

Bureau of Land Management

Alaska Resource Advisory Council Meeting

Virtual, Zoom

Tuesday, May 17, 2022

Attendance

Council members present: Justin Mason, Bronk Jorgensen (RAC Co-chair), Erik Kenning, Jeff Bruno (RAC Chair), Jessie Badger, John Schell, Jusdi Warner, Sean "Sully" Sullivan, Rada Khadjinova, Rod Arno, David Gregory.

Council members absent: Stan Foo, Fannie Suvlu

BLM representatives present: Tom Heinlein (Acting State Director), Bettie Shelby, Bud Cribley, Callie Webber, Donna Bach, Deborah Coble, Dave Mushovic, Kevin Pendergast, Kent Slaughter, Leslie Holland, Marnie Graham, Nichelle "Shelly" Jones, Paul Krabacher, Chris Mckee, Stacie McIntosh, Serena Sweet, Tim Hammond, Ted Inman, Zach Million, Tammy Warner, Sophia Hamann, Tina McMaster-Goering, Gordon Claggett, Wes Davis.

Representatives of other agencies: Jim Walker (State of Alaska), Sara Taylor (Department of the Interior, Office of the Solicitor), Catherine Heroy (State of Alaska), Leigh Honig (Office of Subsistence Management), Brooke McDavid (Office of Subsistence Management), Bradley Dunker (State of Alaska), Jennifer Wing (State of Alaska), Gordon Brower (North Slope Borough).

Members of the public present (or on conference line): Al Barrette (Trapping Cabins, Alaska Board of Game), Andrew Tunnell (Doyon), Jen Leahy (Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership), Gretchen Weiss-Brooks (Anchorage Museum), Randall Zarnke (Alaska Trappers Association), Megan Condon (Native American Rights Foundation), Drue Pearce (Holland and Hart law firm), Kathryn Martin (Ahtna Inc.), Jamie Marunde (Doyon), Maisie Thomas (Fairbanks Daily News Miner).

9:02 a.m. Meeting Opens – Bolton

RAC Coordinator Melinda Bolton: introduced herself, reviewed agenda, purpose of the meeting, shared contact information, shared blm.gov/Alaska/RAC as information resource, and reminded viewers and attendees that meeting is being recorded.

9:07 a.m. State Director Welcome – Heinlein

Acting State Director Tom Heinlein: welcomes everyone, introduces Steve Cohn as BLM Alaska's new permanent State Director. Introduces Bud Cribley, former BLM Alaska State Director and now Senior Advisor for Alaska Affairs with the Bureau of Land Management. Heinlein discusses Bud's background and function to improve communications for BLM Alaska with headquarters and BLM Director Tracy Stone-Manning. Finally, he highlights recently completed projects and return to work.

9:13 a.m. Leadership Introductions

Bud Cribley, Special Advisor for Alaska – describes his function advising BLM Director, Tracy Stone-Manning. He is working closely with state leadership to get up to speed after having been away from BLM for four years.

Deputy State Directors and District and Field Managers in for BLM Alaska, including Kevin Pendergast, Leslie Holland, Callie Webber, Stacie McIntosh, Shelly Jones, Marnie Graham, Ted Inman, Tim Hammond, and Dave Mushovic.

9:25 a.m. RAC Member Introductions

Members introduced themselves and shared where they live and the interest groups they represent, including Justin Mason, Erik Kenning, Jessie Badger, John Schell, Rada Khadjinova, Rod Arno, Sean "Sully" Sullivan, Dave Gregory, Bronk Jorgensen, and Jeff Bruno.

9:38 a.m. Vote on February Meeting Minutes – Bruno

No quorum, vote postponed to later in the day.

9:41 a.m. Resources Update – Pendergast

Major planning project updates: Alaska Native Vietnam-era Veterans Land Allotment Program Public Land Order Environmental Analysis; National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska Integrated Activity Plan Record of Decision; Conoco Phillip's Alaska Proposed Willow Project Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, Coastal Plain Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. Highlights recent resources projects: Kaktovik Air Quality Monitoring Station and Partnership with State of Alaska to reintroduce more wild wood bison to the herd in western Alaska in support of restoring the previously absent native species to the state; mentioned infographic completed by BLM.

