERG: Chuqach Regional Resources Commission. They voted no, but she's not on 21 the line. Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission. 2.2 23 24 MS. STICKWAN: No. 25 26 MS. SCHWALENBERG: Kawerak. 27 28 MR. AHMASUK: Patty, I have a couple 29 things. I have to defer to the North Slope Borough and Tagulik's decision, but also my question earlier to 30 you. So I'm not actually the bird rep. 31 32 Fagerstrom is. His alternate is whoever the vice chair is. So am I supposed to be voting or not voting or 33 what's the deal on that? 34 35 MS. SCHWALENBERG: I don't think you 36 can vote if you haven't been designated as an 37 38 alternate, but if you guys discussed this then you can 39 relay that information for Gayla's information. 40 MR. AHMASUK: I think at our last 41 42 regional bird meeting the discussion that we had definitely times are changing, spring is coming 43 44 earlier. All the animals don't go by an exact calendar

46 47 48

45

MS. SCHWALENBERG: Okay. So Maniilaq.

49 50 Currently for our region it's not an issue yet, but it

date. They go by what Mother Nature tells them.

very well could be in the near future.

MR. HARRIS: Patty, we didn't have our regional meeting here, so I'll be neutral on this one. For discussion, for waterfowl and seabirds they do have different patterns of nesting, that the seabirds are later. I'm thinking that the Common Eiders are considered seabirds, am I correct?

MR. TAYLOR: Cyrus, this is Eric Taylor with Fish and Wildlife Service. They're actually considered sea ducks, but nonetheless you still are correct. This particular species does nest later than many species of waterfowl.

MR. HARRIS: Thank you, Eric. That could be clarified within that regulation on the North Slope or Kaktovik area.

MS. BURNS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. BURNS: This is Nora Jane Burns. I just want to say that in our village we don't have that many eggers. It's just a certain number of families that go out and egg. I just wanted to make sure that they have -- when the Common Eider nest, I wanted to make sure that they are able to get the eggs before they started growing inside the egg. That was why I helped co-write this proposal.

Thank you for hearing me.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yes, ma'am. Thank you. Patty, could you continue, please.

MS. SCHWALENBERG: Yes. North Slope Borough.

 MS. HEPA: Thank you. The North Slope Borough is going to vote down. Thank you, Nora Jane, for participating in today's conference call. The reason I'm voting down is because with the new regulation that's going to come into place we will work with the local hunters from each of our different units to identify when the closures should happen instead of it being on a set date. So when they're done picking eggs they'll notify us and then we'll close the season.

So my vote for the current proposal is

```
Page 97
     no.
 1
 2
 3
                     Thank you.
 4
 5
                     MS. SCHWALENBERG: And the Sun'aq Tribe
 6
     of Kodiak.
 7
 8
                     MS. CHERNOFF: No.
9
10
                     MS. SCHWALENBERG: Thank you, everyone.
11
12
                     CHAIRMAN SCOTT:
                                     Thank you, Patty.
     Thank you everyone. Ms. Burns, thank you very much for
13
     calling in. Hopefully we'll have addressed the need
14
     and the concern there as well. Certainly if we need to
15
     revisit it and go at it again, we'll do that for sure.
16
17
18
19
                     Any other discussion on Proposal
     2020-02.
20
21
2.2
                     MS. HOSETH:
                                  Question.
23
24
                     CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The question has been
25
     called. Patty, could you poll the Executive Committee,
     please.
26
27
28
                     MS. SCHWALENBERG: U.S. Fish and
29
     Wildlife Service.
30
31
                     MR. TAYLOR:
                                  Oppose.
32
33
                     MS. SCHWALENBERG: Alaska Department of
     Fish and Game.
34
35
                     CHAIRMAN SCOTT:
36
                                      Oppose.
37
38
                     MS. SCHWALENBERG: And the AMBCC Native
39
     Caucus.
40
41
                     MS. HOSETH:
                                  Oppose.
42
                     MS. SCHWALENBERG: The motion fails,
43
44
     Mr. Chairman.
45
46
                     CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Patty.
47
     Thank you again everybody for weighing in on it.
     Again, based on the information we have from a previous
48
     regulatory change that was made, we're just waiting on
49
50
```

