

0001

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

KODIAC/ALEUTIANS SUBSISTENCE
REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

PUBLIC MEETING

VOLUME I

UNALASKA PUBLIC LIBRARY
Unalaska, Alaska
September 4, 2024
9:00 am

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Rebecca Skinner, Chair
- Patrick Holmes
- Natasha Hayden
- Brett Richardson
- Della Trumble
- Coral Chernoff

Regional Council Coordinator, DeAnna Perry

Recorded and transcribed by:

Lighthouse Integrated Services Corp
877-261-2495
Info.@lighthouseonline.com

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Unalaska, Alaska - 9/04/2024)

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, so the time is 9am and we'll go ahead and get started. This is a Kodiak/Aleutians Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. We're meeting here in Unalaska. Okay. We'll go ahead and start with our agenda. The first item is the invocation. Pat, would you like to do that?

MR. HOLMES: We'll say Alutiig deity. And I believe even some of the Unangan folks agreed with us, but it was the male, and (In Native) [IU 7:10/1] was the female entity for spirituality in our neck of the woods. And I'm sorry, I forgot it, I'm getting old. But anyway, one of the things I wanted to do today a little different is I brought artemisia. And if you folks want. Anyway, that's a herb that grows through the Aleutians all the way through Prince William Sound up in the interior. And it was used medicinally and also spiritually amongst folks. And basically, if you rub it, it's very aromatic. And so, the Unangan people and Alutiig people would put this on the floors of their barabbara to keep it from getting moldy. And it was also something they used when they'd take a banya, to kind of relieve their lungs and everything. And I read that the Athabascan folks and the Tlingits would build a bed of hot rocks, and then they would put this on there and if somebody had pneumonia and tuberculosis, they'd lay them on a blanket and steam them in this stuff. So, I just wanted to have this as kind of a something symbolic about what we're trying to do to help each other and to leave behind our own personal thoughts on things and try to share, so that we can make sure that subsistence can continue in our region. And so, if you.....

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: I think somebody online doesn't have their mute on. Sorry Pat, go ahead.

MR. HOLMES: So, I would just like to take a moment and thank -- I was -- often call the villages to talk to old friends about what they think is important before I come down and a -- several really fine folks in Kodiak, and I'm sure you all know other folks that have passed in the last year, Margaret Roberts, (indiscernible), Johnny Raft some of my -- anyway. But just let's just take a moment to close our eyes and just think about those people that have passed

0003

1 and what we've learned from them. And then when we get
2 done, then we'll just, amen. Okay.

3
4 (Pause)

5
6 Amen.

7
8 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Pat.
9 Okay. We'll go ahead and call the meeting to order at
10 9:04am. And next is roll call and establish quorum.
11 DeAnna.

12
13 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Madam Chair.
14 Patrick Holmes.

15
16 MR. HOLMES: Here.

17
18 MS. PERRY: Christopher Price.

19
20 MR. PRICE: Here.

21
22 MS. PERRY: Coral Chernoff.

23
24 MS. CHERNOFF: Here.

25
26 MS. PERRY: Della Trumble and Della may
27 be on the line. Della, your phone might be muted. So,
28 if you want to press star six. And Natasha Hayden.

29
30 MS. HAYDEN: Here.

31
32 MS. PERRY: Thank you. Brett Richardson.

33
34 MR. RICHARDSON: Here.

35
36 MS. PERRY: Samuel Rohrer.

37
38 (No response)

39
40 Jeffrey Wasley.

41
42 (No response)

43
44 Rebecca Skinner.

45
46 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Here.

47
48 MS. PERRY: Madam Chair, you have seven
49 of your participating and seated nine members present.
50 You do have a quorum. Just for the record, Jeffrey Wasley

1 and Sam Rohrer have excused absences as they are guiding
2 this week. Thank you.

3

4 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Great, thank you.
5 Okay, next item is meeting announcements. DeAnna, if you
6 had those, and then depending on what you cover, I may
7 have a few things to say. Thanks.

8

9 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Madam Chair. Hello
10 everyone and welcome. My name is DeAnna Perry, Council
11 Coordinator for the Southeast Alaska Subsistence
12 Regional Advisory Council. And this week, I'm honored
13 to step in the shoes of your Council Coordinator, Lisa
14 Hutchinson Scarborough. This is a fisheries regulatory
15 meeting, and I do have a few housekeeping items to go
16 over that will help us get through our meeting
17 productively and provide opportunities for interested
18 parties to engage in the meeting. It does seem like with
19 more technology and logistics there comes a little bit
20 more instruction, so please bear with me. For those
21 joining us on the phone or by Microsoft Teams, you can
22 find the agenda and meeting materials online. The
23 Federal program website is www.doi.gov/subsistence. Then
24 at the top under regions tab, choose Kodiak/Aleutians
25 and then the box named Meeting Materials. For those
26 attending our meeting in person, please make sure that
27 you sign in at the front table. It's right here to my
28 right, your left as you walk in the door and there is a
29 sign in sheet for each day of the meeting that helps us
30 make sure that we record participation, and everyone's
31 names spelled correctly.

32

33 If you would like to address the Council
34 during the meeting for folks in the room, fill out a
35 blue testifier form like this. You'll find that also on
36 the front table you can hand it to me or any of the
37 staff. This will help us keep track of anyone who'd like
38 to speak to the Council, and our Chair can recognize you
39 at the appropriate time. You can note on that sheet what
40 agenda item you would like to speak to. For those on the
41 phone or on Teams, we will provide further instruction
42 later on how to speak during public comment
43 opportunities. But currently, most lines are now muted
44 to make sure that we minimize any audio distractions.
45 So, for the mute function, if you press star six, it
46 will mute and unmute you. Again, at the time appropriate,
47 the Chair will recognize you. The Chair will announce
48 the time for tribal and public comment on non-agenda
49 items each morning. This will be an opportunity for those
50 present as well as those participants -- participating

1 on the phone and Microsoft Teams to speak on non-agenda
2 items, we would ask you to hold any comments on proposals
3 or agenda items until such time as they come up before
4 the Council so, the Council can hear all pertinent
5 information at the time they are working on that item.
6 For this regulatory meeting, if you would like to provide
7 a comment on a particular proposal, you can speak during
8 the proposal process, or you may consider submitting a
9 written comment instead. And you can do that by emailing
10 your comment to subsistence@ios.doi.gov. Those will be
11 sent to myself, and staff and we will share those with
12 the council. Again, comments can be sent to email
13 subsistence@ios.doi.gov. And then a reminder to all, our
14 meetings are conducted by Robert's Rules. It helps us
15 provide structure and maintain order throughout the
16 meeting. All participants, Councils, staff and public
17 members are expected to be courteous and respectful in
18 all interactions as a matter of meeting etiquette. As
19 members have discussed or as members have discussion,
20 listen to staff presenting information and possibly
21 hearing public testimony, Council members should
22 remember to address the subject matter when they comment
23 on the record. There are bound to be differing opinions,
24 and it would be inappropriate for a Council member to
25 personally rebuke another person's comment. It's more
26 productive and in line with Robert's Rules for a Council
27 member to simply express their perspective on the
28 subject matter without specifically referencing
29 another's comment. And again, that's whether it's a
30 fellow Council member, staff or member of the public.
31 And council members If you have any conflict of interest,
32 if you feel you have a conflict of interest, please
33 indicate this on the record, and you can abstain from
34 voting on that issue.

35
36 Absent a conflict of interest, Council
37 members are expected to vote on all action items. And
38 I'll probably remind you again once we get to the
39 proposals. I'd also like to bring to everyone's
40 attention, we are capturing a recording of this meeting
41 a bit differently. The previous court reporters for our
42 program, who probably knew all of you by Council name
43 and voice and face will no longer be covering our
44 meetings, so it'll be extremely important for everyone
45 to identify themselves each time they speak. We are
46 welcoming Jonathan Butzke, I hope I pronounced that
47 right with okay with talking Circle Media to serve as a
48 recorder. He'll hand off this recording for
49 transcription to Lighthouse Integrated Services Corp.,
50 so the actual transcriber won't have the benefit of

1 putting faces to names and nameplates. So again, just a
2 reminder to identify yourself each time you speak. Okay,
3 before we begin, for those in the room, I would ask you
4 to just take a moment to look at your cell phones and
5 silence any ringers. And I know that was a lot but thank
6 you for allowing me to take care of those housekeeping
7 items, Madam Chair.

8
9 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Great, thank you,
10 DeAnna. This is Rebecca Skinner. So, for my
11 announcements, just so people have a sense of the day,
12 I do plan to break right around noon for lunch. We'll
13 probably do an hour and a half for lunch, because I'm
14 just a little uncertain about how long it's going to
15 take us to get lunch. So, probably an hour and a half.
16 And then I do expect to break around 5 or 5:30 tonight
17 depending on how the day goes. But I do want this to be
18 a reasonable day. Okay, We will.....

19
20 MS. TRUMBLE: Madam Chair

21
22 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes. Go ahead.
23 Della.

24
25 MS. TRUMBLE: And this is -- yeah, Madam
26 Chair this is Della. I'm just letting you know I am
27 online. I just happened to hit the wrong button and
28 disconnected, but I'm here.

29
30 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, thanks,
31 Della. Okay, so moving on to agenda item five welcome
32 and introductions. Everyone welcome to the
33 Kodiak/Aleutians Subsistence Regional Advisory Council
34 fall meeting here in Unalaska. We will go around the
35 room. If everyone in the room can come up to the --
36 sorry, let me back up. We're going to do introductions,
37 but I am going to do it by agency. So, we have an orderly
38 approach. We'll take those in the room first from each
39 agency, and then I'll ask if there's anyone online. But
40 we will start at the table with the Council members, and
41 then I'll go down to the agencies. So, I'll start with
42 myself. I'm Rebecca Skinner, I'm the Council Chair and
43 I'm from Kodiak, Alaska. And I'll move to my right to
44 Pat Holmes.

45
46 MR. HOLMES: Pardon me. Getting old.
47 Forget to push buttons. I'm Pat Holmes from Kodiak, and
48 I've been doing subsistence since probably about 1963,
49 in Alaska. And before that, other places. But anyway, I
50 will wait for more time to blather. Thank you.

0007

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

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, Chris Price.

MR. PRICE: Good morning, Chris Price from Unalaska. Thank you.

MS. CHERNOFF: Good morning, my name is Coral Chernoff, and I am from Kodiak and I'm happy to be out here in Dutch again for a meeting. Thank you.

MR. RICHARDSON: Good morning, I'm Brett Richardson. I represent Unalaska for subsistence purposes.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. And we'll move to Council members online. Can we go to Della?

MS. TRUMBLE: Good morning. Della Trumble, from King Cove.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Do we have other Council members online?

MS. HAYDEN: Good morning, Madam Chair. This is Natasha Hayden, I am in Kodiak.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, Natasha. Any other council members online?

(No response)

Okay. Then I'm going to go down the list of Federal agencies, then the State and then others in the room. So, we'll start Federal with Fish and Wildlife staff. So, anyone in the room, whoever wants to come up first.

(No response)

Okay, so we don't have anyone from Fish and Wildlife in the room. Next on the line will be Bureau of -- sorry, I was thinking -- okay, Indian affairs. Oh, sorry. BIA, go ahead.

MR. CHEN: Hello, Madam Chair and Council members, my name is Glenn Chen. I'm the subsistence branch chief for the BIA. Always a pleasure to attend your meetings.

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, Glenn.
2 Okay, sorry. Now, office of the Secretary, interior. And
3 if you want to restate what I'm supposed to be calling
4 that again. Thanks.

5
6 MS. LEONETTI: This is new to everybody.
7 Good morning, Crystal Leonetti and I am acting director
8 for the Office of Subsistence Management, which is now
9 located in Office of the Secretary Policy Management and
10 Budget, PMB for short. Thank you.

11
12 MR. KOLLER: Hey, good morning. My name
13 is Justin Koller. I'm a fisheries biologist with the
14 Office of Subsistence Management. We have several
15 vacancies in our office right now, so I'm filling in as
16 acting regulation specialist as well. Thank you.

17
18 MR. ROBERTS: Good morning, Madam Chair,
19 members of the Council, I'm Jason Roberts. I'm an
20 anthropologist for OSM.

21
22 MS. MORROW: Good morning, Madam Chair,
23 members of the Council. My name is Kristin Morrow. I'm
24 an anthropology pathways intern with OSM.

25
26 MS. WESSELS: Good morning, Madam Chair.
27 Members of the Council. Katya Wessels, I'm Console
28 Coordination Division supervisor. And just as Justin
29 said, because of the vacancies, I'm currently Acting
30 Deputy Director for OSM. Thank you.

31
32 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, so that was
33 it for people in the room from OSM. I did want to
34 backtrack. Is there anyone online from Fish and Wildlife
35 Service?

36
37 MS. KLEIN: Good morning. Yeah, there are
38 a few of us on this morning. I'll just start. My name
39 is Jill Klein, and I'm the regional subsistence
40 coordinator based in Anchorage for the U.S. Fish and
41 Wildlife Service. So, I work with the Federal
42 Subsistence Management Program, and I'm also acting
43 right now for our fisheries deputy assistant regional
44 director as well. Good morning.

45
46 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Next
47 person.

48
49
50

0009

1 MR. GERKEN: Madam Chair, this is Jon
2 Gerken Fish and Wildlife Service. I'm the Federal in-
3 season Manager for that area. Good morning.

4
5 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Next
6 person.

7
8 MS. FUJI-DOE: Good morning. This is
9 Danielle Fuji-Doe. I'm the Deputy Refuge Manager for
10 Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge.

11
12 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Next
13 person.

14 (No response)

15
16 Okay. Not hearing anyone else from Fish
17 and Wildlife Service online. Is there anyone else from
18 BIA online?

19
20 MS. FOSADO: Good morning.....

21
22 (Simultaneous speech)

23
24 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay.....

25
26 MS. FOSADO:this is Maria Fosado -
27 - I'm sorry.....

28
29 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER:Sorry, go
30 ahead.

31
32 MS. FOSADO:Fish and Wildlife
33 Service, Izembek Refuge Manager Sorry for the delay.

34
35 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, thank
36 you, Maria. Okay. So, are there any people online from
37 OSM or Office of Secretary PMD?

38
39 MS. LAVINE: Good morning, Madam Chair.
40 Members of the Council, this is Robin LaVine,
41 subsistence policy coordinator with OSM.

42
43 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Anyone
44 else?

45
46 (No response)

47
48 Okay. Not hearing anyone. Next, we'll
49 go to BLM. Is there anyone in the room from BLM? Okay,
50 not seeing anyone. Is there anyone online from BLM?

00010

1 (No response)

2

3 Okay, not hearing anyone. Is there
4 anyone in the room from National Park Service? Not seeing
5 anyone in the room. Is there anyone online from National
6 Park Service?

7

8 (No response)

9

10 Okay. Is there anyone in the room from
11 Forest Service?

12

13 MS. PERRY: Madam Chair. DeAnna Perry.
14 I'm from USDA Forest Service. Thank you.

15

16 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, DeAnna. Is
17 there anyone online from the Forest Service?

18

19 (No response)

20

21 Okay, all right. Do we have anyone in
22 the room from Alaska Department of Fish and Game?

23

24 MS. KEATING: Good morning, Jackie
25 Keating, Division of subsistence ADF&G. Thanks.

26

27 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. And do
28 we have anyone online from Fish and Game?

29

30 MR. FUERST: Yeah, Good morning. Brad
31 Fuerst (indiscernible) Kodiak (indiscernible).

32

33 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Whoever that
34 was, you were very, very muffled. If you could change
35 something on your end and then try that again.

36

37 MR. FUERST: Yeah, sorry. Brad Fuerst
38 Kodiak Fish and Game.

39

40 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Thanks,
41 Brad.

42

43 MR. WITTEVEEN: This is Mark Witteveen.
44 I'm Division of Sport Fish Kodiak.

45

46 MS. KRUEGER: Good morning this is Kelly
47 Krueger.....

48

49 (Simultaneous speech)

50

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, Mark.

00011

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

MS. KRUEGER: Good morning. This is Kelly Krueger with the Division of Sport Fish in Kodiak.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Next person.

(No response)

Okay, I'm not hearing anyone else online from Alaska Department of Fish and Game. We'll now turn to other people in the room who aren't with -- or I guess I'll ask, is there anyone in the room from a government agency that I missed? Okay, we'll go first to tribal in the room.

MR. SMITH: Good morning, Madam Chair, members of the Council. I'm Daniel Smith, tribal biologist with the Shungnak Tribe and project lead for the crayfish project on the Buskin. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Do we have any other tribal representatives in the room?

MR. PREVATTE: Good morning, Scott Prevatte, Qawalangin Tribe fisheries biologist.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. And do we have any other tribal representatives on the phone? Okay, we'll go to -- I think we have one person in the room, one left. Do you want to go ahead and introduce yourself?

MR. TUTIAKOFF: Good morning, my name is Vince Tutiakoff, I'm the mayor of City of Unalaska. I was on the subsistence board for many years before, and I just stopped by to welcome you to Unalaska and look forward to talking with you about any issues you might have regarding subsistence. And being a subsistence hunter and a fisher myself most of -- about the only thing I do other than this job. So, I look forward to make -- hear the comments that are being spoken in our region. I'm also the Chairman of the Board of OC. A majority of the lands that we own is utilized by sports fishermen and subsistence users. I'm also the Honorary Tribal Chief for the Qawalangin Tribe and have some concerns regarding use and -- I've been getting reports from different communities, like Nikolski and Atka in particular, that some of our salmon have depleted this year really bad to a point that they'll have a tough

00012

1 time in this winter getting -- still fishing silvers. I
2 heard recently from Nikolski that some of the meat in
3 the silvers is -- got a weird white or, like, pock marked
4 -- marks on them on the inside and a rash, pretty bad
5 rash on the outside, on the silvers and some of the
6 pinks also. So, that's something maybe the biologists
7 can look into at some point down the road and address
8 the issue. People are not keeping these salmon, and
9 that's causing more of a problem for most of the
10 communities that live off the subsistence like Nikolski.
11 So, I'll be in and out of the meetings. And I appreciate
12 you guys being here. Thanks.

13
14 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, thank
15 you, Vince. Okay. Those are all of the introductions in
16 the room. Are there others online who haven't had a
17 chance to introduce themselves?

18
19 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, good morning. This
20 is Allison Williams with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
21 I'm the wildlife biologist at Eisenback National
22 Wildlife Refuge.

23
24 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Great, thank you.
25 Next person.

26
27 MS. CHAPA: Hi, good morning. This is
28 Gisela Chapa. I am a council coordinator for the North
29 Slope (indiscernible).

30
31 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, thanks. You
32 were a bit muffled, but I think you came through. Next
33 person.

34
35 (No response)

36
37 Okay. It sounds like that's it for
38 introductions. We'll move on to agenda item six, which
39 is review and adopt the agenda. So, we do have an agenda,
40 if we could get a motion to adopt and then we'll talk
41 about any necessary changes for the agenda. Does someone
42 have a motion to adopt? Pat, go ahead.

43
44 MR. HOLMES: Move to adopt.

45
46 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Chris,
47 for seconding. Is there -- are there any suggested
48 changes? I will start there is one change; we're going
49 to move item 12B, which is the partner's update. That
50 will be moved out of the action item section into other

00013

1 business to 14E because that item is not an action item.
2 And then are there any other changes that Council members
3 wanted to make to the agenda.

4
5 UNIDENTIFIED: (Indiscernible -
6 distortion)

7
8 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Sure. So, we're
9 moving item 12B as in bravo, it's the partner's update.
10 We're moving it to 14, other business, 14E as in echo.
11 Okay. Is there any discussion on the agenda?

12
13 (No response)

14
15 Okay. Is anyone opposed to approving the
16 agenda as with the discussed edits? Okay, seeing no
17 objection, the agenda is approved or adopted. Next
18 agenda item seven is review and approve previous meeting
19 minutes.

20
21 MS. WESSELS: Madam Chair.

22
23 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Sorry, go ahead
24 Katya.

25
26 (Pause)

27
28 MS. WESSELS: Pardon me if I missed it,
29 but did the Council actually vote on the motion?

30
31 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: I asked for any
32 objections.

33
34 MS. WESSELS: Okay.