Council Member Bronk Jorgensen – We have just got too many PLOs that interfere with too many activities on BLM managed lands. The lands are there for recreation, mining, multiple uses, and they are not actually open to them. PLO question, looks like they don't include any of the Conservation System Units (CSUs).

Pendergast – the National Park Service lands and United States Forest Service National Forests are not included. It is correct that eligible veterans cannot select lands in those areas, they can only select from certain BLM-administered lands.

10:00 a.m. Quorum formed: Welcome Jusdi Warner

RAC Member Jusdi Warner – introduces herself and explains her area of interest as Executive Director of the Alaska Mental Health Trust Lands, who benefits from them, and her priorities in representing those interests.

10:02 a.m. Meeting Minutes Approval

RAC Chair Jeff Bruno – motion to approve February meeting minutes

RAC Co-Chair Bronk Jorgensen seconds

All other members present vote in favor

10:16 a.m. Recreation Update Summer 2022 – Million [Presentation on File]

Bronk Jorgensen: is there any money for recreation projects in the infrastructure package?

Million: in the beginning phases of making two proposals for those funds. The next call for the Fiscal Year 2023 process is soon. We're definitely keeping an eye out for opportunities to take advantage of those funds.

Rod Arno: Can infrastructure money be used for upgrades and armoring the existing trails. Does it have to be used on new construction? And are RS 2477s and 17bs included in the 1,000 miles of designated trails

Million: We can, but they are limiting to improving existing infrastructure, for travel and transportation improvements, for example. For the 1,000 miles, they don't include the 17bs or RS 2477s. Those designated trails are on BLM designated lands with no restrictions as far as authorizations. When we publish the designate trails information we're really careful about privately owned lands and being mindful of that ownership.

Public Attendee, Gordon Brower, Mayor North Slope Borough – (via chat) can trails in the federal lands, like NPR-A, that are used by local traditional hunting trails that are seriously torn up be repaired or benefit from your program?

Million: will need clarification on trail specifics and will follow up with Gordon offline.

10:41 a.m. Federal Subsistence Update Agenda Item – Mckee [presentation on file]

RAC Member Justin Mason: Regarding Wildlife Special Action (WSA) 21-01, I know it's complex, but I'm concerned about the precedent it sets. I feel one user group really got singled out for the small impact they have on the Western Arctic Caribou Herd. I disagree with the

claim that non-federally qualified subsistence users are deflecting the herd and feel the science does not support that claim. What is your plan to monitor the herd movements? How will we know there is a difference when there wasn't a measurable problem to begin with.

Mckee – the analysis is just one facet that informs the FSB, they hear from the councils on it, this one involved three or four RACs, they're required legally to give deference to the councils with few exceptions. They also weigh heavily on testimony from the public and federally-qualified subsistence users. The National Park Service has some collared animals and the State of Alaska has some, but the data from those collars wasn't collected in a timeline that could reflect the deflection. Most of the data was from local observation.

Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) only provides three criteria for the board to decline the request and they felt those criteria weren't met. They're really looking for the herds to come back around the community. "Continuation of subsistence uses," is a specific aspect of the law and a lot of folks miss that. When people aren't getting their subsistence needs met, that's one of the criteria to close the hunt. I think the law was intentionally vague to allow for flexibility in the FSB decision making.

There was so much interest and involvement from the public. But when you look at the original request, much less of GMU 26a was closed than initially requested. I think the bar for lifting of the closure will be the caribou coming back around.

Justin Mason: Other activities are still open, right?

Mckee: Yes, it doesn't stop people from flying low in the area. You can still go float and fish. People can still technically harvest caribou below mean high water mark because it's technically state lands. The WSA closure still allows for any other recreational use of the lands.

Justin Mason: I'd really like to know that BLM and BLM biologists are really involved in getting us some concrete science and not just anecdotal evidence and we avoid social weapons.

Mckee: These requests are becoming more and more common over the last several years.