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

AK MIGRATORY BIRD CO-MANAGEMENT COUNCIL 5/4/2020 SPRING MEETING Page 98 the regulations to be published. I think we'll be in good shape, but if we need to revisit this, please, 2 Tagulik and others, let us know and we'll get it back 3 on the docket. 4 5 So that moves us down to Item C under 6 new business. Eric, whatever magic you did to keep us 7 online thank you for that as well. I believe, Patty, 8 9 correct me if I'm wrong, we just need to adopt the consent agenda, is that accurate, for the 2021 10 regulations? As I recall, there weren't any other 11 changes. Is that accurate? 12 13 14 MS. SCHWALENBERG: That is correct, Mr. 15 Chairman. We just need a motion. 16 17 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Thank you, 18 Patty. I guess I'll entertain a motion to adopt the consent agenda items consisting of the 2021 19 regulations. 20 21 2.2 MS. HOSETH: Mr. Chair. This is Gayla. 23 So moved. 24 25 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: So moved. Discussion. 26 MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair. This is Eric 27 28 Taylor. I second. 29 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Eric. 30 discussion on the consent agenda items. 31 32 33 (No comments) 34 35 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none. Can we have somebody call for the question. 36 37 38 MS. HOSETH: Question. 39 MS. HEPA: Question. 40 41 42 MS. STICKWAN: Question. 43 44 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Great. Thank you. 45 That was a big response. Patty, will you poll the 46 Committee, please. 47 MS. SCHWALENBERG: Yes. U.S. Fish and 48

49 50 Wildlife Service.

Page 99 MR. TAYLOR: Approve. 2 3 MS. SCHWALENBERG: Alaska Department of 4 Fish and Game. 5 6 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Approved. 7 The AMBCC Native MS. SCHWALENBERG: 8 9 Caucus. 10 MS. HOSETH: We didn't poll, but I'm 11 12 pretty sure it would be approved. 13 14 MS. SCHWALENBERG: Okay. We just need to call for the question, I believe. No. The motion 15 16 carries. I'm sorry. 17 18 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: That's okay. You're in good company with me. Thank you. So Item C has 19 been approved. Thank you everybody for looking into 20 that. I'm glad that we could get through that quickly 21 as well. 2.2 23 24 I think that's the end of our needed regulatory actions. At this time is an invitation for 25 public comments. If people have comments, please let 26 27 us know. 28 29 (No comments) 30 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none. We'll 31 32 move to Council and Staff member comments. 33 MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chair. This is Eric 34 35 Taylor with Fish and Wildlife Service. I'll just say thank you for everyone's perseverance and patience as 36 we work through proposals, particularly in this new 37 38 format that we're facing. As Gayla mentioned, it's much nicer to surround the table and see each other and 39 be able to communicate in that way. Thanks for 40 everyone's patience and endurance and thanks Mr. Chair 41 for leading us through the meeting. 42 43 44 MS. STICKWAN: This is Gloria. want to say thank you for supporting AITRC's proposal 45 for the Ahtna Region. I hear there's an EIS out for 46 the National Parklands on enforcement. I think that 47 should be on the agenda for discussion in the fall. 48

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

Thank you. 2 3 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Gloria. I'm not aware of that, but we'll look into that as 4 5 well. 6 Other Council members or Staff 7 8 comments. 9 10 MR. DEVINE: Yes, Mr. Chair. Peter Devine, Aleutian Pribilof Region. Just some 11 observations for the spring. The Trumpeter Swans they 12 13 came through Sand Point March 22nd. The geese took off 14 the Sand Point. We had 100 Emperor Geese stick around all year round this year. It was a mild winter and 15 usually we don't see them unless it's really cold and 16 17 it forced them from the mainland. Due to the abundance of them, they were there all the way up to a week ago. 18 They finally took off and the Brant are there now. 19 20 Due to social distancing, I can say 21 this is my first meeting I did a teleconference while 2.2 pedaling Homer Spit, so it was pretty awesome. 23 24 25 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: That's great. you for that. 26 27 Other Staff or Council comments. 28 29 MS. HOSETH: Mr. Chair. This is Gayla. 30 I just wanted to thank everybody for participating this 31 32 morning on AMBCC call. I know with everything that's going on with COVID, to take time out for this 33 migratory bird meeting is really important as our 34 35 subsistence resources are so important to all of us. I'm missing you guys. I'm looking forward to seeing 36 you guys when we can. 37 38 39 I do need to step off the call, so if there's any other actions, Taqulik, I'll turn it over 40 to you. But we're also fighting out here to protect 41 our homes from an influx of 15,000 people that are 42 going to be coming here this summer. So I appreciate 43 44 everybody's time and everybody stay safe. 45 46 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Gayla. You 47 too. Be careful out there. Thank you for your time. 48