35
36 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Do you need a voice
37 vote?

38
39 MS. WESSELS: No. It just like -- I
40 thought I didn't hear that. But, you know, we just need
41 to make sure that the Council votes on all of the motions
42 in some way. Like.....

43
44 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: I will be more
45 clear in saying there were no objections. But I did ask
46 for objections. There were no objections. So, the agenda
47 was adopted.

48
49 MS. WESSELS: Okay, thank you.

50

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yep, thanks. Okay,
2 so, item seven review and approve previous meeting
3 minutes. We have two sets of minutes. The March 8th,
4 2024, Winter 2024 meeting minutes that are at page five
5 in the book and then March 5 through 6, 2024 Joint
6 Council meeting -- Joint councils meeting at All Council
7 meeting minutes. And we can either approve these
8 together or approve them separately if anyone would like
9 to make a motion.

10
11 MR. PRICE: I'll make a motion to approve
12 these two together.

13
14 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Chris.

15
16 MS. CHERNOFF: Second.

17
18 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Coral.

19
20 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Is there any
21 discussion or corrections to the minutes?

22
23 (Pause)

24
25 Pat.

26
27 MR. HOLMES: Madam Chair, on page 11,
28 there was a discussion on a call for Federal fishery and
29 proposals, first, second, third paragraph down. One of
30 the questions I think was left out was the question of
31 the lack of enforcement and difficulties that resulted
32 from that. And then the folks were commenting, difficult
33 for people living outside the road system to obtain
34 Federal permits I believe it was. because I think you
35 can call in if you're in the village to the State. So,
36 I think it was -- should insert Federal between obtain
37 permits.

38
39 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Who is --
40 DeAnna or who.....

41
42 MS. PERRY: Madam Chair, we'd have to
43 look in the transcript to confirm that. I wasn't present
44 at that meeting, sorry, I can't recall it for you.

45
46 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, I'm just
47 asking.

48
49 (Pause)

1 MS. PERRY: We would have to go back and
2 look at the transcript. So, if you wanted to hold up
3 this action item until we have an opportunity to do
4 that, we could certainly do that. Unless somebody else
5 on the Council can confirm that that was their
6 understanding as well.

7
8 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, sorry. So, I
9 was asking DeAnna who I needed to look at in the room
10 to make sure that Pat's point was noted down and
11 understood so that the transcript could be checked and
12 if necessary, the minutes could be updated. I just wasn't
13 sure who to look at to ask that question. So, Pat has
14 noted areas for clarification. My understanding is that
15 will be checked in the transcripts. If it's in the
16 transcripts, it'll be updated. Otherwise, it'll be --
17 it'll remain as it is written. Are there any other
18 comments on the minutes?

19
20 (No comment)

21
22 Okay, I am not seeing any comments. Is
23 there any objection to approving both sets of meeting
24 minutes with the clarification that Pat requested if
25 it's in the transcripts? Okay, seeing no objection, the
26 meeting minutes from March 8th and March 5 through 6 are
27 approved. Next agenda item eight, reports. Will start
28 with Council member reports. I'm going to start at the
29 far-left end of the table and move down the table. So,
30 if you want to lead off.....

31
32 MR. RICHARDSON: Brett Richardson
33 Unalaska. So far this year, subsistence, as far as I can
34 see, has been kind of up and down. There have been some
35 successful harvests of sockeye salmon and some less than
36 successful harvests of sockeye salmon for subsistence
37 users. I think the Regional Culture event that happened,
38 Camp Qungaayux went pretty well. I believe that a lot
39 of the people benefited from the classes and the addition
40 of some science-based classes to the Culture Camp. There
41 was a good harvest of pinks during the first day, and I
42 believe everybody had a had a good camp, as far as I
43 know. As far as any other subsistence. I've heard reports
44 of decent halibut. Other than that, I think we're still
45 kind of in a holding pattern as far as completing the
46 summer season, waiting for the silvers to kind of move
47 through the end of the of the month and see how that
48 goes. There have been a couple incidences with maybe
49 reports of overfishing on Front Beach. An incident that
50 required a rescue from the Coast Guard out at Volcano

1 Bay, which just kind of underscores the danger of kind
2 of moving out to different -- to the island that are far
3 off course and the requirement of, you know, being
4 careful and, you know, maintaining you know, safety
5 gear, radios in proper working condition, rafts, nets,
6 all that kind of stuff. You know, I would like to hear
7 more from community members, if any are available, add
8 to this report. But that's as far as I have so far this
9 year. Thank you.

10

11 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Brett.
12 Coral.

13

14 MS. CHERNOFF: Yes, thank you. This is
15 Coral Chernoff. And my report, I guess I'm just mostly
16 going to talk about like our weather and probably a
17 little bit about birds and then I'll touch on fish. So,
18 we had -- it looked like all over the State, but we
19 particularly had kind of a long, cool spring and summer.
20 And for myself in a lot of plant gatherings and berry
21 gathering everything seems to have been, you know, fair,
22 pretty well. All our plants and -- just everything seems
23 to be just flush. There was a lot of salmonberries.
24 There are -- I was out hiking the other day, and there
25 are a lot of blueberries out there that people have been
26 picking them, but I don't -- I think they're mostly not
27 as ripe as they could be right now. Our emperors -- so,
28 I sit on the AMBCC regional committee for emperors and
29 attend State meetings every year. This year under --
30 we've been kind of watching the emperor geese. We had a
31 management plan, I think, in 20 -- 2017 that was supposed
32 to cover three years. And so, we've been in the process
33 of updating that management plan. There's two different
34 management plans, one is for the spring summer
35 subsistence harvest, and one plan is for the fall winter
36 subsistence harvest. This year's surveys -- the survey
37 estimate numbers are down, and they're down in the, what
38 we call the red zone, they're in the range for emperors
39 to be shut down. So, 2025, there will not be an emperor
40 season. And we'll be -- that's per both management plans.
41 And so, our next couple meetings will be talking about
42 that. We will be talking about it in -- I think we're
43 having a management plan meeting in Kodiak next Friday,
44 and we're going to have our AMBCC state -- I have to
45 think of what season is -- State winter meeting or fall
46 meeting next week in Kodiak, Wednesday and Thursday. So,
47 if you want to call in to those meetings, there'll be
48 probably lots of discussion on emperors. Locally three
49 years ago or four years ago, 2019, I think we opened
50 this -- or 2020, we were supposed to open the road season

1 for bird hunting. It was -- our road season was closed
2 down for many, many years. So, we put in a proposal, and
3 we had the season open for three years with the mew
4 gulls, Aleutians terns, Arctic terns and emperors were
5 shut down, but everything else was open for harvest on
6 the road system. That three years has run up and we just
7 voted and passed at the AMBCC to eliminate that harvest,
8 reporting and permitting. So, now with just a license,
9 subsistence is open on the road system with the four
10 species that were previous closed -- previously closed;
11 they're still closed down. And they had Flyway -- Pacific
12 Flyway had meetings -- their meetings last week, all
13 last week and they passed that through at the Pacific
14 Flyway also.

15
16 And then lastly, I guess about the fish.
17 I've heard different reports, fishing is good, fishing
18 is bad -- was bad for people. I personally -- this year
19 we caught some fish early on but really haven't fished
20 for the whole summer. So, I -- my report is kind of
21 based on the last weir counts that I've seen from
22 Department of Fish and Game. As of 8/20/24 -- 8/20/2024,
23 in particularly we've talked a lot here about Buskin.
24 So, I'm happy to say that the Buskin numbers were way,
25 way up, I -- 9700 sockeyes passed through the weir as
26 of 8/20 and that's compared to last year, which was
27 1700. So, Buskin return was quite phenomenal this year
28 and that was great. There's many others, Pasagshak,
29 Afognak Lake, {UI 45:31] sultry, Upper station; many of
30 them had really high runs, or they were in the top three
31 highest runs in the last ten years. So, I won't go over
32 those numbers, but a lot of things -- a lot of them did
33 well. And like, our Karluk River is doing okay right
34 now, but Karluk generally has a big run of late salmon,
35 so we don't know what those are until, you know, October
36 or something. So, that's all I have for my report. Thank
37 you.

38
39 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Coral.
40 Chris.

41
42 MR. PRICE: Good morning. Glad everyone
43 could be here in Unalaska this week. Everybody seems to
44 have made it in. We didn't have any major issues with
45 the weather. So, that's fortunate cause we've had kind
46 of a cold, blustery type of.....

47
48 UNIDENTIFIED: (Indiscernible)

49
50

1 MR. PRICE:is that better? Okay.
2 Yeah, we had kind of a cold summer. This might be one
3 of our best days today that we're going to have all
4 summer. Looking pretty nice out. So, thanks for coming
5 -- bringing the good weather with you guys. So, I
6 unfortunately haven't been able to do much fishing this
7 summer at all, no halibut and no salmon. We've been able
8 to help a lot of the elders with food boxes over the
9 last couple of years, that we purchase and have shipped
10 out here. Vince is here, and he's really our expert,
11 would have the best understanding of all the -- what
12 happened this summer with subsistence, but from what
13 I've heard, salmon hasn't been good, sockeye haven't
14 been good. There are some pinks showing up, and we're
15 hopeful the silvers will show up this year, too. The
16 Front Beach is right out here, if you guys haven't been
17 there or know where that is. But basically, it's right,
18 you know, north of the school there, the whole beach,
19 the whole we call it Front Beach area. They do open that
20 up for subsistence net -- set net fishery throughout the
21 summer. And there's concern that those fish are being
22 hit pretty hard and that we're not getting enough fish
23 up the Iliuliuk River. So, that's something we're
24 looking to find out, is -- you know, the health of
25 Unalaska Lake and the health of Iliuliuk River for the
26 sockeye. And -- so, we're looking forward to hearing --
27 we've got a -- we'll have a fisheries report today on
28 that. So, that's that is an area of concern. People did
29 get out to McLees Lake and Volcano, even though they
30 didn't have a fisheries management out at McLees this
31 year. And typically, we don't have any type of
32 enforcement or management out of Volcano Bay. We did
33 have an accident, the Coast Guard was called out to
34 rescue some people that were subsistence fishing in
35 Volcano Bay, and it was pretty dangerous. It was -- it
36 could have gone the other way. So, thankfully, the Coast
37 Guard was able to rescue those folks. And Camp Kenai,
38 we did have decent pink run, we got some fish put away.
39 I got to taste some of them, they were really good
40 actually, this year really good fish that were put away.
41 The berries have been kind of late this year. Again,
42 it's been a cold summer. Hopefully we'll see -- there's
43 still salmon berries around here. You guys can get some
44 if you -- you can just hike around a little bit, you'll
45 find them. And the blueberries should be getting ripe
46 here pretty soon. That's about all I have for now. Thank
47 you.

48
49 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, Chris.
50 Pat.

1

2

MR. HOLMES: Madam Chair, thank you. I don't get out like I used to, and kind of rely on other folks to -- have been giving us fish. And so, anyway, the gossip I hear from the villages is that deer populations are up slightly, some of the does are having two ponds [sic] or fawns, but usually one. Coral's report on the Buskin reds was an incredible improvement and change. And this is an even year for pinks on the island. So, some of the places are normally going to be a bit weak. Same kind of feelings about berries as Chris has on being cold and wet and slowing things down. Some of the places that I went to, the berries were really small and not the numbers that I'd normally expect to see, i.e. on the south (indiscernible) front of my house but basically, okay. Let's see. Karluk early run for reds was a bit weak and king salmon around the island were not so good, and at Karluk they were very poor. And so that's a big hissy fit issue with particularly people down in the States. And I believe -- you can correct me, but Shungnak is still doing the fish boxes for elders from your little fish plant, which is incredible, because I'll go and share some of the fish that somebody brought to me and go over and see Iver Maloon's wife, and she says, well, my freezer's full and they're the right size. You bring me full fish, so either cut them up or I'll stay with chinook. So, I guess that's kind of the highlights. Things are fair to Midland. Thank you, Madam Chair.

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Pat, and we'll move to the online Council members, Della. Della are you still on? Are you muted.

(No response)

Okay, we'll circle back for Della. Natasha are you online?

MS. PERRY: Madam Chair, just a reminder for folks online, their phones are muted again. So, they may have to press star six before their line will be open. Thank you.

MS. HAYDEN: Madam Chair, this is Natasha. Can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes. Go ahead, Natasha.

1 MS. HAYDEN: Okay, thank you. I was in
2 the Team's call, but I think we're having internet
3 difficulties both in Kodiak, and I'm not sure if anybody
4 else on the Team's line is having issues with getting
5 kicked out of the meeting so, I called in, so I'm on my
6 phone now. I -- and I, unfortunately, I got kicked out
7 right -- shortly after Coral started her report. And so,
8 I missed part of what she was -- what she reported on.
9 But agree about the weather, just, you know, wet, cold
10 for the majority of the summer, just started to get nice
11 a couple weeks ago, and now we've got our first big fall
12 storm that's just coming through. And so, the foliage
13 is really turning fall-like very fast, which is kind of
14 a bummer. But same thing with the salmonberries, lots
15 of salmonberries this year. I'm not sure of the -- if
16 the raspberries are transplanted or if they're
17 indigenous to our area. But the raspberry patches that
18 I know of are not producing at all this year. And I've
19 heard that report from several people. And I also am
20 looking forward to -- I don't know if anybody reported
21 on -- if there's been successful deer harvesting so far.
22 The season opened August 1st, I'd be looking forward to
23 hear how that's going, you know, we've seen lots of deer
24 this year, which is really good. The -- I participated
25 in our Culture Camp on Afognak, for a couple of the
26 camps they were successful in taking a nice seal earlier
27 this summer, which was shared amongst the campers and
28 the hide is going to be used for projects in the future.
29 And very successful in getting fish, the salmon -- the
30 Culture Camp is right next to the mouth of the Afognak
31 Lake, locally referred to as Afognak. I'm looking
32 forward to having some discussions about the proposals
33 regarding the subsistence taking in those river systems.
34 Locally here, I did get reports of a lot of concern, and
35 I saw that it was noted in our meeting book about
36 subsistence fishing, federally qualified subsistence
37 fishers, fishing right up to the mouth of the river. And
38 in the report or in the meeting materials, it talks
39 about the local ADF&G and the troopers didn't -- weren't
40 aware of those removal of those closures. And so, there
41 was a lot of concern and alarm about that in particular
42 earlier this summer, that there was subsistence fishing
43 that was happening right up to the mouth of the river.
44 And fortunately, there was a big return in that river,
45 I think there were over 30,000 to 35,000 sockeyes for
46 the season, so, that's great. Let's see, there's a couple
47 of other big meetings coming up. There's a -- I serve
48 on the NOAA fisheries -- Marine Fisheries Advisory
49 Committee, it's referred to as MAFAC. And we typically
50 have two meetings a year and one of them is in -- is

00021

1 held in a fishing community. So, it's comprised of and
2 provides advice to all eight Federal fisheries --
3 regional fisheries management Councils. The one in our
4 region is the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council
5 but there are seven other regional Councils around the
6 nation. And their fall meeting is coming up here in
7 Kodiak. And I don't know if they've ever met in Kodiak,
8 I think they've had meetings in Alaska before, but maybe
9 in southeast or Juno. We've -- since I've been on the
10 committee, we've met in Puerto Rico, we met in San Diego.
11 They to have their spring meeting in Washington, DC. So,
12 they're -- it's a nationwide thing. And so, they're
13 meeting in Kodiak next week, which is really remarkable.
14 I'm going to be facilitating a panel discussion on
15 climate impacts on fishing dependent communities.
16 There's going to be two panel discussions. I should
17 report the dates of those meetings, sounds like it's
18 going to be conflicting with the migratory bird, AMCC -
19 - the AMBCC. But the dates are the 10th through the 12th
20 of next week. So, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday here in
21 Kodiak and the agenda is online. If you look up NOAA
22 MAFAC, it'll take you to their page where they've got
23 the online agenda. As far as other subsistence
24 activities, I think that the marine mammal populations
25 are doing really well. I have heard of a couple --
26 there's been a couple of whale mortality events, but not
27 as many as we've seen in the past. So, I think that
28 that's really good. There's been a ton of whales out in
29 Afognak strait -- Afognak Bay this -- earlier this year,
30 which is great because I know last year there was --
31 some of my friends that live over in Ouzinkie in Spruce
32 Island area and Whale Island were like, we're not seeing
33 as many whales as we usually do. And so, this year
34 there's just been a ton of whale activity, which is
35 great. And I think that's all that I have for now. So,
36 thank you very much.

37

38 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, Natasha.
39 Della, are you online and can you unmute?

40

41 MS. TRUMBLE: Yeah, I was -- I unmuted,
42 Madam Chair, but apparently, they had muted me, so I
43 didn't realize that. I guess as everybody says, it's
44 been a cold, dreary summer. King Cove has gone through
45 a tremendous amount of changes since our last meeting.
46 We all know that Peter Pan did not operate and, I mean,
47 it's kind of a sad thing when they power it out down
48 there. It's just -- the Silver Bay did take the fishermen
49 -- did fish for them for -- out of False Pass. And that
50 sounds from what I can tell and here I did spend about

1 a month and a half in Wasilla with my daughter, but it's
2 been a slow salmon season. And I'd like to be quite
3 honest with you, June is usually the month that I put
4 up my fish -- I got one fish, that's it. A little scary
5 when you look at these -- what's going on and all we can
6 do is hope and pray for the best at this point. Very
7 wise, I think people are starting to harvest berries.
8 We had a silver salmon derby last weekend, so there were
9 silvers, but nothing like numbers from prior or last two
10 years. The pinks are running, but there's not -- those
11 are not really in any big numbers at all, I mean,
12 usually, you see jumpers in the bay, and you hardly see
13 anything. So, currently, now the caribou season is open.
14 So, a few people have gotten some, but hopefully get --
15 more people will be able to harvest some because --
16 caribou because they definitely can use them this year.
17 I think other than that I don't believe I have anything
18 else to report.

19
20 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, thanks,
21 Della. Okay, I will share the Chair's report, again this
22 is Rebecca Skinner. So, a few things that I did as RAC
23 Chair since our last meeting. I attended the Federal
24 Subsistence Board meeting April 2 through 5, and this
25 was a wildlife regulatory meeting. I reported on
26 wildlife actions taken by the Kodiak/Aleutians RAC. So,
27 as a reminder, we took action on 8 items for the Federal
28 Subsistence Board meeting. 5 of those were on the
29 consensus agenda, so there was really no discussion and
30 3 were on the non-consensus agenda. So, those ones I
31 gave a brief report of the -- our Council's
32 recommendation. As a reminder one of those items was
33 Wildlife Proposal 24-01, which relates to allowing the
34 sale of brown bear hides that are taken in subsistence.
35 That particular item is still not resolved. There's some
36 issues with, let's call them outside of subsistence with
37 kind of the bigger cross-jurisdictional issues going on.
38 Maybe at some point we can get an update on that. The -
39 - another regulation we dealt with was the Unit 8 deer.
40 This had to do with the harvest limit -- changing harvest
41 limits for antlerless deer and our RAC recommended we
42 didn't want those taken because of the danger to does
43 and fawns. So, that was wildlife proposal 24-11. And
44 then the third item was rescinding the closure -- sorry,
45 I'm reading off my computer and the screen keeps going
46 dark, rescinding the closure for Peninsula caribou,
47 which was WCR24-06. And as I recall, except for the
48 brown bear item, which hasn't had action by the Federal
49 Subsistence Board, I believe that the Federal
50

1 Subsistence Board took the recommendations of our
2 Council.

3
4 I also met with -- so, my second update
5 I met with the partners for Fish and Wildlife and Coastal
6 Programs, folks who traveled to Kodiak. They were in
7 Kodiak May 20th through 24th and went on one of their
8 field trips. The group visited the Buskin River, Buskin
9 Lake and Lake Louise on May 20th, and they were focused
10 on the habitat restoration work that the service has
11 done through the partners program. And so, these were
12 people from back east, the D.C. area and throughout the
13 country. It was a fairly small group; I want to say
14 maybe 15 to 20 people. So met with them, talked a little
15 bit about the Federal subsistence program and went to
16 visit the Buskin Lake with them.