Rod Arno: What's the exit plan for coming out of these Special Wildlife Actions, like the closures in GMU 13 subunits A and B. On the moose it's close to half the moose harvest on Federal lands. But A & B that's almost a million acres. And you've got almost 3 million acres. Federal harvest is 70. Non-federal is just 26 moose in 13a and 13b. It seems there's about half the harvest being taken by federal subsistence users. This has nothing to do with Covid like down in Kake. If I was a FQSU in GMU 13 and it gave me the exclusive use of a million acres of prime moose habitat, that achieves what the FQSU wants to cut down on which is

competition. And I feel there's no data to back up the claims of the "safety issue" cited prior to the temporary closure. So, here's OSM (FSB) who agrees with the closure (User conflict and excessive competition, safety concerns). Since no individual proposed it as a permanent closure it'll expire on June 1. Why does the state users and public have to go through this whole process. How can the closure go away and without making sure the issues are not still there. When will the non FQSU be drug through the process for another temporary closure.

Mckee: The longest you can have a closure is one regulatory cycle, two years. Once the cycle expires the closure expires. For it to continue, there'd have to be another proposal for a Temporary Wildlife Special Action, analysis, public comment, vote. For it to continue someone would have had to make another proposals weeks if not months ago. It's a user driven system. If the user doesn't make a proposal, you won't likely see OSM or another agency request to close public lands to non-FQSUs.

Rod Arno: That would just be talking about another wildlife special action. If OSM (FSB) agrees there are safety concerns and user conflicts.

State failed to amend constitution to set up rule priority. Seems like FSB has achieved it's goal in giving preference.

We've got funds for the state and OSM to gather data. But will it be used to make a permanent change. If the courts can't straighten it out, it seems the Federal Land Managers should look at helping FSB.

Mckee: There's not regulatory framework for that. Someone would have to make a permanent proposal. That's how the sections of the Noatak became permanently closed. Then someone could present a proposal to open it back up again. It's user driven and up to the public to make proposals.

Rod Arno: I think it would behoove the federal government to remove that loophole so we're not having to gear up every few years for the same closures or take it to Judge Gleason to interpret the sections of ANILCA.

Mckee: it's even more difficult than that. Those regs aren't in subparts c and d. It would take an act of the secretary to change those regs.

Rod Arno: I don't see it getting any better like with GMU 4 or like with the fisheries.

My next question is going through the process on the Yukon River, will we have the same issue there for that analysis and process. Will BLM be responsible for that analysis?

Mckee: That's a complicated one because there's lots of state lands there and complex boundaries. And the federal manager can open or close the fishery. I think it's a safe bet to expect continued poor runs along the Yukon. I think it will be unlikely to see any fishery open there this year.

Bronk Jorgensen: making sure I understand it, the State Director has a seat on the board and a voting voice. Does BLM have a framework for dealing with proposals in a systematic way. Or is each proposal just discussed before the vote. These issues are getting very complex for any one person to keep their heads wrapped around.

Mckee: reviewed by field level staff, then leaders at OSM, then ISC members which supports with our review and comment. Then OSM takes comments and edits and makes a final analysis. We make sure the board has the proposal to review before they vote on it. It also involves public comments on the analysis and state comments on the analysis.

Part of what I do for BLM is communicate with our people in the field and get their perspective on the analysis and incorporate their concerns. Brief state director prior to meeting and formulate BLMs stance on any given action or proposal. There's a lot of prep work.

Bronk Jorgensen: seems like the rules will continue to be used to limit access to nonFQSUs and it will become an increasing problem.

Mckee: People are certainly becoming more involved in making proposal.

Rod Arno: state has no seat and no vote, just the ability to provide comments and field data which they have at length to refute the concerns regarding the conflicts of caribou and moose in the northwest. Basically, the state is at the mercy of the FSB.

Mckee: the state does interact during the meetings. They respond to questions and make comments during the meetings. They don't have a vote, you're right, but they are participating.

12:50 p.m. BLM Alaska Trapping Cabin Permit Policy: Mushovic [presentation on file]

Erik Kenning: Can you go over bonding requirements?

Mushovic: Put in place for when the authorization is no longer needed to ensure the lands go back to the way they were before the authorization was issued. Bond is in place just in case the permittee doesn't get it cleaned up and to ensure the lands can continue to be enjoyed by the public for other uses. Otherwise, the public must foot the bill for the cleanup. Recently it's become a more high-profile issue for BLM if the lands are selected by the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) corporations or state and we need to make sure there's no contamination on those selected lands. Bonding makes sure the permittee has financial ability

and commitment to reclaim the lands after the authorization ends. Bond amounts vary from location depending on reasonable costs for what they want to use it for, some people want to do more on the lands than others.