49

50

I'll just add a little bit as well.

I'll echo both Eric and Gayla's comments, thanking everybody for hanging in there today. Most of us at this point have been through lots of teleconferences and it's difficult. One of the highlights for me in a given year really is getting together. I thoroughly appreciate the AMBCC and all the organizations involved, the great discussions. Those discussions and working through things similar to Proposal 01 I think certainly goes better when we're in the same room and we have an opportunity to talk directly to one another.

That said, we got together. Patty, thank you for putting the teleconference together and continuing to do all the great work you do and everybody else for taking time and being on here. I am very much looking forward to the next time that we can get together in person as well.

2.2

MS. SCHWALENBERG: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Patty. I just wanted to echo what everyone else said obviously, but Crystal did get back to me. They had one other tribal consultation on ravens in Alaska, so there are not very many up here yet.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you for that additional information. Other Council or Staff comments before we set the date and time of the next meeting.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Hearing none. Patty, any suggestions or do we want to send a poll out to people as far as the date and location of the next meeting?

Patty, are you still with us?

 MS. SCHWALENBERG: Yep. I had my phone on mute. Sorry. I can't keep track of this mute button. I was saying that generally we usually choose right around the third week in September, but if you want me to send out a Doodle poll, I can certainly do that especially since we're overdue on this call.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: I'm fine with that. Eric, Taqulik, are you comfortable with that? We've got plenty of time to put that into motion.

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

```
Page 102
                     MS. HEPA: I think that would be just
     fine. Thank you. Doodle polls work fine. With the
 2
     target of sometime in September.
 3
 4
 5
                     CHAIRMAN SCOTT: I agree.
                                                 Thank you
 6
     for that. Eric, are you good with that?
 7
                     MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I am.
                                              Thanks.
 8
9
10
                     CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Patty, let's do
     that and generally speaking focusing on a normal time
11
     period that we could get together in the fall.
12
13
14
                     MS. SCHWALENBERG: All right. We just
     need a motion to adjourn, Mr. Chair.
15
16
17
                     CHAIRMAN SCOTT: That's all we need.
18
     We don't even need a second.
19
                     MR. HARRIS: So moved.
20
21
                     CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, everybody.
2.2
     Please be safe out there and give your love and all
23
     your time and energy to your communities just like
24
25
     you're doing here. I appreciate it.
26
                     (Off record)
27
28
29
                       (END OF PROCEEDINGS)
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
```

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473

```
CERTIFICATE
 2
 3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
 4
                             )ss.
 5
     STATE OF ALASKA
                             )
 6
 7
                     I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and
     for the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer
 8
 9
     Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:
10
                     THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02
11
     through contain a full, true and correct
12
13
     Transcript of the ALASKA MIGRATORY BIRD CO-MANAGEMENT
14
     COUNCIL MEETING taken electronically by Computer Matrix
     Court Reporters in Anchorage, Alaska;
15
16
17
                     THAT the transcript is a true and
18
     correct transcript requested to be transcribed and
     thereafter transcribed by under my direction and
19
     reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and
20
     ability;
21
2.2
23
                     THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or
24
     party interested in any way in this action.
25
                     DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 29th
26
     day of May 2019.
27
28
29
30
                     Salena A. Hile
31
32
                     Notary Public, State of Alaska
                     My Commission Expires:9/16/2022
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
```

Phone: 907-243-0668

Fax: 907-243-1473