17
18 My third update, I attended the Federal
19 Subsistence Board work session on August 7th in
20 Anchorage. A few items out of that, just for
21 informational purposes for the Council. The Board had
22 discussion on the Board's correspondence policy. So,
23 this is really looking at letters that the RACs generate
24 that go to the Federal Subsistence Board. And right now,
25 there's not a really -- a highly regimented, consistent
26 process for how those letters are handled. So, there's
27 discussion. My understanding is there's discussion at
28 the Board level, maybe how to make that more predictable
29 and consistent. The RACs do have a process every year
30 where we get to submit an annual report where we can
31 raise the Board's awareness on issues that are occurring
32 in our region, issues of concern, etc., and that does
33 have a consistent timeline. So, we finalize those
34 reports at our winter meeting, they go to the Federal
35 Subsistence Board and then we get responses in the
36 summertime timeframe. So, we now have responses back
37 from the Federal Subsistence Board on our annual report.
38 And what's happening is -- I know our Council did this.
39 We had items in our annual report that we also sent
40 letters on because we felt that they were very important.
41 So, part of the discussion is, I think, really thinking
42 through and getting clarity on, should we be reporting
43 things in both places, should some things go in the
44 annual reports and other things should go in letters?
45 And then I think the Federal Subsistence Board is going
46 to talk about or maybe work through what is their letter
47 policy and what are the timing expectations, because I
48 don't think it's the case that those letters necessarily
49 get a faster response because there's not the, like I
50 said, a regimented process for that.

1

2 The other thing I wanted to bring up,
3 the Federal Subsistence Board got a presentation and a
4 document. What I'll call a matrix where OSM staff went
5 through all of the annual reports and correspondence,
6 and they created a spreadsheet or a matrix that showed
7 areas of common concern across all of the RACs. So,
8 issues that have been brought up in annual reports. And
9 then -- so you could see where areas of common concern
10 were, and then it kind of went down. So, at the bottom
11 of it that you could see issues that only 1 or 2 RACs
12 brought up. It was really interesting, I had never heard
13 the RAC issues presented in that way, because at a RAC
14 level, we talk about what's going on in our region. We
15 -- not very often do we have the All Council meeting,
16 and then when we have the All Council meeting, it's so
17 packed that we don't really get a chance to have a good
18 discussion about what's happening in other regions. So,
19 this matrix was a really, I think, handy way to see
20 where the similarities are, the similarity of concerns
21 across all the regions and then where some of the
22 differences are. And I did ask that we get our Council,
23 get a copy of the matrix. And I think it'd be good for
24 all Councils to see that. And I think we are going to
25 be able to get copies of that at some point here soon.

26

27 So, those are the three updates I had
28 as my Chair's report. Switching over, putting on Council
29 hat for Council updates. There -- so, from the Kodiak
30 Area, you heard that the sockeye returns at Buskin were
31 phenomenal this year compared to recent history. On top
32 of that, or in addition to that, the pink salmon returns
33 have been very low, so, even lower than expected. So, I
34 will be curious as we learn more about what might be
35 driving these differences, because I think the extremely
36 low pink salmon returns were not predicted or expected.
37 So, that I think was a surprise to a lot of people. And
38 then just echoing Della's comments and concerns about
39 the state of commercial fisheries in our communities.
40 We do have -- we're -- as far as regions in the State,
41 we are the most active and probably dependent fisheries
42 region. We definitely produce the most fish. And our
43 communities really rely on robust and healthy commercial
44 fisheries, as you know, as well as subsistence. And right
45 now the -- on the commercial side, we're seeing a lot
46 of struggles. Processing plants are closing down or
47 selling and those have huge ripple effects out into the
48 community. So, just echoing Della's comments there and
49 that's all I had for my Chair's report. So, Pat has his
50 hand up. Go ahead, Pat.

1

2 MR. HOLEMS: Madam Chair, I might be able
3 to share a little bit of light on the weak pinks.
4 Probably 35 years ago and farther back, we usually had
5 really strong runs in the even years, but they had some
6 bad winters, it offset the reproductive cycle on
7 production or numbers that were returning. And so, since
8 then, all the way from Attu through the Gulf of Alaska,
9 the pink even years have become weak. And I think that
10 might answer one of Vince's concerns, because I know the
11 years I was at Atka and then the surveys that I did
12 earlier that was often the case that they would drop an
13 even year. And why? I don't know, but that's just kind
14 of a Gulf of Alaska situation.

15

16 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, we have one
17 more comment. And then, Glenn, you're on deck for the
18 next agenda item. Okay. Go ahead, Coral.

19

20 MS. CHERNOFF: Thank you, Madam Chair. I
21 just wanted to add one more thing to my list. I thought
22 you would cover it on yours, but Rebecca and I did
23 participate in the -- they had a crayfish day sponsored
24 by Shungnak and the Water and Soil conservation. And so,
25 we went out, and it was pretty fun learning how to --
26 it's a little learning curve in how to catch crayfish,
27 but it was really interesting to see just how many
28 crayfish are in that lake. Once you got used -- once you
29 sort of got acclimated to what they look like and how -
30 - what size they are and where they hide you just start
31 noticing a lot more. So, just to talk about that, I
32 think there's so many in there, I don't know if there's
33 a plan to eradicate them. I know there's not really --
34 if you catch them there, you have to kill them or cook
35 them right at the place. But I guess if they're here to
36 stay they are fun to catch and they are tasty little
37 creatures if you put enough butter and spice on them and
38 so we might be looking in the future at adding crayfish
39 to our subsistence. Thank you.

40

41 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Okay, so
42 next up will be Glenn. Glenn is going to give a special
43 recognition to Della Trumble for 27 years of service to
44 the Council.

45

46 MS. CHEN: Madam Chair and Council
47 members, I have the distinct pleasure and honor of
48 recognizing Ms. Della Trumble's, as you mentioned, 27
49 years of service on this Council and it's been an
50 outstanding number of years. She has shown great

1 leadership in subsistence issues, not only for her
2 community of King Cove and the Alaska Peninsula, but for
3 the entire region. As many of you know she also is a
4 tribal leader there in King Cove for the corporation as
5 well as the Tribe, and she has been a tireless advocate
6 for all the subsistence users in the area. If I may,
7 I'll share an anecdote, I've been saving this anecdote
8 for many years until this particular moment. And my first
9 year working for BIA in the subsistence program, the
10 very first RAC meeting I attended was for this particular
11 region. It was being held in Cold Bay, and the morning
12 of the meeting, we were all gathered in the library
13 there, Federal staff and Council members. And about mid-
14 morning, Della Trumble makes an announcement. She says,
15 I would like everyone to leave the room, we're going to
16 go into executive session except Glenn. It's like, oh
17 my goodness, I'm in trouble now, why am I being asked
18 this day? But anyways, what it at -- what the Council
19 asked me to do at the time was prepare a letter outlining
20 a number of their concerns about subsistence program so,
21 very pleased and honored to do that. So, I've been
22 sharing I've been holding off on sharing the anecdote
23 until this particular time, but this will be Dellas's
24 last meeting. The program has a number of recognitions
25 for you Della. They'll we'll have to find a way to
26 deliver those to you, since you're not here, and be able
27 to give this to you in person. So, if you could please
28 help me welcome and recognize Ms. Della Trumble for all
29 the years of service.

30
31 (Applause)

32
33 Yeah, that's all I have, Madam Chair.

34
35 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Glenn.
36 And I will open it up if there's other anecdotes or
37 embarrassing stories, no. If there's anything else
38 anybody wants to share with Della or about Della. Go
39 ahead, Pat.

40
41 MR. HOLMES: Well, I think Della is
42 absolutely magnificent person in being able to Chair our
43 Council for so many years and keep in contact with folks
44 on the peninsula Aleutians and Kodiak. And I guess I'll
45 give you a big virtual hug there, Della. You're swell.

46
47 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Coral.

48
49 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah. I would like to say
50 thank you to Della for all her years of service, not

1 only on the RAC, but sitting as Chair. That's a job that
2 takes a lot of wrangling of members as well as extra
3 time outside of these meetings. And I'd also like to
4 recognize that as we sit out here in Unalaska. Della was
5 a pretty strong advocate of getting out to Cold Bay and
6 out here. I don't know if you've ever met in Sand Point,
7 but just getting out into these areas, we talk about
8 areas that are very widespread. And she always felt like
9 it was important to get out here in the areas where the
10 people are that we represent. So, I'd like to say thank
11 you for that.

12
13 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, yeah.
14 And I wanted to appreciate the time that I had -- this
15 is Rebecca Skinner -- to work with Della on the RAC and
16 seeing the very high level of advocacy that Della that
17 you engaged in, again, not just at the RAC level with
18 subsistence, but at a community level. And I think, you
19 know, our region does have some interesting perspectives
20 because like I said, we're a very highly engaged
21 commercial fishing region, but we're also very dependent
22 on subsistence resources. And sometimes those two things
23 are -- there's a tension there and sometimes they work
24 very well together. And I, you know, personally observed
25 you, I guess, skill and, and continual effort to really
26 balance those things because as -- at a community level,
27 at a people level, we, we need both. So, I really
28 appreciate that. And then just recognizing the efforts
29 you put in with the King Cove Road. It's -- I hope that
30 there's a positive resolution to that. But I know that
31 was years and years and years of effort that went into
32 that. So again, I just wanted to say that I appreciated
33 my time being able to see you on the RAC, see you lead
34 the RAC and the opportunity to work with you. Is there
35 anyone else, either in the room or online? Oh, sorry,
36 in the room. Go ahead, Crystal.

37
38 MS. LEONETTI: Yeah. Hi, this is Crystal
39 Leonetti, acting director OSM. But my normal job is
40 tribal native liaison at Fish and Wildlife Service. And,
41 Della, I met you, I think it was 14 years ago in King
42 Cove at a government-to-government consultation. And on
43 that issue, that's very near and dear to your heart and
44 your community's heart. And I just admired how you are
45 not intimidated by some pretty big -- big wigs who come
46 to your community and you're able to really represent
47 the community and people, and I don't know if there's
48 anyone who you don't know in Alaska, really -- you know,
49 everybody, including my parents from way back in the day
50 at UAF. So, just thank you for everything you do in all

00028

1 your years of service and your dedication to subsistence
2 and the Alaska Native way of life, quyana.

3

4 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, is there
5 anyone else, either in the room or online? Okay. Yep.
6 Go ahead.

7

8 MS. TRUMBLE: This is Della. First of
9 all, thanks everybody. I very much appreciate it and I'm
10 sorry I couldn't be there. I did end up with Covid after
11 I got back from my -- from Wasilla. And I'm finally
12 starting to feel better, but I really was looking forward
13 to being in Unalaska. Glenn, I appreciate your story. I
14 guess just I had forgotten about that, but Glenn is --
15 you've done such a good job for our RAC for so many
16 years, and I know we've all appreciated your efforts and
17 just you being there. And I'm going to miss Cold Bay
18 meetings because you always gave me -- put your -- all
19 your silver salmon away for me. But going back and
20 listening to Vince talk earlier -- Tutiakoff about being
21 on the Council for many years, and I think about some
22 of our trips that we had been on in Sand Point being one
23 of them and Vince and Al Cratty and Rick and these guys
24 always did something. They would post -- put post-it
25 notes in the back of my coat, or at one point in time,
26 I think Al filled up my hood with leaves, dried up
27 leaves. So, when we took a lunch break and I put my coat
28 on, all these leaves fell out everywhere. So, we've all
29 always had good -- really good relations with all the
30 all the Council members over the years. And it's been
31 strong, very strong representation from our communities.
32 And I think that's something that I have always been
33 very proud of. I appreciate all that you've said. This
34 is something that I've enjoyed doing. I think back on
35 the times that we did the extraterritorial jurisdiction
36 in regard to Area M and having the statewide meeting.
37 There's -- we've been through some tough, tough times
38 and battles, I think. But the willingness to work
39 together and the ability to be able to work with other
40 regions and having people come to King Cove and putting
41 them on fishing boats and tenders and just getting a
42 very good view of what and how we live out here. And I
43 think, Rebecca, you kind of -- you did mention that the
44 value of the commercial and subsistence is basically our
45 way of life, and that's how we survive. But I will be
46 around, you know, if people need something from me or
47 would like me to get in touch with somebody, or you have
48 a concern that I might be able to help with, I'd be glad
49 to assist. It's -- this has been a learning experience.
50 It's an experience I have appreciated for so many years

1 and sad to go, but I also am looking and enjoying my
2 retirement time and my grandson. So, with that, I'd like
3 to again thank everybody. I so much appreciate it.

4
5 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thanks,
6 Della. And we have Ernie Weiss wants to speak on Teams.
7 Ernie, are you available? Are you there?

8
9 MR. WEISS: Can you hear me?

10
11 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes, go ahead.

12
13 MR. WEISS: Well, Ernie Weiss, I work
14 with the Aleutians East Borough, longtime resident of
15 King Cove, and I just wanted to give my appreciation to
16 Della, who is one of the most important people in the
17 community and worked with her on many different issues,
18 taught her children, her child, and worked with her as
19 a parent and in many different ways. And again, Della,
20 so very crucial to the path of King Cove and wish her
21 the best in the future. So, thanks for taking my comment.

22
23 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thanks,
24 Ernie.

25
26 MS. TRUMBLE: Thanks, Ernie.

27
28 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. We will then
29 move on to agenda item nine, public and tribal comment
30 on non-agenda items. We'll go ahead and start in the
31 room. Is there anyone who wishes to give comment? All
32 right.

33
34 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Thank you. My name is
35 Vince Tutiakoff. I have several items to comment on
36 before I head out to other meetings. First off, our
37 subsistence is important to this community, the native
38 community as much as it is to non-natives. My concern
39 here is that -- the overfishing issue that was brought
40 up by Brett. If we don't do something to curtail the
41 overfishing activity of certain individuals and they're
42 the same ones every year, we will not have a salmon run
43 in our community stream or lakes. I'm talking about three
44 different lakes; that's the Unalaska Lake, the Summers
45 Bay Lake, and the Morse Cove Lake. If you have time, I
46 would -- it would be advantageous to this Council to get
47 an idea of where it's at and how easily it is to go to
48 these particular areas. And basically there -- I would
49 say about 60% of the people that are out there, so-
50 called subsistence fishing are decimating our runs. And

1 I say that because they go there for eggs, just eggs.
2 And at the end of the season, you'll see salmon on the
3 beaches, in the lakes basically gutted. That's not
4 right. There are people who cannot make their way out
5 to these areas. Our Front Beach is primarily the source
6 of fish for this -- most of the elders. Going out to
7 Reese -- over to Reese Bay or Winslow, there's very few
8 boats. I go out there -- this summer I was out there
9 eight times, and I got 15 fish. Eight times, it's a 15-
10 mile run one way. And it's the weather, a lot of it,
11 that you have to deal with. Fortunately, I'm not able
12 to get as far as McCutchen, unless they have a two-day
13 window, which is very rare. This this year has been
14 crazy. We've had some decent days and some real -- about
15 time you take off and you get stuck out there, and if
16 you don't know what you're doing, you're going -- they're
17 going to find you on the beach somewhere. That's my
18 concern.

19
20 The other one issue that I have is the
21 sports fishing, the so-called sports fishing. They're
22 in the streams, they're in the lakes, there's no
23 enforcement. There -- the police department and Unalaska
24 goes as far as the dump road gate and very rarely go out
25 past there unless there's an emergency or a vehicle off
26 the road or whatever, or hikers lost in the fog, that
27 kind of thing. We need enforcement out here. We have a
28 State trooper here. He's not necessarily a Fish and Game,
29 but it's hard to get, he has other, other issues dealing
30 with. When you do need somebody out there to at least
31 check for fishing licenses, that kind of thing, or abuse
32 of subsistence, take a fish. It's pretty hard to get
33 them to go out there. As a tribal member, I'm concerned
34 what's going to happen here in the next 5 or 6 years,
35 we're going to have a bad run continuously for 3 years
36 after that; fish are returning, what's left of them. I'm
37 hoping that our -- I'm on the Board of a group called
38 the Unalaska Native Fishermen Association, and we have
39 concerns about that particular item also. And we're a
40 small group, but when we do -- we attend all the North
41 Pacific meetings, all the Fish and Game meetings that
42 we can afford to get somebody in to represent our entity
43 and our community, we try to get them out there. The
44 silver runs this year and the pinks and the reds, pinks
45 and reds were very slow getting here, and they're almost
46 -- the month of June -- there was no, hardly any reds.
47 And in July, until about the 18th or 20th of July, almost
48 two and a half, three weeks late were the pinks and very
49 few of them. You look in the creek today, those salmon
50 just came in within the last 2 weeks and they're coming

1 in with the silvers, very few silvers. But I'm concerned
2 about the overfishing. I can't say it enough. I don't
3 know what avenue to take other than file a complaint as
4 a concerned Alaska Native that sees proxy fishing is an
5 issue. When I confronted the individuals about how many
6 fish they were taking out of the Front Beach, they said,
7 well, I've got a proxy, I could take whatever I need, I
8 got five proxies. Five proxies. And so, there's really
9 no limit to what can be taken. We don't know if they're
10 being delivered. I just heard yesterday, for the first
11 time that a so-called proxy holder delivered one to a
12 household. Very concerning.

13
14 The other issue is the traveling for
15 halibut. But I heard Brett mention that halibut were
16 doing pretty well. Well, you've got to go 20 or almost
17 30 miles from Unalaska down to Akutan Pass, and a lot
18 of people can't get out there unless they've got a 28
19 or 32 foot, hundred-thousand-dollar vessel and take out
20 4 or 5 people, and they fished their limit possibly, and
21 then come in. I've been out there only 3 times this year
22 due to weather, and I caught 1 halibut, and it took
23 almost 8 hours. So, I'm concerned about that, the
24 overfishing, or what I call overfishing by commercial.
25 Small boats coming into the area and most of them come
26 out of Homer and they're fishing right in front of town
27 out here. You go out past that red buoy in there -- they
28 got halibut skates running in all directions, going all
29 the way into our bays, into (indiscernible) and Captain's
30 Bay and Reese Bay all the way to Bishop Point, just laid
31 everywhere. So, I'm concerned about what that's going
32 to mean eventually.

33
34 I mentioned support, I guess I'll jump
35 over to the good side and thank Della personally for her
36 service to the communities. I worked with Della for many
37 years, and I remember some of them anecdotes that she
38 mentioned. And I want to thank you for your service to
39 your community, to the region and to the RAC. I had
40 early on -- was encouraged that you took a firm stand
41 on a lot of good issues. And when I left you were
42 appointed to be the Chair, and I appreciate your service.
43 Thank you, Della. That's all I have. Thanks.

44
45 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you.

46
47 MS. TRUMBLE: Thank you Vince, appreciate
48 it.

49
50

00032

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Is there
2 a further public comment in the room?

3
4 MS. SMITH: This is Daniel Smith with the
5 Shungnak Tribe of Kodiak. I just wanted to voice a couple
6 opportunities for getting involved with our upcoming
7 crayfish derbies. The first one is going to be held this
8 upcoming Sunday at Buskin Lake. That will be September
9 8th, where we have tentative times from noon to three.
10 And then the big derby that we have scheduled will be
11 in October -- October 16th that will be on a Wednesday.
12 And this is in -- actually in partnership with the
13 Backcountry Hunters and Anglers of Alaska, their Alaska
14 chapter. And at that derby, we'll do a crayfish boil as
15 well as raffle off a Traeger grill. So hopefully we're
16 going to have some more participation during that derby.
17 That will be on October 16th, from 2 to 5 -- 2pm to 5pm.
18 And that's all I wanted to say. Thank you.

19
20 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. All
21 right, I don't think we have any more or - any more
22 comment in the room? No? Okay. Are there any comments
23 from online?

24
25 (No response)

26
27 Okay. I am not hearing any more public
28 comment online or in the room. What I would like to do
29 right now, it's 10:30. I'd like to take a brief break
30 so people can bio break and get up and move around a
31 little bit. Let's say ten minutes so we can reconvene
32 at 10:40. And then we'll start with the agenda item ten
33 Council training. Thank you.