We do everything we can to keep them reasonable. There are different options for bonds like surety bonds like \$1k for every \$10k. We're trying to keep the bonds as low and reasonable as possible so they're not prohibitive.

Jusdi Warner: You mentioned every 5 years the permit shall be renewed until the death of the last family member?

Mushovic: Yes that's what ANILCA specifies.

Jusdi Warner: This applies to the trapping cabin permits?

Mushovic: Yes, if it's in a Conservation System Unit (CSU), it would be a 5-year permit, under those conditions.

Jusdi Warner: With that "shall be renewed," it could be much longer than a 5-year permit?

Mushovic: Yes. It can become a gray area for some. It can cause controversy in some circles. Is it really a minimum impact permit if it goes for 50 years?

Jusdi Warner: How much does BLM experience that and how much does it impact getting other cabin permits issued that are not in CSUs, as far as prioritization?

Mushovic: I don't have good number for how many people want them whether on BLM general lands or CSUs. I don't think it's a large workload to process them necessarily.

Jusdi Warner: So it's not really causing a slow down as far as adjudicating permits.

Mushovic: Not among the applicants for trapping cabins. Other priorities draw on our time more, as far as being directed by the administration to prioritize certain projects, like for the National Environmental Policy Act analyses, which can pull staff away from these projects and reports on the trapping cabin permits.

Certainly, the number of trapping cabin permits we've had to date aren't huge and I don't foresee it becoming a huge number.

RAC Coordinator, Bolton: What could happen to conveyance of selected lands, even with selectee's concurrence?

Mushovic: Authorization could terminate upon conveyance and then they'd need permission

from the state or ANCSA corporation. We take into account how future landowners would like to see things done. If it's in the public's best interest we could issue, but it would need a robust justification for that.

Rod Arno: Just clarify the Instruction Memorandum (IM) for winter-use only commercial trapping cabins, that was put out under Bud Cribley. Does that only apply on 2.7 million acres in CSUs or does that apply to 47 million acres under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA)?

Mushovic: Everything ANILCA and FLPMA.

1:31 p.m. Public Comment

Randy Zarnke, President of Alaska Trappers Association: We've been commenting on this and seeking changes on this policy and the procedures. I appreciate Mushovic's presentation, and he clearly understands every facet of the process. But this process is overwhelming, it seems daunting and I'm sure it deters applicants.

A previous RAC formed a subcommittee and made recommendations to make it easier for trappers to get a cabin. Cost recovery was a new term at the time, but is familiar now, as are so many other terms.

Until this presentation I thought ANILCA superseded FLPMA and guaranteed our right. I understand that's not necessarily the case. As he said there won't be a flood of applications, but for those who wish to pursue it full time as a lifestyle in remote areas, they're essential. If the process was easier, I think there would be even less than 10 applicants immediately.

I hope the RAC will resurrect the subcommittee and help simplify the process for the trappers.

Kathryn Martin, Ahtna Inc.: Hello members. Some thoughts for ANCSA 17(b) easement maintenance. It would be good if we could contract the maintenance portion of these trails. I want to mention the Vietnam-era Native Veteran Land Allotments. More lands should have been available at the beginning of this program. Thirdly, conveyances. As Alaska Native Corporations, we're still waiting for conveyances and waiting for the state to finalize their selections. It's really sad that some of our folks have passed away before getting their lands through the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act 14(c)(1) process.

Jen Leahy: I'm the Alaska Rep for the TRCP. We work to guarantee quality hunting and fishing opportunities for all Alaskans. Thanks to RAC members for their commitments to this group and their commitment to access. Regarding 17b easements, I want to share that our team recently helped support legislation to enhance recreation on public lands. Modernizing Access to our Public Land Act (MAP) Land Act was overwhelmingly bipartisan in its approval. It supports a 3-year period of modernization and digitization of GIS information. 47 million dollars will help agencies develop standards on outdoor rec data and to make the data

available online, and then filter to popular apps like On X and help reduce trespassing issues. Offer my support to Dave, the State Office, Native Corporations and RAC members on implementation of Map Lands Act.