34
35 UNIDENTIFIED: If any of you guys are
36 interested in going to lunch at the senior center today,
37 the senior center is just across that -- right behind
38 us here. They have a nice lunch program, and the seniors
39 always appreciate..... (distortion)

40
41 (Off record)

42
43 (On record)

44
45 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. So, we'll get
46 started in just a second. I do want to ask a question.
47 So, there was a request for maybe a brief update for
48 outcomes from the All Council meeting. So, at the All
49 Council meeting, there was a number of letters generated
50 that went from the All Councils to the Federal

00033

1 Subsistence Board. And then I know the Federal
2 Subsistence Board did generate some correspondence based
3 on those letters. So, the question was, is there a point
4 on the agenda when the -- kind of what happened after
5 the All Council meeting can be discussed. I'm wondering,
6 can that be part of the OSM report under the report
7 section?

8
9 UNIDENTIFIED: Where is the OSM report
10 section?

11
12 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, so I'm
13 getting a nod of heads that yes. So, report section is
14 13 -- so, 13H right now is Office of Subsistence
15 Management, that'll be Crystal Leonetti and Katya
16 Wessels. If we can just get a just a brief walkthrough
17 of generally the topic of the letters that came out of
18 the All Council meeting that went to the Federal
19 Subsistence Board and then what the Federal Subsistence
20 Board did with those letters. So, I know that the Board
21 did generate some letters to, for example, NOAA
22 fisheries. But if we can just get a brief update on what
23 happened for closure. Okay, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

24
25 MS. HOLMAN: All right. Good morning,
26 Madam Chair, members of the Council. My name is Kendra
27 Holman, I'm a wildlife biologist with the Office of
28 Subsistence Management. So, today we're going to do some
29 delegation of authority letter training. This should be
30 hopefully kind of quick and not too painless. So, DeAnna
31 next slide -- oh, so this will be -- there was a handout
32 that went out to you guys like this, those are all the
33 slides that will be kind of going through and I'll talk
34 through today. There we go, okay. So, we're here to
35 present the delegation of authority letter training. So,
36 moving forward OSM plans to hold one training session
37 at each Council meeting. We feel this will help new
38 Council members become more familiar with the Federal
39 Subsistence Management Program and serve as a refresher
40 for the more seasoned members. Today, we're going to go
41 over the basics of the delegation of authority. This
42 training is meant to be informal, informational, and is
43 not an action item. So, the training objectives of this
44 training are to provide information about the delegation
45 of authority and show the Councils where to find
46 information about delegated authority, and to discuss
47 the Council's role in delegation of authority. This
48 training is meant to be a broad overview of the
49 delegation of authority, and there will be a time for
50

1 Q&A at the end of the training to get into specifics --
2 maybe more regional specific issues.

3
4 Next slide. So, here is the regulation
5 that allows the Board to delegate their authority to the
6 agency field offices. The regulation describes what kind
7 of actions can be delegated. For example, harvest --
8 setting harvest and possession limits, open and closing
9 seasons, etc. We'll try to use plain language in the
10 next few slides to define and describe delegation of
11 authority. So, next slide, all right. So, what is
12 delegation of authority? In the broad sense the
13 delegation of authority is the transfer of limited
14 decision-making power from the Board to Federal
15 managers. Delegated authority is what gives the Federal
16 managers the legal authority to make in-season decisions
17 to manage fish and wildlife populations. As mentioned
18 in the previous slide, the Board transfers the decision-
19 making authority to Federal managers, for example, this
20 may be the National Park Service Superintendents, U.S.
21 Forest Service District Rangers, or the Fish and
22 Wildlife Service Refuge Managers. Local Federal managers
23 often have a greater connection to and an understanding
24 of the resources than those of us in Anchorage. Beyond
25 giving decision making authority to the Federal managers
26 who have boots on the ground, why is this delegation of
27 authority important? A delegation of authority is
28 important for multiple reasons. It allows Federal
29 managers to make quick management decisions and data and
30 local knowledge be -- as data and local knowledge become
31 available in season. For example, maybe the preseason
32 forecast for a fish population is strong, but in season
33 data and local observations indicate that the run is
34 actually weak and will not meet escapement goals. The
35 Federal managers delegated authority allows quick action
36 to close that fishery to all users, to protect the
37 population and close the fishery to non-federally
38 qualified users and protect the continued subsistence
39 uses. It allows for input from locals when there is a
40 close relationship between managers and subsistence
41 users. Authority can be delegated to managers in two
42 places; one is in unit specific regulations, so
43 currently only wildlife regulations have delegated
44 authority in unit specific regulations, mainly because
45 wildlife has a lot of routine management actions. For
46 example, a Federal manager has delegated authority to
47 announce the harvest quota for moose hunt each year
48 before the moose season opens. This optimizes harvest
49 opportunity and conservation, since the quota can be
50 adjusted annually in response to the size of a moose

1 population. Authority can also be delegated through a
2 delegation of authority letters. These letters allow
3 Federal managers to issue special actions, and we will
4 discuss these letters a little bit. Next slide. How the
5 board delegates authority depends on the authority --
6 at the authority -- if the authority is delegated in a
7 letter or in unit specific regulations. For delegation
8 of authority letters, the Board may delegate authority
9 at any time. This is done through administrative action.
10 The administrative actions require a Board to vote
11 either by phone, email, poll, or during a Board meeting,
12 but do not go through the regulatory process. This allows
13 for quick action by the Board and for the Board to be
14 responsive to changing conditions. This method does not
15 require public input, however, the board understands the
16 value of public feedback and may ask for feedback from
17 the Councils before creating or modifying delegation of
18 authority letters. Delegation of authority in unit
19 specific regulations may only happen through the public
20 regulatory process. So, in other words, this requires a
21 proposal to change the existing Fish and Wildlife
22 regulations during the regulatory cycle. While public
23 input is at the Board's discretion for delegation of
24 authority letters, Public and council input is required
25 through the public regulatory process. So, this is an
26 example of authority that is delegated to a manager in
27 unit specific regulations. So, these currently only
28 happen for regulatory -- wildlife regulations for
29 routine annual management decisions. The authority is
30 more limited in scope than the delegation of authority
31 letters. So, in this example the authority pertains to
32 setting permit conditions and announcing closures for a
33 winter hunt. If anyone, the Councils or the public wanted
34 to change or modify this authority, it would need to be
35 done by submitting a regulatory proposal. In contrast
36 to the authority outlined in regulations, managers may
37 also be delegated authority through the delegation of
38 authority letters. These letters give managers authority
39 to issue special actions. The special actions issued by
40 Federal managers are subject to regulatory requirements.
41 For example, public hearings are required for temporary
42 special actions, which are specific actions that last
43 more than 60 days but may not extend past the end of the
44 current regulatory cycle, and the public hearings are
45 encouraged for emergency special actions, which are
46 actions that may not exceed 60 days. The managers must
47 also seek Council recommendations when the timing of
48 council meetings allows. Delegation of authority letters
49 can be issued or rescinded by the Board at any time.
50 Issuing or rescinding the letters does not need to take

1 place at a Board meeting or during a regulatory cycle.
2 This gives the Board the flexibility to adapt to changing
3 conditions and make sure managers have the tools they
4 need to manage and protect populations, as well as
5 optimize subsistence opportunity. Changes to delegation
6 of authority letters may be requested by the Councils
7 or the public, by a letter to the -- by a letter, or
8 during a Board meeting. The delegation of authority
9 letters are not currently published online. However, if
10 the Council or the public ever wants a copy of these
11 letters, they can contact OSM or the local in-season
12 Manager for copies. While letters issued to managers are
13 specific to the area and species covered, the general
14 language and requirements are the same across the
15 letters. For example, all letters require communication
16 with affected parties such as Council Chairs and the
17 ADF&G. Tribal consultation must be conducted if
18 practicable, and managers may also defer decisions to
19 the Board with very controversial issues if immediate
20 action is not needed. The Federal program has fisheries
21 regulations and wildlife regulations. Fisheries and
22 wildlife delegation of authority is issued in separate
23 letters. For fisheries, the scope of the letters is broad
24 and consistent across all letters, they cover all fish
25 species in an area. A list of the Federal fisheries
26 managers with delegated authority can be found on page,
27 I think it's 152 of the current books that was just
28 published. This contrasts with -- oh, I'm sorry, the
29 fisheries, I don't have a fisheries book to tell you
30 what page it is, I'd have to correct that and get back
31 with you on that one. This contrasts with the wildlife
32 delegations, which tend to cover specific hunts, species
33 and management actions. Most wildlife actions are
34 routine and occur every year in unit specific
35 regulations for the Federal Wildlife Harvest Regulation
36 Booklet, a white exclamation mark inside a red triangle
37 indicates that additional management action may be taken
38 by the Federal In-season Manager, and you should consult
39 the delegation of authority table in the back of the
40 book. All of the delegation of authority letters are
41 listed in the wildlife book on page 152. They're
42 organized by Federal Manager and are listed and list the
43 area species and delegation of authority. Each row
44 corresponds with a separate letter. For example, on page
45 154 of the wildlife book, the Izembek National Wildlife
46 Refuge Manager has authority to close the moose season
47 in Unit 9D and 10, when 10 bulls have been harvested.
48 On page 155 of the new wildlife book, the Wrangell-St
49 Elias National Park and Preserve superintendent has the
50 authority to manage the Chisana Caribou Hunt in a portion

1 of Unit 12. Specifically, they can open and close the
2 season, announce the harvest quota and the number of
3 permits issued.

4
5 So, in summary, we have delegation of
6 authority, which means that the Board transfers limited
7 decision-making ability to Federal managers. This
8 authority can be in unit specific regulations or in
9 delegation of authority letters. For unit specific
10 regulations, delegated authority can only be added or
11 modified during the public regulatory process. The
12 delegation tends to be for routine and annual management
13 actions. They are currently only in wildlife regulations
14 because wildlife has more routine management actions,
15 such as closing seasons when harvest quotas are met. The
16 Council's role in delegation of authority in unit
17 specific regulations is submitting proposals to change
18 the delegated authority in regulations, making
19 recommendations to the Board in the associated
20 regulatory proposals and consulting with managers before
21 they take in-season actions.

22
23 Delegation of authority letters are
24 easier for the Board to change or rescind, giving the
25 board more flexibility to act quickly and respond to
26 changing conditions. Again, changes to the letters can
27 happen outside the regulatory cycle. Delegation of
28 authority letters give Federal managers the ability to
29 issue special regulations. The letters are generally
30 broader in scope, but are subject to more requirements,
31 such as requiring public hearings. Both fisheries and
32 wildlife have delegation of authority letters. The
33 Council also has a role in the delegation of authority
34 letters. The Council may request to add or modify them
35 through the letters or at a Board meeting. The Board may
36 ask Councils for feedback on proposed changes to
37 delegation of authority letters when time allows. The
38 letters also require that managers consult with Council
39 Chairs before issuing special actions. The Chair is
40 encouraged to seek feedback from other Council members.
41 Delegation of authority allows for quick in-season
42 management actions. This allows Federal managers to
43 protect fish and wildlife populations and continuation
44 of subsistence. Managers are required to consult with
45 affected parties before taking action. This commonly
46 includes the Council's ADF&G and OSM. Council Chairs are
47 encouraged to bring in other Council members when
48 consulting with managers, and you can contact OSM or in-
49 season managers if you have any questions. So, thank you
50 so much for your time and attention today. I'd be happy

00038

1 to answer any questions. And we have a couple other
2 people that can help answer anything I can't. Thank you.

3

4 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Do
5 Council members have questions? Coral, go ahead.

6

7 MS. CHERNOFF: I have a question and it's
8 actually specific, whereas we've sort of talked about
9 structure, but this might be an answer you can get to
10 us later. What is -- the delegation -- I guess the
11 question is, is there a letter of delegation for
12 migratory birds because, like, we don't deal with that
13 during the hunt or during the fall season and previous
14 to the AMBCC being formed only to act in that spring
15 season. What's the delegation of authority? I guess What
16 was the previous delegation of authority? Is there a
17 delegation of authority to the state of Alaska? And is
18 that something that we can change?

19

20 MS. HOLMAM: So, through the Chair.
21 That's something we'd have to look into at this point.
22 We don't do anything with the migratory birds. And so,
23 I don't know what happened prior to OSM coming in. So,
24 that would be something we'd probably have to get other
25 -- have some conversations with others to figure out and
26 get that information for you.

27

28 MS. CHERNOFF: Okay. So, okay. So, I
29 guess that that would be my question is then there must
30 be a delegation of authority out there for Fish and
31 Game?

32

33 MS. LEONETTI: The migratory -- sorry
34 through the Chair, Crystal Leonetti. The authority for
35 Migratory Bird Management is under the Migratory Bird
36 Protection Act which preceded ANILCA. So, that has
37 always been covered separately from the Federal
38 Subsistence Management Program migratory birds are
39 managed and enforced under the MBTA Migratory Bird
40 Treaty Act. OSM does not delegate authority for that for
41 migratory birds.

42

43 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Are
44 there further questions on the presentation so far?
45 Okay, and checking in, Della and Natasha, did either of
46 you have questions?

47

48 MS. TRUMBLE: Hi, this is Della. Madam
49 Chair, I don't have anything.

50

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, I'm not
2 seeing any more questions at the table or hearing any
3 online. So, if you want to move on to the second half.
4 Thanks.

5
6 MS. HOLMAN: Okay. So again, Kendra
7 Holman wildlife biologist with OSM. So, this is just
8 going to be a quick brief overview of proposed changes
9 for the wildlife delegation of authority. So, this is
10 just meant to be kind of a brief introduction. The
11 Councils will have additional opportunities at future
12 meetings to further review and comment on this, but the
13 Office of Subsistence Management is proposing to move
14 the authority that is existing in the delegation of
15 authority letters back into wildlife unit specific
16 regulations. While staff have not thoroughly reviewed
17 all of the wildlife delegation of authority letters, the
18 vast majority of these are routine management actions
19 that happen every year, such as announcing harvest
20 quotas. So, there may be some like the cultural and
21 education permits that continue to be delegation of
22 authority letters.

23
24 Having the delegation of authority for
25 these routine decisions in unit specific regulations is
26 more appropriate than issuing a special action every
27 year. This provides a more clear public process for
28 changing delegation of authority through regulatory
29 proposals. It decreases the administrative burden on
30 Federal managers by eliminating the regulatory
31 requirements associated with those special actions and
32 the delegation of authority letters. So, the timeline
33 for these proposed changes at this point is March of
34 2025, which should be approximately during the next open
35 window to submit wildlife regulatory proposals, the
36 Office of Subsistence Management will submit a proposal
37 to move the wildlife delegated authority into unit
38 specific regulations and rescind many of the existing
39 letters. In the fall of 2025, so next fall, at your fall
40 meetings, the Council will consider and make
41 recommendations on this proposal, and in April of 2026,
42 the Board will take final action on the proposal at
43 their wildlife regulatory meeting. So, that is my --
44 completes my brief overview of the process and what we
45 have proposed. If you have any questions or any feedback
46 on the topic, I'd be happy to answer those or take notes.
47 Thank you.

48
49
50

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So, I have a
2 question. Can you remind us how many delegation of
3 authority letters we have in our region?
4

5 MS. HOLMAN: So, I'd have to get the
6 specific numbers. There are a couple, but there aren't
7 very many in this region. I know I was verifying with
8 with Justin that fisheries has two that actually cover
9 this region. So, there are two fisheries. There are a
10 couple, but not very many.
11

12 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, yeah, sorry.
13 I should have specified I meant the wildlife ones that
14 would be subject to this further work that you're talking
15 about. Thanks. All right, further questions. Coral.
16

17 MS. CHERNOFF: Thank you. In just in
18 reference to that question, will you get back with the
19 answer?
20

21 MS. HOLMAN: I can get back with the
22 answer, I just need to go back through -- it's 5 to 10
23 at tops. I was kind of looking a little bit earlier, but
24 I'd have to go back through and verify the exact number.
25

26 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, I am not
27 seeing or hearing any more questions on the delegation
28 of authority issue, so we'll go ahead, thank you. We'll
29 go ahead and move on to the next agenda item. Agenda
30 item 11 State regional seasons, fishery reports. And
31 item A is Kodiak Road system FRMP subsistence harvest
32 assessment project data review. This will be Jackie
33 Keating with Fish and Game Subsistence Division.
34

35 MS. KEATING: Thank you, Madam Chair. I
36 think we're just waiting for slides to load.
37

38 (Pause)
39

40 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: And your materials
41 are -- I think they were submitted. So, they're page 24
42 in the book. Correct? So, anyone who has the -- our
43 meeting book, the original first book, it's page 24.
44

45 MS. KEATING: Yes, thank you for noting
46 that. Great. Well thank you, Madam Chair, members of the
47 Council, again, for the record, my name is Jackie
48 Keating. I'm the lead subsistence resource specialist
49 at the Department of Fish and Game for the South-Central
50 region, and for us, that also includes Kodiak. And I

1 appreciate the opportunity to give an update on this
2 study, which was funded by the Fisheries Resource and
3 Monitoring Program. This was a really big project. And
4 so today I'm just going to share some of the study
5 findings that are especially relevant to some of the
6 proposals that this Council will be considering for the
7 Federal Subsistence Board. But there's a whole lot
8 involved in this project. So, if people want to talk
9 about it in more detail, I'm around for the next two
10 days and I'm happy to do so. You can go to the next
11 slide.

12

13 (Pause)

14

15 Well, this slide itself isn't too
16 critical, so, I'll continue verbally if we can get the
17 visual sorted out. This slide is about the project
18 background. And as many of you know, this project
19 originated from concerns from this Council that
20 comprehensive subsistence harvest data hadn't been
21 collected for the Kodiak Road system in three decades.
22 The Kodiak Road System, as you all know, is the largest
23 rural community in Alaska under Federal subsistence
24 regulations, as well as the largest community outside
25 of the State non subsistence area. So, we were very
26 thankful for the opportunity to update this information.
27 The project was a partnership with the Shungnak Tribe
28 of Kodiak and the Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge, and
29 many people from those groups were instrumental in
30 making this project happen. But I especially want to
31 thank Matt VanDale, Daniel Smith, who's here today, Amy
32 Peterson, Mike Brady and Danny Hernandez for their
33 assistance, and the project was funded during Covid, so
34 we employed some research modifications to pull this
35 off. This included mapping only salmon and non-salmon
36 search and harvest areas, as opposed to doing every
37 resource category just to minimize the amount of in-
38 person interaction we had with respondents. We also
39 offered the option to complete these surveys over the
40 phone, so that we weren't excluding folks that weren't
41 comfortable with meeting face to face. This is a big
42 undertaking, just to give everybody a little bit of
43 context, the average time to complete these surveys was
44 about 35 minutes. So, they take a little bit of time.

45

46 And next slide. The dates of this
47 project. So, we did fieldwork from February through
48 April of 2022 for the 2021 study year. So, we ask folks
49 about everything that happened in the entire year prior.
50 The project also involved a qualitative data collection

1 component in the form of ethnographic key respondent
2 interviews. We also did a life history mapping case
3 study, which took place both in February 2022 and then
4 we also went back in July of 2023, and we presented the
5 draft survey results for feedback at a community data
6 review meeting at the Kodiak Refuge Visitor Center in
7 November of 2022. I do want to note that there were
8 multiple members of this Council that attended that
9 meeting in person, so thank you for being there and for
10 your involvement. And we were also invited to the Kodiak
11 Archipelago Leadership Institute Rural Forum last
12 September to talk about the types of subsistence data
13 that we collect and how community members can access it
14 and use it in the regulatory process. Lastly, we're in
15 the final stages of formatting the final technical paper
16 for this project. We'll be submitting the final draft
17 to OSM at the end of the month, and then it should be
18 published online by the end of this year.

19
20 So, this next slide shows our household
21 survey sample achievement. And there's a lot of numbers
22 on here. But I wanted to point out a few for the sake
23 of today. We used what we call a geographically
24 stratified random sample, and it divided the Kodiak Road
25 System into the actual Kodiak City limits. The Kodiak
26 Station Census designated place, which includes the
27 Coast Guard Base and then the remaining of the Kodiak
28 Road System, which of course includes Minashka Bay,
29 Bells Flats, Chiniak and everything in between. The
30 household list that we used originated from a Kodiak
31 Island Borough Utilities list of addresses. And then for
32 each of these strata, we randomly selected the
33 households, and we would go visit in person. Occupants
34 needed to have been living in the house for at least
35 half of the study year in order to be eligible to
36 participate. And a few things to point out, we completed
37 a total of 269 surveys. And as I mentioned, they take
38 about 35 minutes to complete. We did about 127 within
39 Kodiak City, 111 for the remaining road system, and then
40 31 on Coast Guard Station, just because it was a much
41 smaller sample. And I also want to highlight the refusal
42 rate. Overall, we had 20% of the households that we
43 actually made contact with refuse to participate in the
44 survey, which is exactly what we would expect to see in
45 a larger community. If we're in communities with less
46 than 100 households, we usually see more like a 10%
47 refusal rate. But for a community, this massive 20% is
48 really, really good.