Thanks everyone. Feel free to reach out any time: jleahy@trcp.org. I appreciate your dedication to MAPLand implementation.

Cribley: Comment on Map Land, asking if we're aware and engaged on this? Is there any discussion in the bureau about this?

Mushovic: We're aware. We've already done some of the things they're laying out and working to meet other standards. We did the whole process of the 17b easement layer before the legislation.

Jen Wing, ADFG ANILCA program: question about Dave's presentation. He said it's just ANILCA units that 1393 b covers, but it says, "and other federal lands."

Mushovic: I'm not aware of it saying that.

Jen Wing, ADFG: "Regarding other areas of lands not covered in this section."

Sara Taylor, DOI: I have working on ANILCA issues for a long time. Worked on the state ANILCA team for many years. A lot of my work is focused on Alaska-specific legislation. Here's a link to the law: 16 USC 3193(b)

Bronk Jorgensen: I would like to recommend anyone who has an interest in ANILCA to take the ANILCA class offered by the Institute of the North. It is excellent. Most DOI folks I believe are required to take it at some point.

1:55 p.m Break

2:05 p.m Conveyances Update: Krabacher [presentation on file]

Donna Bach, BLM AK: Has BIA partnered with the Dept of Military Veteran's Affairs in tracking updating addresses in addition to ANCSA corporations? That was my only question.

Krabacher- the 13th region is in BIAs court, they have put some time into it and then of course there's the layer of the military determination. And others have been determined to be eligible but we're trying to find them. Once they've been determined eligible, BIA has done some work to find them. And the ANCSA regional corps have done a lot to try and find them.

2:26 p.m. ANCSA 17b Easements compared to RS 2477s: Mushovic [presentation on file]

(Held questions until after RS 2477 presentation)

2:36 p.m. RS 2477, State of Alaska Presenter: Walker [presentation on file]

Rod Arno: What happens with 17bs that overlay RS 2477s, can they all be vacated?

Mushovic: If there's a 17b, and it overlays the RS 2477, the RS 2477 is older so it's the superior right. There's a public process we'd have to go through to terminate the easement. The routes may not be exactly the same, and the rights might not be exactly the same. We wouldn't want to terminate a 17b unless we go through the administrative procedures to validate the RS 2477 before we terminate the access provided by the 17b.

Rod Arno: So ANCSA created 17bs, the committee working group of federal land managers in the state got together and then went through the state and determined how many 17bs there were. That original list of 17b easements is that available? Do both the state and fed have that? Is there a record of what still exists and what's been vacated?

Mushovic: The original list of proposed 17bs was very long, and we're still adding easements with new conveyance documents. Is there a list in one place of the original proposed 17b easements? I'm not aware of one. You could compile one, but you'd have to go through the documents. Important to note, with the conveyance we cannot create any new easements on that land.

We do have information on how you can find the 17b easements that have been reserved through a BLM database. That's the next phase we're in is ground truthing the easement locations and adding that to the GIS layers available online.

No list of easements we've terminated. But it's a small number. Again, it is a public process with appealable decisions before we execute it.

Jim Walker State of Alaska, Department of Natural Resources (DNR): I would have to do some historical research to see if we have records on original proposed 17b easements.

Mushovic: I'd like to clarify one point. During reservation of easements, we went through some legal challenges for easements people felt were not appropriate. We went through easement conformance, and some easements that didn't meet regulations or law were not carried forward in the conveyance documents.

Bronk Jorgensen: On the RS 2477 they were historically create, as time moves on, and they're not used, are their rights diminished because of that nonuse over time? Especially if they've become impassable.

Walker, DNR: From a technical standpoint, disuse of a particular trail once established, should not be deemed as a waiver of the trail or divest the state of the property interest, intellectually speaking. Practically, when a trail has been disused and you have fewer and fewer live

witnesses from pre statehood act, it becomes more difficult to prove those cases. Once established an RS 2477 does not disappear, lapse, or is the state precluded from asserting those rights due to the passage of time. Practically speaking, it's difficult to prove.

And this is another reason the state disagrees with the federal government's position that a court must rule on validity because it can be so hard to prove with living witnesses.

Bronk Jorgensen: Update on litigation?

Bolton: Recommend avoid specifics on litigation.