49
50

1 And these next slides start to get into
2 some of the data. Just to give an example of what these
3 types of surveys show. So, one of the main things that
4 we get out of comprehensive surveys, which ask about
5 every resource that people use, is we can look at the
6 overall use levels of different resources. So, what this
7 figure shows is the 8 different resource categories. And
8 then all of the resources combined in the columns all
9 the way over there on the right. So, in these clusters,
10 the blue columns on the left are showing the percentage
11 of households that use a resource. The green is the
12 percent that attempt to harvest that resource category.
13 And then that teal color shows the percentage that
14 successfully harvest. And we would expect to see a higher
15 blue bar for most resource categories. This indicates
16 that households are using resources through sharing even
17 if they don't harvest it themselves. And as you can see
18 on the far-right side, 96% of Kodiak households used at
19 least one kind of wild resource in the 2021 study year.
20 And by resource category, we're looking at 86% of Kodiak
21 households that used salmon. Almost 60% that harvested
22 it themselves. Again, this shows how important sharing
23 is. And when we consider the total population of Kodiak,
24 the -- this is a lot of households that use salmon, and
25 it's clearly an important resource for the community.

26
27 And another metric beyond just household
28 use is looking at the total pounds of usable wild food
29 weight. And this figure shows the per capita harvest for
30 the road system and 2021 and then the previous comparable
31 study year, which is 1991. We use per capita harvest to
32 control for changes in population. This allows us to
33 better assess trends in harvests over time. And you can
34 see that the Kodiak Road System residents harvested
35 about 75 pounds of wild food per person in 2021, versus
36 140 pounds in 1991. This is not completely uncommon, we
37 usually see a decline, especially if we're looking at
38 this big of a time period. There's another notable
39 difference, this is the composition of harvests. And you
40 can kind of see in the taller bar on the left, there's
41 that orange chunk closer to the top. That's the marine
42 invertebrate harvest, in 1991, 1991, it made up about
43 8% of the total harvest composition. And then in 2021,
44 it was less than 1%. So, we're looking at kind of these
45 shifts of what is available for people to harvest and
46 use. And up until now, with the data that I've shown,
47 we've been looking at things by resource category level.
48 But these tables show the top ten individual species of
49 resources used in the most recent study year, and then
50 the very first available Kodiak study year that we have;

1 that's all the way back to 1982. So, these are based on
2 the percentage of households that use each type of
3 resource. And as you can see, there's some consistency
4 across the 4 decades. Things like halibut, sockeye and
5 coho salmon and deer remain very, very broadly used by
6 a lot of households. But you can also see from the top
7 resources used in 1982, things like marine invertebrates
8 like king dungeness crab, tanner crab, butter clams and
9 shrimp used to be a lot more widely used by at least
10 half of Kodiak households, but they didn't quite have
11 enough widespread use in 2021 to make that list of the
12 top ten resources used. And this is that harvest
13 composition metric that I mentioned. So, it shows the
14 total harvest composition by pounds usable weight. And
15 you can see that for Kodiak, fish makes up the vast
16 majority of the harvest weight. Salmon are 41% in 2021,
17 non-salmon fish make up 36% of the harvest weight and
18 then this is followed by large land mammals and
19 vegetation at 15 and 6%. We can also look at harvest
20 composition by resource category. So, this figure shows
21 the composition of salmon by pounds usable weight and
22 sockeye composed about half of the total harvest weight
23 in 2021, coho were about 35%, king salmon were 8%, and
24 then pink salmon were about 5. And I want to point out
25 that the survey also documents harvest by gear type. And
26 in 2021, about half of the total salmon weight was caught
27 with rod and reel, while 29% came from commercial
28 retention or home pack and 21% came from subsistence
29 gear.

30
31 And this next slide is just an example
32 of the type of spatial data that we collect. Respondents
33 indicate where they fish during the study year. So, this
34 map shows search and harvest areas for all species of
35 salmon combined. In the final technical paper, we'll be
36 publishing maps by individual species of salmon. But I
37 just wanted to give an example of the type of spatial
38 data that will be publishing for this study. And then I
39 mentioned earlier that there's a qualitative component
40 to most of the projects that we do through ethnographic
41 key respondent interviews. And for context, key
42 respondents are identified very closely with project
43 partners. And then what we use what we call a snowball
44 sampling method to get recommendations from those
45 respondents on who else we should be talking to. In
46 total, we interviewed 12 Kodiak residents who had a
47 lifelong experience with fishing and gathering other
48 subsistence foods. And these are what we call semi-
49 structured interviews, where we start with a list of
50 questions that we could ask, but we rely on respondents

1 to talk about what's important to them. Our approach to
2 qualitative data is very rigorous. We record and
3 transcribe interviews verbatim. Then we send those
4 transcripts back to respondents for them to review for
5 accuracy. And then multiple researchers review each
6 transcript and identify key themes, then we develop a
7 coding structure. From there, we use software called
8 Nvivo and go through each transcript and apply the final
9 codes to the text. So, on this slide are some of the key
10 themes that emerged from all of those interviews. And
11 these are the types of things that help us contextualize
12 the quantitative survey findings. So, some of those
13 themes were simply the ongoing importance of wild foods
14 in the Kodiak community, and how deeply intertwined it
15 is in Kodiak culture. Another theme was the very tight
16 relationship between commercial and subsistence fishing
17 trends in numerous ways, one of which is, you know, the
18 transfer of skill sets, the transfer of gear, the effects
19 that more struggles over declining commercial fisheries
20 might have on subsistence ways of life. Another key theme
21 concerns, of course, over the Buskin, in a lot of
22 different ways, both in terms of being able to get fish
23 people need. But there were also these, you know, more
24 intangible themes that came out of this. People had
25 concerns about if the Buskin is closed, are people that
26 live in town and don't get to go out losing that exposure
27 to subsistence harvest activities, and what kind of
28 generational effects might that have. And lastly, Kodiak
29 has always been a hub community, but several respondents
30 kind of elevated the fact that as some of the village
31 populations decline and people are moving in its
32 increasingly important that people go back and forth to
33 where they came from for harvesting food, sharing with
34 the communities that they came from. So, what's the
35 importance of those sharing networks and, and those
36 types of things.

37
38 And then, like any good project, we came
39 away from this one with more research questions that
40 need to be addressed. The first one is just, you know,
41 comprehensive surveys are really valuable information,
42 and ideally, they should be conducted every 10 to 15
43 years. So, having the opportunity to survey the road
44 system again before 30 more years would be ideal,
45 especially because comprehensive surveys are a one-year
46 snapshot, so they reflect the unique circumstances of
47 the study year. In 2021, we would imagine that there
48 would still be some lingering effects of Covid that might
49 have affected people's harvest practices. Second, this
50 is an idea that might come up in the discussion on

1 Priority Information Needs. But as I just mentioned, one
2 of the emergent themes from the study was the broader
3 effects of Buskin closures that might have on exposure
4 to subsistence traditions and general access to
5 subsistence, subsistence fish. So, we proposed in the
6 technical paper that it could be beneficial to have a
7 study of permit holders to assess how fishing behaviors
8 change when the Buskin closes, and what kind of
9 adaptation measures that people employ to obtain the
10 fish that they need. And then finally, another emergent
11 theme was the importance of sharing wild resources among
12 communities across the Kodiak Archipelago. There's a
13 type of study called a social network analysis that helps
14 document the factors that shape wild food sharing
15 networks. It could be really interesting to do this in
16 the Kodiak community at large. Again, we couldn't have
17 done this work without the Shungnak Tribe and the Kodiak
18 Refuge. We also hired numerous local research assistants
19 that were instrumental in helping us do these surveys.
20 And then, of course, I'd really like to thank all the
21 Kodiak residents that took the time to do these surveys
22 to share their knowledge with us. Obviously, we couldn't
23 have done any of this without them. And lastly, I would
24 mention that the Fisheries Resource and Monitoring
25 Program funded this same kind of work for us to update
26 information for Port Lions and Ouzinkie. We did that in
27 the winter of 2023. And so, if the Council is interested
28 in getting those detailed results at your winter
29 meeting, I'd be happy to provide those as well. That's
30 all I have. I appreciate the opportunity and I'd be
31 happy to take any questions.

32
33 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Are
34 there questions from council members? Coral, go ahead.

35
36 MS. CHERNOFF: Thank you. I just had one
37 question on the map page where you have the map. I was
38 just curious as to why there's a little Kenai-Cook Inlet
39 section below that.

40
41 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah. Thank you. That's a
42 great question. So, these surveys document anywhere that
43 Kodiak residents went to obtain fish in the study year.
44 So, this would have been somebody that went and got
45 their fish dip netting on the Kenai.

46
47 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat, go ahead.

48
49 MR. HOLMES: Kenai, that's a dip net
50 fishery, isn't it?

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

MS. KEATING: Yes, sir.

MR. HOLMES: I had a -- I'll let Coral -
- I'll be quiet.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: No. You're good.

MS. HOLMES: Okay. I was thinking about the change in the proportions of pink salmon. Because, you know, 40, 50 years ago, folks focused on that because the reds overall were way down. And so, you know, those shifts through time, looking at your older surveys. And I thought it was interesting on the shellfish harvest, on clams dropping and crab and I think the clams, because Kenai and some of the other groups have been doing a serious PSP monitoring. And I know when I was with the department, I used to write the Do Not Eat Clams. And of course, the first time I did that, two people ended up in the hospital that Saturday because they didn't pay attention to not eating mussels and butter clams. And so, but I think that there's more monitoring and there's more awareness now of PSP. And so, could that be the probability of why it's, there's less harvests of it?

MS. KEATING: Yeah. Through the Chair. Mr. Holmes, I think that's definitely a key contributing factor is concern and then the outreach that's been done about it.

MR. HOLMES: And then I had another question on the other significant changes in crab, dungeness and king crab. And I know a lot of that is because of the population declines caught eating them when they're molting and stuff. But I do recall, oh golly, six years or more ago, we had quite a discussion on that because there was one area left near town, one up in Danger Bay, but one in town was Woman's Bay for residual king crab population, and so the department had reduced the harvest to one per family per year, which was really good. But then we ended up having 2 or 3 big groups of sea otters move in there, like 50 or 60 of them. And I know my friends that were harvesting them, you know, were just amazed to have them so concentrated. But after that, talking to the NOAA people, there just weren't any crabs left. They just cleaned it out. And I've noticed that for the Buskin, since we had that big movement of otters, I don't know, sorry I don't remember the specific years, but we had a large amount move around from Marmot Bay and, and saw the same thing happened for

1 the dungeness at Buskin. And that's where we walk and
2 look for the shells. And I was hoping we'd have a purge,
3 a spike, but it just hasn't. And so, there's multiple
4 factors.

5
6 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, further
7 questions. I had two questions. Can we scroll back to
8 slide seven? So, my question was between these two years,
9 noting that the older one doesn't have any vegetative
10 products, is that really because they didn't rise up in
11 the level, or were they not asked about or do you know?
12

13 MS. KEATING: Thank you, Madam Chair.
14 That's a good question. They were asked about it, I
15 think it just -- actually I should double check that. I
16 believe that if we were looking at the 90s, it would
17 definitely have been asked. 1983, I'm not sure if we
18 asked about vegetation exclusively yet at that point.
19

20 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, and then my
21 second question. So, you collected data for gear type
22 so, rod and reel -- well, rod and reel, commercial and
23 subsistence gear. Did you ask about use of boats? So,
24 do you have a sense of how many people used or needed a
25 boat to harvest the marine resources?
26

27 MS. KEATING: In a sense, not directly.
28 The way that we tease that out is we can -- when we do
29 that mapping data, every point that we document has
30 access type. So, whether it was on boat, on foot, on
31 ATV, whatever it might be. So, we could tease out from
32 the spatial data how many households fished with a rod
33 and reel on a boat. But in terms of -- on the actual
34 survey, not directly.
35

36 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Coral, go ahead.
37

38 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah, I do notice the
39 absence of birds on here. But in seeing that there's
40 plant life, halibut, there's deer, there's a variety of
41 other things. Can you speak to why birds are missing?
42

43 MS. KEATING: Through the Chair. Sure, I
44 think that they don't show up on the top ten just because
45 -- it's interesting looking at the Kodiak Road system,
46 because it's so many households. And so, we're looking
47 at in 2021, the 10th top resource used is rockfish. It
48 was used by a quarter of Kodiak residents. So, I think
49 birds just weren't quite that widespread. I could pull
50 up the percentage of households that did use birds for

00049

1 you after this. I don't have it right in front of me,
2 but I want to say it was around like 15%, something like
3 that.

4

5 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat, Go ahead.

6

7 MR. HOLMES: Yeah. Kendra, on that -- the
8 slide with the picture of the island and the -- and the
9 salmon search and harvest areas. I think that's quite
10 interesting. Some of the places, like, off
11 (indiscernible) Bay, I know, folks, when the Buskin's
12 down, have moved up there directly north on the southeast
13 end of Afognak on those two spots. And so, they're out
14 having to explore around. But some of the way offshore
15 ones really surprised me. Where it's out in the Monashka
16 Bay, way out Chiniak, Cape Chiniak and Nero Cape. And I
17 was trying to figure that out, but then I was just
18 thinking, the chap that brings us king salmon, he's got
19 a boat, and he used to be commercial, but he goes out
20 all the way to Nero Pape and troll back and the same off
21 Cape Chiniak. And that's something 4 years ago nobody
22 would bother at all. And back 100 years ago, they'd
23 catch king salmon right in the channel, just casting off
24 the dock. And so tremendous changes and distribution of
25 the fish and the way people are catching them. So, this
26 is a real eye-opening graph.

27

28 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Any
29 further questions? Della and Natasha just checking if
30 you have any questions. Okay, I'm not seeing further
31 questions in the room or hearing any online. So, thank
32 you Jackie. Thank you.

33

34 MS. KEATING: Thank you.

35

36 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Our next
37 agenda item and well, I guess we'll see how time goes.
38 We may take lunch after the Buskin River item or we may
39 keep going. But the next item is 11 B the Buskin River
40 FRMP Sakai Assessment Project season summary. This will
41 be Kelly Krueger and Mark Witteveen from ADF&G Division
42 of Sport Fish and their online, I believe. So, do we
43 have Kelly Krueger and Mark Witteveen? And what are the
44 unmuting instructions again.

45

46 MS. PERRY: Madam Chair, star six to
47 unmute your phone.

48

49 MR. WITTEVEEN: I think Kelly is prepared
50 to give that report. I think she should be online.

00050

1
2 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Kelly, are you on
3 there?

4
5 (Pause)

6
7 Okay. Why don't we take a brief stand
8 down? Mark, can you see if you can maybe text Kelly or
9 get her online? We'll just stand down for a couple of
10 minutes and see if we can get Kelly back on.

11
12 (Simultaneous speech)

13
14 MR. WITTEVEEN: Give her a shot to see
15 where she's at.

16
17 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, thanks. So,
18 we'll just take three minutes. Go ahead.

19
20 MS. HOLMAN: For the record, this is
21 Kendra Holman. I have the answer to that question about
22 Coral's question for the delegation of authority letter
23 numbers. If since we or -- I'm sorry, your question, so.

24
25 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: No, I'm going to
26 hand the gavel to Coral as Secretary while you answer
27 her question. I'm going to step out for my two minutes.
28 All right, go ahead.

29
30 MS. HOLMAN: Okay. So, Izembek National
31 Wildlife Refuge has 3 that affect units for moose for
32 Unit 90, caribou for Unit 90, and the Unimak Island
33 caribou for Unit 10. And then there is one that is a C&T
34 crossover from Unit 9E for caribou that Becharof
35 National Wildlife Refuge has. Those are the four that
36 affect this region - Becharof -- the Alaska Peninsula,
37 Becharof. That one's a tongue twister for me. So,
38 Wildlife Refuge has the 9E caribou. That is a C&T
39 crossover for this region.

40
41 MS. KRUEGER: Hi, this is Kelly Krueger.
42 Can you hear me now?

43
44 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yep. Kelly, we got
45 you. You can go ahead and start anytime.

46
47 MS. KRUEGER: Okay, great. Thanks. I
48 don't know what happened before. I had sent in meeting
49 materials last week. Did you guys get them?

50

00051

1 MS. PERRY: Through the Chair. Madam
2 Chair this is DeAnna Perry, acting county -- Council
3 Coordinator. Kelly, did you send those to Lisa's email
4 by chance? I don't -- I don't recall receiving them. If
5 you could forward those to me real quick, I could put
6 those on the screen here in the room.

7
8 MS. KRUEGER: Okay. And what's the email?

9
10 MS. PERRY: It's DeAnna, D E A N N A.
11 Perry, P as in Paul E R R Y @usda.gov.

12
13 MS. KRUEGER: Okay.

14
15 MS. PERRY: And I'll look for those and
16 let you know when I have them.

17
18 MS. KRUEGER: Okay, great. There is a
19 written presentation and then there's a PowerPoint, and
20 the PowerPoint is the one that I'll be going off of. And
21 then the written one is just one for -- just for later,
22 just for people to read.

23
24 MS. TRUMBLE: Through the Chair, this is
25 Della. DeAnna, can you forward those documents by email?

26
27 MS. PERRY: Absolutely. As soon as I get
28 those, I sure will.

29
30 MS. TRUMBLE: Thank you.

31
32 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, so we'll just
33 -- we need to wait for the email to show up here so that
34 DeAnna can project it in the room. And then DeAnna will
35 also forward it to our Council members online.

36
37 (Pause)

38
39 Kelly, just checking in. Did you hit
40 send on that email yet?

41
42 MS. KRUEGER: I did, yep. I sent it about
43 two minutes ago.

44
45 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. It still
46 hasn't showed up on our end yet.

47
48 MS. KRUEGER: The ones about -- for the
49 presentation. The PowerPoint is about four megabytes,

50

00052

1 so, it might take a minute. My presentation itself is
2 probably only about five minutes.

3

4 (Pause)

5

6 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, the email
7 came in. We're just pulling it up online here. So just
8 about another minute or so.

9

10 MS. KRUEGER: Okay, Great.

11

12 (Pause)

13

14 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. We've got the
15 presentation up on the screen. And Kelly if you want to
16 go ahead and start.

17

18 MS. KRUEGER: Okay, great. Thank you. So,
19 this is the 2024 Buskin River sockeye salmon stock
20 assessment. And this is a brief overview on our project
21 from 2024. The primary objectives for this study are to
22 census the sockeye salmon escapement, estimate the age,
23 composition of escapement and harvest, and to summarize
24 the sex and length data. The next slide shows the Buskin
25 River escapement from 2014 to 2024. This graph shows
26 Buskin River sockeye salmon escapement from the past 10
27 years. The Buskin River escapement is shown in blue, and
28 the dashed line shows the lower and upper bound
29 escapement goal range. The solid line shows the recent
30 five-year average, which is about 6,300 sockeye salmon
31 from 2019 to 2023 for Buskin River escapement. This year
32 2024, the Buskin River weir was operational on May 15th
33 and was removed on July 31st. Our lower Buskin River
34 weir was installed on July 31st and sockeye salmon
35 continue to be counted through this week. 2024 Buskin
36 River weir count for sockeye salmon through July 31st
37 was 9,600 fish. This exceeds the sockeye salmon goal
38 range of 5,000 to 8,000 fish, which is shown with the
39 dashed line. The next slide, slide three, shows the
40 sockeye salmon run timing. The count by day is shown in
41 blue, the dates are shown on the y or the x axis, and
42 the number of sockeye salmon counted, and percent
43 escapement is shown on each y axis.