Walker, DNR: Will address the case he's probably interested in, Chicken is in settlement negotiation. I can share that much with you Bronk.

Bronk Jorgensen: Thanks and my intention is to just let everyone on the RAC know that there is a lot of litigation going on regarding this matter. It's a very contentious issue among all user groups. I have some other related comments and will address them during the round table a little later.

Justin Mason: Once an RS 2477 is validated, is access guaranteed or can public access be cut off at any point.

Walker, DNR: From the state's standpoint, and the way they're documented. If someone brings it to our attention, and one way it can come to our attention is through public nomination. We research the RS 2477 and determine whether we believe it to be valid. Sometimes we find them to be invalid. Sometimes we take the research and submit it to the legislature to see if it should be codified. And lastly there's a lot of litigation between private, Native Corporations, state, and federal; even litigation between private citizens we find out about well into the proceedings, which we usually sit out. Once we've documented and the state asserts ownership, then it's the state's job to manage it in the public's best interest. For example, a historic route that crosses a ski slope, the ski area might not want people riding snow machines down the slopes as skiers are using it. In that case our regional offices might make a management decision and say we will only have motorized use during certain times or seasons. Similarly for a trail that's been degraded by overuse we may need to close it temporarily to ensure it's viable going long-term. Once it's been validated through the state's process, we manage it. And we try to manage these decisions now and in the future of these resources for Alaskans.

3:14 p.m. 17b Mapping Marking and Maintenance: Shelby [presentation on file]

Jeff Bruno: Dave, can you talk about Map Land Act impacts on this?

Mushovic: It's some standards for the data and metadata. I'm hoping we can link and import the data into that system. It does accomplish a lot more than the Map Land act requires. We

have the layer the public can access readily, and allowable uses, etc. The second Layer is the on the ground information that the field offices have been developing over the years. Trail conditions, are the trails signed or marked, when was the last time they were marked? Is the trail in the right place, are there three trails there and easement only allows for one trail? Management needs both of those layers to make the maps consistent. It's a tool for the public and the managers. It also tells us who has administration of the trail. To some extent we go beyond what the lands act dictates and that's a positive. We've been working on this for years just to answer how many easements and how many miles of them we have for ourselves.

How should we prioritize their maintenance, where are the high use areas? Data from trail heads, two users or 350 annual users? We don't have dedicated funding, we have limited resources, but thousands of easements. A lot of them access state land, which is appropriate, or other federal lands and the map data helps us sort out who can administer the trail: park service, state, BLM, etc. Only we can reserve or terminate them through appropriate processes, but on the ground, maintenance functions are better carried out by field offices.

It is up to the RAC to decide on how involved you want to be and whether to make recommendations on reservations or management or policy we use in managing them. We're in the process of redoing our easement policy handbook of moving easements, prioritizing maintenance and working with landowners.

This is a tool the RAC can use to get an idea of the larger picture of the easements and if appropriate make recommendations to us on how to prioritize or what direction to take in managing them. We have a proposed contract to do some of this and we have to weigh whether that's appropriate, how much information do we have and do we need more, would the work be duplicative, can the agency continue any maintenance on them all?

We can certainly set up subcommittee work groups on this. And we can support that if you want to have a session devoted purely diving deeper.

3:32 p.m Break

3:45 p.m Round Table

Bronk Jorgensen: Federal Subsistence and user conflicts among guides, subsistence users, non-federally qualified subsistence users. The FSB is obviously has the ability to manage wildlife basically based on where you live and who you are, not on biological reasons. I see this becoming more problematic and creating division based on where people live. I think this will be a big issue for Mr. Cohn to carry forward.

Everything we talk about has to do with access. Glad to have heard from the state on RS 2477;

they're a big deal to placer miners, especially where they overlap with 17b easements. I'm not sure with the easements that we need a subcommittee. But I think we need to formulate some recommendations. It's a huge amount of information to digest. But the amount of time and money being spent in the federal court system debating these benefits no one, least of all the users. We need to push for solutions to get them out of the courts so everyone can move on. The easements are deal breakers for small operators; we can't wait around for years for people to decide what's going on.

I think we do need a subcommittee for trapping cabin permits. It sounds like a year long process to get that application approved. That's too long. I don't know what the timeframe is for the same thing on state lands. And it seems like it is still complex for people. My brother doesn't run a computer and that route isn't feasible for him. I think we really need to work with BLM to get that boiled down. The advantage of that is that we can invite other people who are not on the RAC itself to be on the subcommittee. When we did the mining subcommittee on the reclamation standards, we could get it boiled down.

BLM is doing a great job on land transfers. Just went through one. Once BLM has the documents in place, they can make these land transfers happen. Those transfers that are left are more complex and will take more time.

Not sure we can make recommendations at this point.

Other thing on mapping for BLM trails to maps on apps that are accurate that would be valuable for people who end up in the field. Unfortunately, some of the stuff that is available is difficult to navigate and use. BLMs work on map making and marking is wonderful.

Bolton: clarified requirements for recommendation vote and subcommittee creation.

Jeff Bruno: I agree we're not there yet for recommendations, but probably for subcommittees.

Erik Kenning: Following up on these Wildlife Special Actions, something we (Arctic Slope Regional Corporation (ASRC)) brought up with the closure in Unit 23, users might shift north to the North Slope, which then potentially creates a conflict in an area that doesn't have conflict and now we'll spend \$20k chartering flights to make sure people aren't going places they shouldn't because of these closures. That's one more facet, it remains to be seen. But it will eat up time and budget of our small agency.

BLM issued for the 2020/2013 Integrated Activity Plan, the entities on the North Slope put a lot of time going through a thoughtful process and making meaningful comments and then suddenly it's all switched, and we've lost a lot of things that were in the 2020 IAP and it's now been a waste of our time and funds. We're watching Willow closely, we're supportive over that and hope BLM will keep with the timeline. We're also watching ANWR/Coastal Plain.

Jusdi Warner: Thanks to staff at BLM who presented today. I know how much time goes into preparing for these meetings. Good job to them all.

I can't help but push for fulfilling state entitlements and lifting the PLOs.

Access is critical to every one of our seats both professionally or personally. I think access should have a subcommittee.

The trapping cabin permits, I've heard that since I've been on the RAC. I want to know if anything has changed in Randy's 20 years of comments, or what hasn't changed and why not. That might raise the need of a subcommittee to work through those needs.

Justin Mason: I think Bronk hit on the Wildlife Special Actions (WSA) that are super concerning to me that we're basing these decisions without science and user groups are being singled out. I'd love to know the BLMs perspective on whether we can help. Is that putting biologists on the ground or putting money towards research on the claims that are driving the WSAs. We've got to protect this access and it's a disappointment to see user groups pitted against each other.

Other concern is with RS 2477. When I asked whether the public gets access, he said it doesn't guarantee access and that's a concern as well.

Rod Arno: I look at this and the point of volunteering is to see what I can help BLM do. In terms of some of the RAC member's priority issues, for instance with the Federal Subsistence Board, Alaska's Congressional delegation can do more for us because the sections of ANILCA that give a priority not during times of shortage. The state subsistence laws are based on times of shortage. The federal subsistence law is not, it's based on where you live. And these conflicts don't have a shortage of harvestable surplus, but it's locals that see other folks have moved in. We'll have to follow the law.

With access there's a lot of opportunity with access. As I've learned in decades of following the issue, as far as the easement management for BLM, it's discretionary based on the availability of funds. And funds is how you get staff and then you can actually talk about management. We have a good opportunity with the infrastructure funding coming out, tourism, increases in access, long term transportation plans, it seems it's all alignment to work together for the benefit of everyone and the economy. I think the subcommittee that looked at 17b and RS 2477 would be good.

RS 2477s are interesting. A lot of BLMs priority is access to BLM lands and then the trails getting highest use. I think we need to maintain those lower use trails to spread out the use and avoid conflicts. Maybe we can give some guidance or suggestions to BLM on how to mitigate some of the conflicts by improving access for all Alaskans to public resources.

Trapper Cabins again is just an issue of what's written in ANILCA and FLPMA. I appreciate what Randy's trying to do but it's what ANILCA was trying not to do which is having private recreational cabins and facilities on public lands. Those recreational cabins would mean people would have to share with a private cabin on public lands and then you'd have trespass issues. We have to follow the current law unless we can change it.