44

45 This year it started out fairly slowly
46 and the fish did not hold long in the river before
47 passing through the weir. The peak day you can see was
48 on June 28th with 818 sockeye salmon counted. For
49 reference, the normally -- normal peak is during the
50 third week in June. The next slide. So, for this project,

1 our funding cycle through OSM 2022 to 2025, we had added
2 the scale measurement component. So, we're looking at
3 freshwater and saltwater annually growth. And we're
4 looking at different climate indices freshwater
5 productivity and using this to refine our forecasting.
6 Looking at 2 versus 3 years in the ocean. We had a slow
7 start to this just due to some equipment and software
8 issues, and we finally got that figured out with the
9 purchasing and setting up, mainly with some lenses that
10 just wouldn't allow us to look at the full scale
11 underneath the lens. But we got that figured out, and
12 at this point in time, we have completed ten years of
13 scale measurements, and we're looking at the initial
14 data exploration, and we're going to be looking at more
15 scale measurements this winter. And by the conclusion
16 of the project, which will be next December. So, December
17 31st, 2025, we will have completed 20 years of scale
18 measurement data. So, by the next RAC meeting next
19 spring, we will have some more information based on our
20 findings and have a little bit more information on what
21 we've seen for different population observations and
22 some environmental observations on what we've seen for
23 this component of our project. Next slide, slide five.
24 Our interim program. Our interim program annually
25 employs two top qualified students who work on the Buskin
26 project from June 8th to August 8th. Our interns gain
27 knowledge of principles involved in fisheries management
28 and research while obtaining field experience and
29 fisheries data collection methods and techniques. Our
30 intern program continued in 2024. Our interns were Elias
31 Litzow and Frank Dorner. Since 2003, 24 of 38 interns -
32 oops, one second, I just lost my place. One minute. Hold
33 on my computer just glitched out on me.

34
35 So, since 20 -- 2003, 24 out of 38
36 interns have returned to work for the department. And
37 after the conclusion of Elias's season this year, he
38 came back to work for the department as a technician,
39 which was great, and we hope to have him back again next
40 year. So, the next slide, slide six. With that, we will
41 take any questions. And thank you to the Office of
42 Subsistence Management Fisheries Research Monitoring
43 Program for providing funding for this project. Thank
44 you.

45
46 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Great. Thanks,
47 Kelly. Are there any questions, Pat. Go ahead.

48
49 MS. HOLMES: Yeah, Kelly, thanks for your
50 report. Looking at the graphs of the returns over time

1 it's quite conspicuous how things have declined in the
2 last 4 or 5 years, and particularly last year, having
3 totally closing it down. And you know, a decade ago, it
4 would be open to the mouth for gillnetting. But I'm
5 wondering, this year, you said the age class the
6 predominant two-twos, two-threes. So, just looking at
7 the raft with a 24 Buskin River sockeye run timing and
8 the numbers of fish parent escapement, where what were
9 the apparent years maybe for this year's big return and
10 any kind of guess onto why it was so much more productive
11 than the prior year?

12

13 MS. KRUEGER: We haven't aged the scales
14 from this year yet, we will be aging them this winter.
15 So, we'll have the age information at the spring meeting.

16

17 MR. HOLMES: That'd be swell. And I had
18 another question. Even though your main report is on
19 sockeye. Looking at earlier report on the escapement of
20 coho, it seems to be up and down. Do the coho go all the
21 way up through the weir, or do you folks have to do that
22 on foot? And how do you how do you know how many coho
23 get back up the river?

24

25 MS. KRUEGER: So, we have the lower weir
26 that we install at the beginning of August. So, once we,
27 we take down the upper weir and that same day or the day
28 after we put in the lower weir, and that's how we
29 enumerate the coho escapement. And so, then that weir
30 stays in through the end of September. And then we'll
31 do foot surveys after that point and kind of gauge
32 escapement after the end of September to see how many
33 coho are coming in after that point.

34

35 MR. HOLMES: Thank you very much. It's a
36 complex critter to keep track of there. Thank you.

37

38 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Are
39 there any further questions? Okay, I am not seeing or
40 hearing any further questions. So, Kelly, thank you very
41 much for your presentation.

42

43 MS. KRUEGER: Thank you.

44

45 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. So, it is
46 11:53, I will double check. We do have 11C, any other
47 reports questioned mark. Do we know if we have any other
48 reports under 11C?

49

50

00055

1 MS. PERRY: Madam Chair, we have not been
2 advised of any. Thank you.

3
4 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, great. Okay.
5 I think what we will do is go ahead and break for lunch.
6 Hold on, let me confer with Chris here.

7
8 Okay. We're gonna take an hour and a
9 half for lunch, but I'm gonna -- it's a little over an
10 hour and a half, so we'll come back at 1:30 to give
11 people here in Unalaska enough time to travel to wherever
12 we're eating lunch and then get back. I neglected to
13 mention earlier that immediately after lunch, we will
14 be taking the NOAA Fisheries presentation by Julie
15 Scheurer, and right now that's listed as 13E. This is
16 the overview of Gulf wide status review of chinook salmon
17 populations as it relates to the petition to list chinook
18 under the endangered -- Gulf chinook under the
19 Endangered Species Act. So, it's a time certain we will
20 hear first from Julie at 1:30 when we reconvene, and
21 then, for the good of the order. Does anyone have
22 anything else before we break for lunch? Okay, not seeing
23 anything. All right. We will reconvene at 1:30. Thank
24 you.

25
26 (Off record)

27
28 (On record)

29
30 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. It's one.

31
32 MS. PERRY: Please, go ahead.

33
34 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, so it's 1:30.
35 We're gonna go ahead and call the meeting back to order.
36 We will start with a quorum check. And then just a
37 reminder that our first item after lunch will be the
38 NOAA Fisheries report by Julie Scheurer. But we'll have
39 DeAnna do the quorum check.

40
41 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Madam Chair.
42 Patrick Holmes.

43
44 MR. HOLMES: Here.

45
46 MS. PERRY: Christopher Price.

47
48 MR. PRICE: Here.

49
50 MS. PERRY: Coral Chernoff.

00056

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

(No response)

And I believe I saw her earlier. Della Trumble, are you back with us?

(No response)

You may have to press star six if you're muted. Okay, I'll come back to you. Natasha Hayden.

(No response)

Brett Richardson.

MR. RICHARDSON: Here.

MS. PERRY: Rebecca Skinner.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Here.

MS. PERRY: Okay, and Coral, did you -- were you able to join us yet?

MS. CHERNOFF: (Indiscernible)

MS. PERRY: Okay, Thank you. I couldn't see you. Della Trumble.

(No response)

And Natasha Hayden.

(No response)

Okay, I'll give you just a moment. Star six. I do see some lines unmuted, so I'll give you just a moment.

(Pause)

MS. PERRY: Okay, Madam Chair, you do have five of your nine Council members present, and you do have a quorum.

(Pause)

And with Coral coming on we do have five Council members. Thank you, Rebecca. I couldn't see straight down the line.

00057

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

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: I heard, thank you.

(Simultaneous speech)

MS. HAYDEN: (Indiscernible)

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes, we have you, Natasha. Okay, we'll go ahead then, and we've established quorum. Julie Scheurer, are you on the line?

MS. SCHEURER: I am, can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: We can. Well, I'll hand it over to you.

MS. SCHEURER: Okay, so just to -- So, no one has cameras on. Is that correct? Or would you like me to have my camera on or off?

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: I think that my personal preference would be off. I just -- my experience with video is that a lot of times it bogs down bandwidth, and we end up with connection problems.

MS. SCHEURER: Okay, sounds good. So, if someone could share my slides, (distortion) that'd be great.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, if you just give us a moment here to get those up onto the screen.

(Pause)

Okay, it looks like we have your presentation up, and I'll hand it back over to you.

MS. SCHEURER: Okey, thank you. I can't see it.

(Pause)

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. We are working on sharing it on Teams.

MS. SCHEURER: There we go, excellent. Well, thank you all for the opportunity to come and speak today about the Gulf of Alaska, chinook salmon status review process. My name is Julie Scheurer, and I

1 am a endangered species biologist with the Protected
2 Resources Division at the Juneau Office of NOAA
3 Fisheries, and I am one of the Chairs of the status
4 review team responding to the petition. I'd like to just
5 go over the general process, where we're at in the
6 process, and that should take about ten minutes or so,
7 and then I'd be happy to answer any questions that you
8 may have. Any questions before I get started?

9
10 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: There is not,
11 please proceed.

12
13 MS. SCHEURER: Okay, thank you. Next
14 slide please. Great. So, this diagram outlines the, the
15 process from receipt of a petition to an eventual listing
16 if a listing is warranted. In January of this year, we
17 received a petition from an organization out of Seattle
18 called the Wild Fish Conservancy to list chinook salmon
19 in the Gulf of Alaska or any Evolutionarily Significant
20 Unit of chinook salmon that may exist in the Gulf of
21 Alaska. If you're familiar with Endangered Species Act
22 jargon and Evolutionarily Significant Unit, or ESU, is
23 similar to -- or is the same thing as a distinct
24 population segment. It's basically a subpopulation of a
25 wide-ranging species, and that's the unit that is
26 considered for listing. So, we received this petition,
27 and by law, we have 90 days to review the petition and
28 make a determination. We're only at the 90-day review
29 stage. We're only allowed to consider the information
30 in the petition and the information that we have readily
31 available in our files. At that 90-day review stage, we
32 do not conduct additional research, and we do not solicit
33 information from parties outside the agency to help us
34 to evaluate the petition. There's two possible outcomes
35 from a 90-day review. A negative 90-day finding means
36 that there's -- the petition has no merits, and we are
37 not going to consider it further. And a positive 90-day
38 finding means that the standard that we use is that a
39 reasonable person, not a reasonable expert, who is
40 reviewing the petition, would conclude that the species
41 may warrant listing, and this standard is, is pretty
42 low.

43
44 So, on May 24th, NOAA Fisheries
45 published a positive 90-day finding and started a status
46 review. We recognize that the petition had many flaws.
47 And -- but despite these flaws, we decided that the
48 information in the petition regarding missed escapement
49 goals and reduced size and age could lead a reasonable
50 person to believe that a listing may be warranted. There

1 are other factors that influenced our finding, including
2 the high-profile nature of the topic. There's lots of
3 people that are interested in chinook salmon
4 conservation on both sides of, of the issue. One
5 challenge that we had in reviewing the petition that
6 also encouraged us to move forward with the status review
7 was that these listable units, these ESU, Evolutionarily
8 Significant Units, have not been identified in Alaska.
9 So, we didn't know what -- how to scale our analysis of
10 the population status and trends. Additional with only
11 -- additionally, with only 90 days to conduct the review,
12 that's not very much time to review the population
13 status. Numerous -- there's numerous populations over a
14 huge area and we had incomplete (indiscernible -
15 distortion) complete information in our files regarding
16 the status, trends, and threats to all populations of
17 chinook in the very large, petitioned area. Therefore,
18 we made the conclusion despite -- again despite the
19 poorly prepared petition, we decided to move forward
20 with a positive 90-day finding because we believed that
21 the most defensible and prudent route was to assemble a
22 team of experts to conduct a thorough scientific review
23 based on the best available science to determine whether
24 a listing is warranted.

25
26 It's really important to note that a
27 positive finding does not mean that a species or
28 population warrants listing. It just means that we're
29 going to do a status review to determine whether or not
30 it warrants it. We're just -- we're just taking a much
31 closer look with a little more time. So, the -- after
32 the positive 90-day finding was published in, in late
33 May, we opened a 60-day public comment period. 60 days
34 is the standard, but given that it was the summer, busy
35 summer fishing field season for a lot of people, we
36 received a few requests to extend that comment period,
37 and we accommodated those requests, and the comment
38 period has been extended until September 6th, which
39 closes this week. We have assembled a team of Federal
40 scientists and other advisors to form the status review
41 team, and this team will prepare a status review report
42 that will inform a 12-month finding. Similar to the 90-
43 day finding, the 12-month finding can result in either
44 a not warranted finding or a warranted finding. And if
45 there's a warranted finding, that means we think at least
46 one ESU within the proposed area warrants listing, and
47 will publish our finding, the rationale for that
48 decision, and a proposed rule, proposing to list the
49 species. And then we'll go through another round, if,
50 if we make a positive finding or a warranted finding,

1 we will go through another round of public comment and
2 review before any final decision to list the species.

3
4 So, just to give you an idea of the scope
5 of the action, this is the petitioned area. All of the
6 streams shown in blue are those that have been identified
7 by the State of Alaska in their Anadromous Waters catalog
8 to have populations of chinook salmon. It's a huge area
9 extending from Chignik on the Alaska Peninsula all the
10 way down to the BC border south of Ketchikan. Next slide
11 please. So, the status review itself, there's a number
12 of steps in the process. And this status review, I forgot
13 to mention when I was going over the whole process that
14 we -- when a status review is initiated, we only have
15 one year under law from the time the petition is received
16 until we publish the 12-month finding and proposed rule,
17 if applicable. So, we only have until January of 2025
18 to review the status and threats on to all populations
19 of chinook in that very large area. It's a huge task,
20 and so, this process that I'm going to describe here is
21 -- it'd be nice if it was happening step by step, but
22 really we're having to -- we're doing the first three
23 steps all at once too, to try to meet our deadline. So,
24 the first step is compiling the best available
25 information. Part of that information is gathered
26 through the public comment period. We also gather peer
27 reviewed literature, grey literature, personal
28 communications and traditional knowledge. But one thing
29 we do not do is conduct new research. There's no funding
30 available and no time available to conduct new research,
31 but we do as we're conducting -- as we're going through
32 our review, we identify where information gaps may
33 exist.

34
35 The next step is to identify these
36 Evolutionarily Significant Units that I've been talking
37 about. Under the Endangered Species Act. And ESU is a
38 Pacific salmon population or group of populations that
39 is substantially reproductively isolated from other
40 populations and represents an important component of the
41 evolutionary legacy of the species. And NOAA Fisheries
42 has a policy that defines the criteria for how to
43 identify these, these ESUs. Part of one major line of
44 evidence is genetic differentiation, another line of
45 evidence that we use is biogeographic distribution, also
46 life history differences a number of line -- number of
47 lines of evidence contribute to that, that
48 identification process but genetics is probably the
49 biggest factor involved. And for reference the ESUs,
50 were still deciding how many there are going to be in,

1 in this petitioned area. But for reference, there are
2 15 ESU of chinook salmon in Oregon, Washington and
3 California combined. We don't expect they'll be anywhere
4 near that many in Alaska, there's the -- yeah, we think,
5 we think they'll be far fewer than that. But just to
6 give you an idea that there's definitely more than one
7 ESU present in the area. So, I changed my presentation
8 a little bit since I submitted these slides. I just
9 wanted to go real quickly. Can you go back one slide,
10 please? There we go. So, yeah, that one. After we
11 identify the ESUs, we do what's called an extinction
12 risk assessment, and there are three parts really to
13 this this extinction risk assessment. The first one is
14 what we call the demographic analysis, and this is where
15 we look at the status and trends of the populations, the
16 abundance of productivity, diversity, spatial
17 distribution, connectivity, that type of thing. And then
18 the second part of our assessment is looking at threats
19 to the species, and these obviously vary by area. What's
20 happening in Kodiak may be very different -- is likely
21 very different than what's happening in Cook Inlet or
22 in Southeast Alaska. And so that there's defined types
23 of threats that we will, we will evaluate. We want to
24 evaluate all threats and so that's another thing that
25 we're -- is -- we're learning through the public comment
26 period is people are raising our awareness of different
27 threats in different regions. And the categories of
28 threats include habitat loss, overutilization, disease
29 or predation, inadequacy of existing regulatory
30 mechanisms, and other natural or human factors. So,
31 after we do these two types of analysis, the demographic
32 analysis and the threats assessment, then we synthesize
33 that and do what's called a risk assessment, and we can
34 -- we look at the risk to each population, each stream
35 that's monitored, and we also consider restoration and
36 protective efforts that are underway. And we will assign
37 each stream within an ESU to one of three extinction
38 risk categories, either low, medium or high. And that
39 all gets summarized in a report and that report is then
40 used to decide whether or not any ESU should be proposed
41 for listing as threatened or endangered. So, that's what
42 I have for you today, and I'm happy to answer any
43 questions that you may have.

44

45 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, thank
46 you. Are there any questions from council members?

47

48 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat, go ahead.

49

50

1 MR. HOLMES: Yeah, thank you for your
2 description. Obviously, a long bureaucratic process. I
3 did read the materials that were -- came out earlier on
4 it presented by that association, and it seemed to me
5 that they were cherry picking a bit. But I do have a
6 question being all 25 years ago, we had a study in Kodiak
7 on the sport fishery, where they looked at microwire
8 tags, and I think 65% of the salmon that were caught by
9 sport fishermen off shore Kodiak, were coming from
10 British Columbia, and the majority of those were coming
11 from the British Columbia hatcheries, and I know that's
12 a whole different treaty deal, but is this group also
13 approaching the Canadian Government over a similar
14 issue? Thank you.

15
16 MS. SCHEURER: Okay. I'm not hearing
17 anything is.

18
19 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So, you did not
20 hear the question that was just asked? Can you hear me?
21 Can anyone online hear me talking right now?

22
23 MS. HAYDEN: Yep. We can hear you fine.

24
25 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, thanks.

26
27 (Pause)

28
29 MS. SCHEURER: Strange, somehow I've lost
30 my ability to hear you.

31
32 (Pause)

33
34 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Can someone say
35 something, please? Unplugged my headset.

36
37 MS. HAYDEN: Julie, can you hear us?
38 (distortion) Natasha.

39
40 MS. SCHEURER: There we go. Now I can
41 hear you. How strange.

42
43 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Can you
44 hear -- this is Rebecca in the room. Can you hear me?

45
46 MS. SCHEURER: Yes, I can hear you, thank
47 you.

48
49 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, all right.
50 I'm going to ask Pat to -- well, I can summarize his

1 question. Basically, has the group that filed the
2 petition, have they approached the Canadian Government
3 to ask for something similar to a -- to the petition
4 that they filed on the U.S. side? Is a, is a very cliffs
5 notes version of Pat's question?

6

7

MS. SCHEURER: Not that I know of.

8

9

(Simultaneous speech)

10

11

12

MR. HOLMES: The reason I ask for --
Madam Chair.

13

14

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Go ahead, Pat.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

MR. HOLMES: The reason I ask was that
several years back in Kodiak, I'm geezer, can't quite
remember the dates, but the ADF&G and the Sport Fish
division did a study of micro wire tagged chinook that
were caught by sport fishermen in offshore Kodiak. And
I believe at that time the conclusion was a 65% of the
catch was coming from British Columbia, and I guess the
majority of that was from British Columbia hatcheries,
and so that was what prompted my question, is, if they're
approaching British Columbia, and basically there's so
many streams that kings are in, some are up, some are
down, and that petition to me when I read through it had
some cherry picking, but that's something for me to write
a note on, thank you.

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

MS. SCHEURER: Yeah, they have -- I
don't, I don't -- haven't heard, but they have petitioned
and sued the West Coast region on a number of issues.
This is the same group that sued NOAA fisheries last
year to try to close the Southeast Alaska Salmon Trawl
Fishery. So, yeah, we're -- yeah, it's a -- they're a
litigious organization for sure.

39

40

41

42

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, are
there any other questions from Council members? Pat, go
ahead.

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. HOLMES: A brief one, when you get
into this discussion period, will those discussions be
available? So, common folks can listen in and see what's
being discussed or are they going to be private meetings?
Thank you.

MS. SCHEURER: They are private meetings.
We -- the public comment period is the opportunity for,

1 for people to recommend what we consider and what we
2 discuss in our review. But no, the just -- well, for a
3 number of reasons, but our time frame is so short to
4 conduct this review that it doesn't allow a lot of
5 opportunity for public process beyond the comment period
6 that we're in right now. And then it's a little bit
7 strange if we don't propose to list any ESU, then we
8 will publish a negative finding and the final version
9 of the status review report, if we do and I didn't
10 mention the status review report will be peer reviewed.
11 If we do decide that a population may warrant listing,
12 then we will publish that proposed rule, and we will
13 also publish a draft of the status review report, and
14 then the public will have an opportunity to review --
15 to also review the status review report and provide
16 additional information. In some cases, in the past, at
17 that stage, when there's a proposed rule to list new
18 information emerges that wasn't available when the
19 status review was first prepared, and the result could
20 be that the proposed rule is withdrawn and, and it's not
21 listed after all.

22
23 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, this is
24 Rebecca. I do have a question. It looks like you have a
25 slide six that you didn't speak to, which is subsistence
26 harvest. So, in the book, it's after the question slide.
27 But it deals with the exception for Alaskan Natives in
28 the ESA, and I thought there was also another exception
29 either D so, immediately before E or F immediately after
30 E, that had to do with subsistence, but can you speak
31 to the exceptions in ESA that might apply to subsistence
32 use of chinook if the listing does end up happening?

33
34 MS. SCHEURER: I can try, I'm not real
35 well versed, but there is -- so, if an ESU is listed,
36 there would be what are called take prohibitions and
37 take is harming the species. It could be, it could be
38 injury or harvest. There's an exemption from the take
39 prohibitions for Alaska Natives and for rural residents
40 of Alaska for subsistence harvest. And so basically
41 subsistence -- in extreme cases, if a population were
42 supremely depressed, there's a possibility that
43 subsistence could also be restricted, but my
44 understanding is that under the Endangered Species Act,
45 subsistence is given priority over other uses.

46
47 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, thank
48 you. Are there any other questions from council members?
49 Okay, and then I did want to bring attention to, for
50 both Council members and members of the public. So, we

1 just heard the presentation from NOAA Fisheries, which
2 for Council members, it's in your supplement book at tab
3 9. We also have tab 10, which is a press release from
4 the Commissioner of the Alaska Department of Fish and
5 Game, and tab 11, which is a little bit more detailed,
6 I guess I would call them talking points from the Alaska
7 Department of Fish and Game in response to the petition.
8 So, the public comment period for this petition does end
9 on Friday, September 6th for people who do want to make
10 comment, the materials in the book can -- if you wanted
11 to look at them, to get a sense of at least what the
12 State's perspective -- so, the State opposes the listing
13 of, of the chinook. There are talking points or points
14 in the -- under tab 11, and I don't think we have anyone
15 from the State on the line that planned to speak to
16 that, but we do have the materials in our book. And if
17 there are no further questions from the Council, we'll
18 go ahead and wrap up this agenda item. So, I'm still not
19 seeing any further comments. All right, so, we'll go
20 ahead and wrap up this agenda item. Can I check -- did
21 Della -- do we know if Della was able to connect?

22

23 MS. TRUMBLE: I'm in here, Rebecca.

24

25 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, thank you,
26 Della. Okay, so moving on to our next agenda item,
27 section 12. These are action items on our fishery
28 proposals, and I think we will have DeAnna give an
29 overview/reminder of the proposal procedure before we
30 jump in with the -- with going through the individual
31 proposals.

32

33 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Madam Chair. For
34 the record, again, this is DeAnna Perry, Acting Council
35 Coordinator. To go over the procedure for the proposal
36 presentations, as we go through each proposal, you can
37 refer to page 37 in your meeting books and follow this
38 process, or for those online, you'll see the document
39 named Presentation Procedure for Proposals and Closure
40 Reviews on our website, again that address is
41 www.doi/subsistence, and then you'll go to the regions
42 tab, and then meeting materials. The Chair will announce
43 each step of this process which provides an opportunity
44 for various agencies, Councils, committees, commissions
45 and the public to participate. I wanted to bring a few
46 things to your attention, under number 3C, sorry, I just
47 scrolled a little too far here. There will be time for
48 tribal public comment, and under number six, there will
49 be time for public testimony, for those on the phone who
50 may wish to provide a comment, you'll need to press star

1 five at the beginning of the presentation. That way we
2 can line up everyone and know who wants to comment and
3 call on you at the appropriate time. For step seven the
4 Council will make a motion to support the proposal just
5 to bring the issue on the table for discussion. As a
6 reminder, with Robert's Rules, all motions are made in
7 the positive. So, even if you plan to not support a
8 proposal, if you're making the motion, do put it before
9 the Council in a positive motion to support. Then for
10 step eight, there are some questions listed there to
11 help guide your discussion and deliberation, and of
12 course, you can make reference to anything in the
13 analysis or public comment, anything that you've heard
14 in the meeting during the time at which you discuss a
15 justification for your vote. And each of these proposals
16 are action items, so that reminder that we are looking
17 on everyone to vote, absent a conflict of interest. Thank
18 you, Madam Chair.

19
20 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, thank
21 you, DeAnna. And just to let everyone know, I do plan
22 on doing roll call votes for each of these regulatory
23 proposals. So, the voting process might take a little
24 bit longer than the previous votes that we had. Okay,
25 we'll go ahead then and get started with the first
26 proposal. Justin.

27
28 MR. KOLLER: Good afternoon, Chair
29 Skinner, members of the Council. My name is Justin
30 Koller, I'm a fisheries biologist with the Office of
31 Subsistence Management. And first proposal up is
32 Fisheries Proposal FP 25-06. This was submitted by this
33 Council Kodiak/Aleutians Subsistence Regional Advisory
34 Council, and requests to remove the harvest limit for
35 salmon and the road accessible zone of Kodiak Island.
36 The proponent states that this change is needed to
37 simplify regulations and reduce regulatory burden on
38 federally qualified subsistence users in the Kodiak
39 area. The proponent states that there is functionally
40 no limit for salmon in this area, because the regulations
41 allow additional permits to be issued when one harvest
42 limit is reached. The Council stated it is unnecessary
43 and burdensome to require federally qualified
44 subsistence users to obtain additional permits to
45 harvest more salmon. If this proposal is adopted, Federal
46 salmon harvest limits will be aligned throughout the
47 Kodiak area, except for the Women's Bay rod and reel
48 only area. Federally qualified subsistence households
49 would no longer be required to obtain multiple permits.
50 Available ethnographic data suggests that adopting this

1 proposal would not -- would probably not increase
2 harvest amounts and would reduce confusion about harvest
3 and permit limits, potentially improving harvest
4 reporting. The OSM preliminary conclusion is to oppose
5 this proposal. This proposal will primarily affect
6 Buskin River salmon. Salmon populations in the Buskin
7 River have declined in recent history, leading to
8 several State and Federal closures to the harvest of
9 sockeye and coho salmon. Removing the harvest limit for
10 salmon in this area may lead to more rapid salmon harvest
11 possible, possibly resulting in more rapid closures of
12 the fisheries. This could undermine opportunity for some
13 federally qualified subsistence users depending on the
14 run strength, a few households could take the
15 harvestable surplus of a species. This could lead to
16 lost opportunity for even more users than the closures
17 that occur under current regulations. That's all I have
18 on this one Chair Skinner, thank you.

19
20 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, thank
21 you. Okay, we're gonna -- I'm gonna walk down the
22 organized list of way -- the ways that the Council takes
23 feedback here. So, the first normally who we'd hear from
24 would be the report on board consultations. This would
25 be tribes and ANCSA corporations for all of the proposals
26 we're going to do there, there are no -- there were no
27 consultations or consultation reports. So, just noting
28 that for this proposal, there is no consultation report.
29 For agency comments, the first up would be Alaska
30 Department of Fish and Game. Are there any comments from
31 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game?

32
33 (No comment)

34
35 Okay, I'm not hearing any. Moving on to
36 Federal. The first up would be the Fish and Wildlife
37 Service.

38
39 (No comment)

40
41 Not hearing or seeing any comment. Next
42 up would be the BIA.

43
44 (No comment)

45
46 Not hearing or seeing any comments. Next
47 up would be BLM.

48
49 (No comment)

50

1 Not hearing or seeing any comments. Next
2 up would be National Park Service.

3

4

5 (No comment)

6

7 Not hearing or seeing any comments.
8 Next up would be Forest Service.

9

10 (No comment)

11

12 Okay, no comments there. Next group
13 would be any Tribal comments.

14

15 (No comment)

16

17 Okay, not seeing or hearing any
18 comments. Next would be comments from advisory groups.
19 So, first other Regional Advisory Councils.

20

21 (No comment)

22

23 Nope, no, so we have no reports from
24 other Regional Advisory Councils. Any reports from State
25 Fish and Game advisory committees?

26

27 (No comment)

28

29 Nope. Not seeing any there. And
30 Subsistence Resource Commissions.

31

32 MS. PERRY: Madam Chair, we have not
33 received any written comments from any subsistence
34 regional advisory commissions.

35

36 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, thank you.
37 Okay, next up is a summary of written public comments.
38 Are there any?

39

40 MR. KOLLER: Madam Chair, there were no
41 written public comments.

42

43 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, and next
44 would be public testimony, so anybody that submitted a
45 blue card or anybody on the phone who wants to testify.
46 So, any blue cards in the room? Okay. No blue cards in
47 the room. Is there anybody on the phone that wishes to
48 give public testimony on this proposal?

49

50 (No comment)

1
2 Okay, all right, we're to the point
3 where I would ask for a motion from the Council. As
4 stated, the motion should be in the positive, and what
5 I would like is for each of the proposals for there to
6 be a motion, and then the Council will vote it up or
7 down so that the Federal Subsistence Board has a clear
8 understanding that one, the Council did evaluate each
9 of these proposals, and two, the Federal Subsistence
10 Board will understand what our perspective as a Council
11 is on each of these proposals. So, would somebody please
12 make a motion to support this proposal. Pat, go ahead.
13

14 MR. HOLMES: Madam Chair, I move to
15 adopt.

16 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, is there
17 a second?
18

19 MS. CHERNOFF: Second, this is Coral.
20

21 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER All right, thank
22 you, Coral. Okay, is there discussion on this proposal?
23 Pat, go ahead.
24

25 MR. HOLMES: Yeah, I have a question, and
26 it relates to particularly the Buskin. What happens if
27 they have an exceedingly good return and open the stream
28 to the mouth for sport fishing or for the regular gill
29 nets of subsistence fishing? Are they going to be in
30 violation if they're fishing with the State permit or
31 even if they have -- it's sort of a sticky issue, I
32 wonder. Are they going to be busted for.....
33

34 MR. KOLLER: Yeah. Madam Chair, member
35 Holmes, if the State chooses to expand the area that's
36 open to nets due to good salmon runs, accounts that the
37 Buskin River weir, our Kodiak in-season Manager can also
38 take action to expand opportunity for federally
39 qualified subsistence users at the same time as, as
40 appropriate. And there would be no conflict because
41 there would be no conflict under State regulation if
42 people were using nets in that area.
43

44 MR. HOLMES: Thank you.
45

46 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Chris, go ahead.
47

48 MR. PRICE: On page, I'm sorry. On page
49 43 it talks about the Coast Guard there. Says residents
50

1 of Kodiak, except those residing in the Coast Guard base,
2 have like opportunities of subsistence. What happens to
3 the people on the Coast Guard base, are they unable to
4 do subsistence on the Buskin River?

5
6 MR. KOLLER: Yeah, Madam Chair, member
7 Price. This particular proposal doesn't affect customary
8 and traditional use determinations, and the customary
9 and traditional use determination for salmon in this
10 area excludes people residing on the Coast Guard base.
11 So, they don't have it now and this doesn't affect that.

12
13 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat, go ahead.

14
15 MR. HOLMES: Madam Chair, one point that
16 you might want to make if this is ever revised is that
17 there are chum salmon at Women's Bay, and I have a secret
18 spot I fished when I can't get reds, and I'm not going
19 to say where, but they are there, and they certainly are
20 just as -- almost as tasty.

21
22 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, thanks,
23 Pat. Any further comments?

24
25 MS. HAYDEN: Madam Chair, can you hear
26 me?

27
28 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes, go ahead,
29 Natasha.

30
31 MS. HAYDEN: Thank you, this is Natasha.
32 So, I just want to add a little bit of discussion to the
33 -- regarding this proposal. So, I am concerned about not
34 overharvesting when you know, related to escapement. I
35 do think that without the requirement, or without the
36 limit that it will -- it has the potential to lead to,
37 you know, excessive harvesting by a few. We've been
38 concerned about there not being any limit for
39 subsistence take over on Afognak over in the Litnik
40 system. And so, I think that I'm not in favor of this
41 proposal, just because I think that it is kind of
42 premature with how many changes we've seen (distortion)
43 we've seen them, and I don't think it's overly onerous
44 for, you know, if there's individuals that need to take
45 more than what they're allowed under their permit, for
46 them to go in and get another one at this point. So,
47 yeah, I was just wanting to add that, I think that I'm
48 not going to be in support of this proposal.

49
50

00071

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, thanks,
2 Natasha. Are there further comments?

3
4 MS. TRUMBLE: Madam Chair, this is Della.

5
6 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yep, go ahead,
7 Della.

8
9 MS. TRUMBLE: If my dog is barking, just
10 try to ignore him. Sorry about that. I guess I'm wanting
11 to -- if someone could refresh my memory here as to who
12 it says, submitted by Kodiak/Aleutians. I have to be
13 honest with you, I'm, in reading this, I have a concern.
14 I'd be concerned about the potential for overharvesting.
15 There's the -- like using the Buskin as an example and
16 it's really refreshing and promising to hear that the
17 returns this year were good, and I'm looking at our area
18 and including what Vince and people from Unalaska and
19 surrounding areas basically said that there's been a
20 lack of salmon. There just seems to be a lot of potential
21 for fluctuation, and not any good solid data as to where
22 we're headed, given all these situations and things
23 going on around global warming and what's going on. So,
24 my concern is the potential for overharvesting, and I'm
25 not sure why somebody would want to remove what's in
26 place right now, I can see possibly increasing the
27 (indiscernible) the limit by a little bit, but I for one
28 would not be able to support this.

29
30 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Della.

31
32 MS. TRUMBLE: Thank you.

33
34 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Coral, go ahead.

35
36 MS. CHERNOFF: Yes, I will be supporting
37 this. For the reasons that were said, stated in the
38 beginning that functionally there is no limit like --
39 but there is a burden to have to return, if you fill up
40 what is currently the limit, then you have to return,
41 which in this room returning to get another permit
42 doesn't sound like a big deal, but it could be a burden
43 for a lot. You have to go out to -- these permits are
44 issued at Buskin River, which there's not a walkable
45 road or a drivable road. I mean a walkable and bikeable
46 road, really, it's about four miles out of town, three
47 and a half, four miles out of town. So, it's not that
48 simple to just simply go and get your permit. So, I look
49 at the burdens and so, I -- so, some have asked about
50 that, and so that has been Stated in here that releases

1 that burden of having to return for another permit, when
2 functionally there is no limit, anyway. I could go back
3 and get four permits if I want, I can go and fill the
4 permit, go get, go again, go again, go again. There is
5 no limit on how many times I can return, so functionally
6 there is no limit.

7
8 Also, if you look at the data, you'll
9 see -- you'll see that Federal subsistence permit users
10 in Buskin River in this area are a fraction, they are
11 the smallest user group according to the data in here,
12 I think that -- so if you get a State, Federal or if you
13 get a State subsistence permit you can fish at Buskin.
14 If you get a Federal permit, you can fish at Buskin.
15 Now, the State, the lowest amount of permits they've
16 ever issued was 55, and then in some years, up to 300
17 subsistence permits are -- could possibly fish under the
18 State regulations. The Federal, the highest number ever
19 in the last 10 years issued was 55 permits. So, the
20 number of users in this group that we're talking about
21 are so small that -- I think that the worry that people
22 are going to overfish, or you know, that, that worry, I
23 think we should look at how many permits are available
24 to do that. So, that's it, I guess, and looking at that,
25 the numbers, the release of the burden to have to go
26 back and get another permit and Federal subsistence
27 fishing in the Buskin area is by far the lowest group
28 of users and the amount of fish fished. So, I think it's
29 really negligible, and I think in that exchange that
30 you'll get in releasing that burden of having to get
31 multiple permits I think that'll benefit the subsistence
32 user. Thank you.

33
34 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Brett, go ahead.

35
36 MR. RICHARDSON: Brett Richardson,
37 Unalaska. I have a question for you, sir. Can you briefly
38 describe the difference between the Federal and the
39 state permit?

40
41 MR. KOLLER: Yeah, through the Chair, Mr.
42 Richardson. So, the State and Federal permits have
43 similar harvest limits. They have very similar
44 regulations. I think what you might be getting at is
45 who's getting what permit. I think most people that fish
46 at the -- in front of the Buskin River are federally
47 qualified subsistence users, whether they get a Federal
48 permit or a State permit. If, if, for instance, there
49 was no limit under a Federal permit. Most of those people
50 that are currently fishing under a State permit could

1 just switch over to fishing under a Federal permit. I
2 don't think the user base for, for subsistence fishing
3 in front of the Buskin consists of many people that are
4 not from the Kodiak Archipelago.

5
6 MR. RICHARDSON: So, after the limit of
7 25, either permit can go and extend. Is that correct?

8
9 MR. KOLLER: Through the Chair, yeah,
10 there's a little bit of history here, actually, right
11 now, under State regulations, I believe it still says
12 that you may obtain an additional permit if it can be
13 shown that more fish are needed. And this Council back
14 in 2011 when they dealt with limits in the area, removed
15 that from Federal regulations. So, now in Federal
16 regulation it only says you may obtain an additional
17 permit. So, there's a question on what an additional
18 permit means, is that one additional permit? Not too
19 many people go in to get multiple permits for that.

20
21 MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you. I believe
22 that when this came up in the Winter meetings. I voted
23 in favor of the proposal simply to forward the process
24 and get more information. You know, basically the OSM,
25 and our advisory, and if this were in my region, I would
26 feel nervous about relaxing regulation on people
27 extending permits after catching their allotted amount.
28 And I can understand concerns about the onus of
29 additional permits. However, I don't know that that's
30 worth the recording discrepancies that may take place
31 or the overfishing problems that may take place if we
32 stop keeping track of these things. If it were in my
33 area, I would definitely be against this. So, I will be
34 opposing it, thank you.

35
36 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, I have
37 a question, I think it's either a two-part question or
38 two questions. I assume so, this is looking for
39 confirmation that if this proposal were to pass, it does
40 not change the reporting requirement. So, regardless,
41 even if there is no limit, people would still have to
42 report their harvest before they could get a permit the
43 following year. Is that your understanding?

44
45 MR. KOLLER: Madam Chair, yes, there's
46 always a reporting requirement with the permits,
47 regardless of any particulars.

48
49 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, and then do
50 you know with reporting, before you can get a second

1 permit in the same year, do you have to report what was
2 caught on the first permit you got? Or is -- so, that
3 would be before you can get a permit in that same season
4 you have to report on permit one or does the reporting
5 requirement not kick-in until later. So, you're
6 submitting reports on how ever many permits you
7 requested for a season, but you're doing it after the
8 fact, and somebody's actually making sure if you did
9 request three permits that you're reporting on all three
10 permits, do you have any sense of how that works?

11
12 MR. KOLLER: Yeah, Madam Chair, this is
13 essentially a per permit household harvest limit. So,
14 for instance, if somebody was out harvesting and reached
15 their maximum number on that particular permit, they
16 would just go in and get another one. They wouldn't have
17 to report on that permit, our permits have to be reported
18 on before 15 days of the end -- after the end of the
19 season. I'm not sure of the exact date for that, but
20 they don't have to be reported on before you get another
21 permit. You just can't take more than that permit allows.

22
23 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, and the --
24 somebody is keeping track of how many permits a household
25 got. So, if they got three permits, somebody is double
26 checking that they reported on all three of them. Is
27 that true?

28
29 MR. KOLLER: Typically, yes. There's,
30 there's a mechanism in our current system to basically
31 restrict users, that serves as a reminder to obtain a
32 harvest report before we issue more harvest permits.

33
34 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat, go ahead.

35
36 MR. HOLMES: On issuing permits, I've
37 heard some discussion about having multiple permits, but
38 basically, I haven't gotten a Federal permit, and I'd
39 like to discuss that first. When I began fishing at the
40 Buskin River decades ago, I learned from Moses Malutin,
41 Iver's older brother [UI 0:53:30/2], who's been dead
42 like 40 years, and also Iver, and he's been gone quite
43 a while, too. But when the Federal permits came out,
44 what I noted and talking to those people, it was after
45 this -- the State advisory committee had recommended
46 that they set time limits on when the fishery opens and
47 when it closes, and that was to provide for better
48 enforcement, it was requested by the State troopers. And
49 so, when the Federal permit came out, even though it's
50 harder to get, you got to go out to their office. I

1 would say, honestly, most of the folks that I talked to,
2 got the Federal permit at that time so that they could
3 get the best places to fish. And I didn't think about
4 it at all until I went out at 5:30 and waited for my
5 6:00 place and had 3 or 4 nets there, and they asked
6 them what they were doing fishing early, and they said,
7 well, I've got a Federal permit, I can do that.
8 Basically, na na na [sic] and so that's made me biased
9 for a long time, and I think I would confer with folks,
10 and I think I'm going to vote against this proposal
11 because I think it's not correct.