The mapping project is great and then everyone can do a better job not trespassing on private lands. Getting more funding is one way we could potentially help. In terms of access, I think we can be good partners and it'd be a constructive effort.

Jeff Bruno: sounds like we want a subcommittee on access how do we decide who is on it and nominate members.

Bolton: clarified how to nominate and who should be nominated for an access subcommittee.

What about trapping cabins?

Bronk Jorgensen: I think we need one for trapping cabins. It's a problem for the user and for BLM. I'd like to hear people opposed or for it. If we don't have that interest, it's not worth pushing forward. I'd also like to see if the Acting State Director would want to see that happen as well.

Tom Heinlein, Acting State Director: On the Trapping cabin subcommittee, that's one, since we've been there before, I would bet our incoming SD, Steve has had a part in it in the past. I would defer to Steve to get his concurrence on it. It's obvious. I hear you on the complexity and the timeline. It's a complicated process, no doubt. Maybe there are some things we can do to assist people to better understand that and help them through it. That's not to say a subgroup couldn't come up with innovative ways to help. But I'd defer to Steve on that and it's not a long deferral.

Jeff Bruno– Definitely can pass it along from Steve and see where he wants to go from there. I'm in support and just want to make sure Steve is too.

Heinlein: I think a subgroup for access, that is something I'm comfortable endorsing now. I think it's a little more straightforward with things we can work with immediately.

Bronk Jorgensen: Maybe there will be thoughts Steve will have on how we can issue it. And if there are areas we haven't touched on that Steve thinks we can touch on, it would be great to know about them before the next meeting. And he might have ideas from his previous time with BLM.

Heinlein: We can certainly get those considerations incorporated in agenda planning meetings.

Jessie Badger: Totally agree, love the trapping cabin subcommittee idea. I'm behind you on it.

Jeff: So sounds like we're moving forward on an access subcommittee and seeing what Steve thinks on the trapping cabin subcommittee.

Bronk Jorgensen: one more comment for access subcommittee, but I think Jamie Marunde would be a great addition to that.

Bolton: If I may also call out a member of the public and former RAC member who might consider joining the access subcommittee, since they will be impacted, Kathryn Martin?

Kathryn: I'm Senior VP for Ahtna Incorporated. I would be willing to sit on the access committee.

Jamie Marunde: (via chat) Thank you, Bronk. I will plan to reach out after the meeting. I have a mic issue today with my new laptop.

Justin Mason: can we have something more broad for a subcommittee?

Jeff Bruno: I think it can be open to a larger group but the recommendation has to be specific.

Justin Mason: What about conflicts we're seeing down south that we could see up here. Maybe we could help BLM get ahead of the issues before Alaska's issues in the future.

Bronk Jorgensen: it'll be good to try and minimize the amount of BLM staff that have to be on it because their areas don't always dovetail. For things like easements and trapping cabins they need to be in a column so to speak. I think the BLM staff will tell us if it's too big and awkward and wont work.

Jeff Bruno: calls for RAC Member volunteers for access subcommittee.

Jeff Bruno & Justin Mason on it; refer nominees to Bolton.

4:30 p.m Acting State Director's Parting Thoughts

Bolton will poll members for August or September meeting Dates

Heinlein: thank you all. I'm really impressed with how much engagement we've gotten the whole way through the day. I appreciate the frank discussion and sharing the issues that are out there for you and the people you represent, particularly for the easements and cabins. I'm really impressed with all the knowledge you all have of our programs. They are really complex, and we've got people dedicated to try and tease that all apart and engage you all on how we can provide the best service to you all.

I have got a lot to transfer to Steve, along with Melinda. I'm happy to sit in and support your transition with Steve as well. I think we can keep momentum going. It was a good stroke we were able to maintain with all our actings being in-state staff and we've had great support as we've been in these acting positions.

One more thing I want to mention from the round table, and it's a take-home message. The decisions we make, the durability of them between administrations. We've revisited a lot of them already and made changes and I appreciate the impact on you and the people you represent you diligently participate in the process only to have it change in a few years. It's unfortunately a political reality, but I know the administration is trying to find a more durable ground so these decisions will be more durable with the next administration.

4:37: Adjourn

Jeff Bruno- Motion to adjourn.

Bronk Jorgensen seconds.

Meeting closed.