12

13 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Are there
14 additional comments from Council members?

15

16 MS. TRUMBLE: Madam Chair, this is Della.
17 I have a question.

18

19 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, go ahead
20 Della.

21

22 MS. TRUMBLE: So, the -- I guess my
23 question also, the mentioned between the Federal permits
24 and the State subsistence permits, are the Federal
25 permits are basically only on Federal waters. Is that
26 correct?

27

28

29 MR. KOLLER: Through the Chair, yes.
30 That's correct.

31

32 MS. TRUMBLE: Okay, and the other, I
33 think point that I kind of wanna to bring up being
34 involved with this process for way too many years; there
35 was always a trend to try to align the Federal
36 regulations with State regulations to avoid confusion.
37 And I know that I -- living out here, we've been
38 fortunate from the State perspective we were able to get
39 to get I'm thinking it's 250 fish. But if we were able
40 to -- if we utilize that, we're able to get another
41 permit if we needed it. So, that's my question, is the
42 amount of the 25 salmon? The other part I think was
43 brought up was having to go drive four miles or
44 something. I don't -- I'm hoping there's a point, some
45 point in time that, that the Federal -- and works toward
46 going online to get these permits, to be able to get
47 these permits, because it makes it easier for people to
48 do that. But I strongly feel that it's important to
49 acquire the permits report, and if you need, I think,

50

1 you know, to get more. I just, I really concerns me that
2 it opens a door for potential abuse, thank you.

3

4 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Justin, go ahead.

5

6 MR. KOLLER: Yeah, through the Chair.
7 Regarding the permitting availability. Our office is
8 currently working towards reorganizing and redoing our
9 permitting system. The hope, and we're not 100% sure,
10 but we're working towards the online permitting option
11 and also online harvest reporting now that, that may be
12 available as soon as next year. But we are seriously
13 working towards that with a contractor right now. So,
14 just for your information, thank you.

15

16 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Coral, go ahead.

17

18 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah, thank you. I would
19 just like to speak to some comments that were made
20 earlier. People talked about canneries closing in areas,
21 commercial fisheries not being great. I know our
22 population in Kodiak is reduced, and when those
23 canneries leave our town, jobs go. Sometimes businesses
24 go, sometimes local small mom and pop stores go.
25 Sometimes our safeways and grocery stores don't get food
26 in. So, I think, like, there's a real concern. I don't
27 know, like, I like to think about, like, food security
28 for subsistence users too. And I like to remove -- I
29 mean, that's my reason for just making it the whole
30 process less burdensome is one of my goals on this
31 Subsistence Board, one of the things that I weigh things
32 against. Another thing is, you know, I've been with ANBCC
33 and other things, and I think there's a lot of fear-
34 based decisions made. We don't know what's going to
35 happen, but we do also, you know, like we're assuming
36 people, or a lot of people or large quantity of people
37 are going to over catch and abuse the system, and I
38 think for me, that's not -- I don't decide that that is
39 a way to make my decisions. There is also, for those
40 cases, if there's a less return at the Buskin or there's
41 an issue with user groups using fish, there is, of
42 course, always a process in regulation that we can use,
43 we can draw upon. So, and then I just want to reiterate,
44 and I think it's been kind of said a couple times but
45 that there is still permitting and there still is
46 reporting, so, we are going to know those numbers. It's
47 not like, like I think removing, removing this extra
48 permitting system is not going to make this a wild, wild
49 west show.

50

1 I think also when I look at what is my
2 duty sitting on this subsistence Council, I do hear us
3 talking about aligning with State regulations. State
4 regulations are different, commercial regulations are
5 different, they have different ways that they come about
6 the regulations. I sit on a Council where I think about
7 how this is going to affect subsistence users, how it
8 applies to laws that apply to laws and regulations and
9 treaties and whatever applies to this subsistence
10 process. I think about that. So, I often don't think
11 that you know, we gather fish and do subsistence in
12 different ways. Oftentimes we are gathering large
13 amounts of fish with the least amount of expended energy.
14 I think Vince spoke to that earlier, that he went out
15 on eight trips and got 15 fish, and so I think the
16 objective a lot of times we see our weather here, we see
17 our weather in Kodiak. A lot of times it's not, you
18 know, we wait, we look for weather, good weather certain
19 times of year where we can dry our fish and smoke our
20 fish. And so that's really important for us to be able
21 to get kind of a fish in a different way than sport
22 fishermen fish. And so, I also keep that in mind when I
23 am looking at these issues and so often, I think aligning
24 with the way the State regulates differs with how
25 subsistence users gather and use and process and share
26 their fish. I think often those things aren't in
27 alignment, so. And I think that's all my comments, thank
28 you.

29
30 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, are there
31 any other Council comments.

32
33 (No comment)

34
35 Okay, I'm going to make a few comments.
36 So, at a high level, I do continue to be concerned that,
37 the -- I'm going to call it the disconnect between sport
38 harvest under State regs, and subsistence harvest.
39 Looking at reporting requirements and, and limits. So,
40 my understanding from the State sport regulations, there
41 is some reporting on harvest, but it's looking at a very
42 small subset of people who got permits. So, most sport
43 harvesters don't have to report their catch, and as far
44 as I know there's not an annual limit on sport harvest.
45 There's bag limits, daily bag limits, possession limits,
46 that kind of thing. Contrasting that with the
47 subsistence side, it feels like there are a lot more
48 restrictions around subsistence harvest, and that does
49 continue to be a concern to me, because at a Federal
50 level and a State level, subsistence is supposed to be

1 prioritized. It just doesn't look like it always is.
2 That being said, I share the high level of discomfort
3 with this proposal similar to what has already been said.
4 I am uncomfortable with the expectation that's going to
5 be set if the limit is removed altogether. Right now,
6 functionally, you can go request another permit, but
7 because you have to go through that extra step, it does
8 set an expectation that there is a limit, and it does
9 make you go through that extra step. I think right now
10 I feel more comfortable with that more precautionary
11 approach, especially looking at escapement at Buskin
12 River. It has been highly variable, but it's also
13 generally been trending down, and that does concern me.
14

15 The other concern I have is that if the
16 limit were removed completely, 1 or 2 permit holders
17 could literally take all of the fish because there would
18 be no limit. So, even if there are only two subsistence
19 permits that have been issued historically, those two
20 permits could take all of the fish and cause a problem.
21 And again, that's why I'm more comfortable keeping the
22 limit where it is and having that extra step where you
23 do have to go get another permit. So, that is an extra
24 step, but it is available, so, if you need more fish,
25 you can go get another permit and be able to get more
26 fish. So, I will be not supporting this proposal. Okay,
27 I think everyone has had a chance to talk. So, and I
28 don't see any more hands up. Was that Della?
29

30 MS. TRUMBLE: No. Madam Chair, but I do
31 want to add one more thought into this discussion. And
32 that is as our role as supporting subsistence users, but
33 to also maintain a renewable resource so that our
34 subsistence users have something to subsist in the
35 future, thank you.
36

37 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, thank you,
38 Della. And I see I scribbled at the bottom of my sticky
39 note here, I did have that noted as well that I strongly
40 support a subsistence priority, but I do feel a bit
41 constrained with the system in which we're operating.
42 So, the decision in front of me is a specific decision
43 about a removal or a harvest level in a particular area,
44 given the conditions that exist today. And you know,
45 when I consider all of that, it does lead me to, to not
46 supporting this. So, we're going to go ahead then.
47 DeAnna, can you do a roll call vote on this?
48

49 MS. PERRY: Yes, Madam Chair. For the
50 record again, this is DeAnna Perry, Acting Council

1 Coordinator. The motion on the table is to adopt FP 25-
2 06. And again, we are expecting everyone to vote since
3 no conflict of interest has been declared on this
4 proposal. Patrick Holmes. For or against?

5
6 MR. HOLMES: Against

7
8 MS. PERRY: Christopher Price.

9
10 MR. PRICE: No.

11
12 MS. PERRY: Coral Chernoff.

13
14 MS. CHERNOFF: Yes.

15
16 MS. PERRY: Della Trumble.

17
18 MS. TRUMBLE: Oh, no.

19
20 MS. PERRY: Thank you. Natasha Hayden.

21
22 MS HAYDEN: No.

23
24 MS. PERRY: Thank you. Brett Richardson.

25
26 MR. RICHARDSON: No.

27
28 MS. PERRY: And Rebecca Skinner.

29
30 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: No.

31
32 MS. PERRY: Madam, the Chair is one for
33 and six against. This motion fails.

34
35 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, thank
36 you, DeAnna. Okay, moving on to the next proposal. FP
37 25-04. Justin.

38
39 MR. KOLLER: Thank you, Madam Chair.
40 Justin Koller again, Office of Subsistence Management.
41 Fisheries Proposal 25-04 was submitted by Rebecca
42 Skinner of Kodiak and request to establish salmon
43 harvest limits specific to the Buskin River that would
44 match the Women's Bay rod and reel area Federal limits.
45 The area this proposal would affect is from the river
46 mouth at headland to headland on the Buskin River,
47 extending upriver for about 0.3 miles to mean high tide.
48 The proponent states that conservation measures are
49 needed for coho and sockeye salmon at this location, to
50 ensure adequate numbers of salmon can enter the Buskin

1 River system. If adopted, this proposal would institute
2 more conservative harvest limits for salmon in the
3 Federal public waters of the lower Buskin River.
4 Federally qualified subsistence users would not be able
5 to harvest their entire Kodiak Area road zone limit from
6 the Buskin River. If this proposal is not adopted, the
7 limits in the Federal public waters of the Buskin River
8 will remain 25 salmon for the permit holder, plus 25
9 additional salmon for each member of the household
10 listed on the permit. Households would be able to harvest
11 their entire limit. Would be able to harvest their limit
12 from the Buskin River or from Federal public marine
13 waters adjacent to the Buskin River. The OSM Preliminary
14 Conclusions Support Proposal FP 25-04. Buskin River
15 salmon are among the most heavily harvested stocks in
16 the Kodiak area, and those salmon are more vulnerable
17 once they harvest or, excuse me, more vulnerable to
18 harvest once they are in the Buskin River having
19 separate, more conservative harvest limits for salmon
20 in the Federal public waters of the lower Buskin River
21 is a reasonable conservation measure, given the
22 challenges of meeting sockeye and coho salmon escapement
23 in some recent years, and the general declining trend
24 of sockeye salmon stocks. The salmon limit in the marine
25 waters adjacent to the Buskin River remains unchanged,
26 and the Federal in-season Manager can continue to
27 implement or excuse me, can continue to manage the
28 fisheries based on Buskin River weirs counts. Thank you,
29 Madam Chair.

30
31 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. So, I'll
32 -- I will make a couple comments. When I voted, I think
33 it was now a couple years ago, to rescind the closure
34 for the Federal subsistence fishery in this area. I had
35 a different understanding of the area we were talking
36 about. I did not realize at the time that it went as far
37 up into the, into Buskin River as now I understand that
38 it does. Given that and since we rescinded the closure
39 I did, I've heard concerns about enforcement challenges
40 because you have sport fishers on the river using rod
41 and reel, and they have certain limit -- daily limits.
42 And if you have mixed in their subsistence users who are
43 also using rod and reel that have higher limits. I did
44 hear from both the Refuge and Fish and Game that they
45 had concerns about enforcement. So, I did put this
46 proposal forward and again, mostly because my
47 understanding of the area we were talking about became
48 more clear over time, compared to when I originally voted
49 on rescinding the closure. So, I'll pause. Are there any
50

00081

1 comments or questions from council members? Pat, go
2 ahead.

3

4 MR. HOLMES: Just for future reference,
5 the Buskin River does not have any king salmon?
6 (Distortion) there, to close?

7

8 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: No, he said.....

9

10 (Simultaneous speech)

11

12 MR. HOLMES: Okay. Well, my wife always
13 says I have bad vibes at times.

14

15 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, he wants it
16 closer. Can you go any closer?

17

18 MR. HOLMES: Okay, closer? Okay. In the
19 discussion of the regulations here, I believe it
20 references king salmon as a bag limit. There aren't any
21 natural run of kings there. Maybe 25 years ago or so
22 they did, or 30, they tried to transplant to put it in
23 there. But then the concern was, is that the smolt that
24 were released might carry disease to the sockeye, so,
25 it was dropped and it's rule the death out of me to
26 catch one that comes through by accident. But as a
27 general rule, there are not naturally there, thank you.

28

29 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, are
30 there other questions or comments from Council members?
31 (No comments)

32

33 Okay, I'm not -- did I just skip a bunch
34 of steps?

35

36 (Pause)

37

38 Okay, I'm fired as Chair. All right, I
39 completely skipped the entire list of stuff that we were
40 supposed to do. Okay, so we've heard the, the staff
41 analysis, we do not have any reports from Board
42 consultations. Agency comments, do we have anyone from
43 Fish and Game that wants to comment on this?

44

45 (No comment)

46

47 Okay, on the Federal side, anyone from
48 Fish and Wildlife Service?

49

50 (No comment)

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

The BIA?

(No comment)

BLM?

(No comment)

National Park service?

(No comment)

Forest service?

(No comment)

Okay, and are there any tribal comments?

(No comment)

Okay, and do we have any comments from any of the advisory groups which would include other Regional Advisory Councils, the State Fish and Game advisory committees or Subsistence Resource Commissions?

(No comment)

Okay, not seeing any there. Do we have any summaries of written public comments?

MR. KOLLER: Madam Chair, there were no written public comments.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, and we don't have any blue cards in the room? Nope. Is there anyone on the phone that wants to give public testimony on this item? Okay, so now we are to -- I'm looking for a motion to support this proposal so we can kick off the Council discussion that we already started, thanks. Pat, go ahead.

MR. HOLMES: I'd like to make a move to adopt, and I guess it's too late to make comments, so, I'll be quiet.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, Pat. Is there a second? Thanks, Chris. Okay, now we're to discussion and justification. So, everybody is welcome

1 -- is there anyone who wants to make comment? Pat, go
2 ahead.

3
4 MR. HOLMES: I think that, you know,
5 limiting the subsistence limits could be a
6 conservationist thing, but then some folks, that's the
7 only place they fish, and it doesn't necessarily mean
8 that they're going to be a greater harvest. So, I'm
9 probably going to vote against this even though I
10 understand your thoughts there, Becky. I think they're
11 well made.

12
13 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, are there
14 additional comments or questions? Coral, go ahead.

15
16 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah, I will be voting
17 against this, and I think mainly as with the last one,
18 I just don't see the need to be so limiting for a
19 subsistence harvest that, I think here on page 65, the
20 Federal subsistence permit issued and reported the
21 average reported over the last 24 years, it says permits
22 reporting Buskin River salmon harvest is 4 and the
23 average Federal permits issued is 26. I just I just
24 don't see the need to be adding limits to something
25 that's already, pretty limited in its take.

26
27 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, are
28 there further comments or questions?

29
30 (No comments)

31
32 Okay, I am not seeing further comments
33 or questions. Coral, go ahead.

34
35 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah, I'd like to just
36 correct my comment. I was reading the wrong -- the permit
37 reporting is the number that reported, the permits
38 issued were 26. But what I meant to say was the sockeye
39 average take on those permits is 68, and the average
40 coho take is six, thank you.

41
42 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, are
43 there any further comments or questions?

44
45 (No comments)

46
47 Okay, if not, we will go ahead and move
48 to a vote. Okay, DeAnna, if you could do a roll call,
49 vote.

1 MS. PERRY: Madam Chair, one quick
2 question before we get into roll call voting. I heard
3 that Pat made the motion, but I didn't get who seconded
4 it.

5
6 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Chris.

7
8 MS. PERRY: Chris, thank you so much.
9 Okay, this vote again is to adopt FP 25-04. Patrick
10 Holmes, for or against?

11
12 MR. HOLMES: Against.

13
14 MS. PERRY: Christopher Price.

15
16 MR. PRICE: Yes.

17
18 MS. PERRY: Coral Chernoff.

19
20 MS. CHERNOFF: No.

21
22 MS. PERRY: Della Trumble.

23
24 (No comment)

25
26 MS. PERRY: Natasha Hayden.

27
28 (Simultaneous speech)

29
30 MS. PERRY: Go ahead, Della.

31
32 MS. TRUMBLE: (Distortion) I don't know
33 if I can abstain on this? I guess, I -- I'll make my
34 comment after.

35
36 MS. PERRY: Della, do you have a conflict
37 of interest?

38
39 TRUMBLE: No, I don't. I'm gonna have to
40 say... no.

41
42 MS. PERRY: Okay, thank you. Natasha
43 Hayden.

44
45 MS. HAYDEN: Yes.

46
47 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Brett Richardson.

48
49 MR. RICHARDSON: No.

50

1 MS. PERRY: Rebecca Skinner.

2
3 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes.

4
5 MS. PERRY: Okay, Madam Chair, your vote
6 is three for and four against, that motion fails.

7
8 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, all right. We
9 are moving on to the next proposal, which is FP 25-05.
10 Justin.

11
12 MR. KOLLER: Thank you, Madam Chair.
13 Again, Justin Koller with Office of Subsistence
14 Management. Fisheries Proposal FP 25-05 was also
15 submitted by Rebecca Skinner of Kodiak and seeks to limit
16 the allowable gear type to rod and reel in the previously
17 closed waters of Afognak Bay. Since the fishing closure
18 at this location was lifted during the 2023 to 2025
19 fisheries regulatory cycle, the Kodiak area Federal
20 subsistence fishing regulations apply. The proponent
21 States that these regulations are not sufficient to
22 protect fish populations returning to the Afognak River,
23 locally known as Litnik. If this proposal is adopted,
24 federally qualified subsistence users will be limited
25 to rod and reel in this formerly closed area at the
26 mouth of the Afognak River up to mean high tide.
27 Prohibiting nets in this area where there is no harvest
28 limit, could reduce the chances of overharvest and
29 mitigate the risk of in-season management actions
30 resulting from conservation concerns. If this proposal
31 is not adopted, federally qualified subsistence users
32 can continue to use more efficient gear types such as
33 gill nets and seines. This may lead to more federally
34 qualified subsistence users fishing under Federal
35 regulations at Afognak Bay over time, because of the
36 more efficient methods allowed in an area that is also
37 closed to State subsistence fishing. Current Federal
38 regulations allow unlimited harvest. Increased fishing
39 pressures could lead to conservation concerns and
40 subsequent in-season management actions. The OSM
41 preliminary conclusion is to support proposal FP 25-05.
42 Afognak River salmon are among the most heavily
43 harvested subsistence stocks in the Kodiak area, and
44 they are more vulnerable to harvest with nets once they
45 are near the river mouth. Limiting gear type to rod and
46 reel only is a reasonable conservation measure,
47 considering there is no harvest limit for salmon in this
48 area. Additionally, during several recent years there
49 have been closures along the Buskin River, which has
50 increased fishing pressure at other harvest areas,

1 including Afognak Bay. Managers can continue to
2 implement any necessary actions based on Afognak River
3 weir counts. Thank you, Madam Chair.

4
5 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, okay. We
6 will move on to -- so, again with this proposal, there
7 were no Board consultations with tribes or ANCSA
8 corporations. Moving down to agency comments, do we have
9 any comments from Alaska Department of Fish and Game?

10
11 (No comments)

12
13 Okay. On the Federal side, do we have
14 comments from Fish and Wildlife Service?

15
16 (No comment)

17
18 From the BIA?

19
20 (No comment)

21
22 From the BLM?

23
24 (No comment)

25
26 National Park service.

27
28 (No comment)

29
30 Forest service.

31
32 (No comment)

33
34 Okay, are there any comments -- Tribal
35 comments?

36
37 (No comment)

38
39 Okay, not seeing or hearing any. Do we
40 have any comments from advisory groups which include
41 other Regional Advisory Councils, State Fish and Game
42 Advisory Committees, or Subsistence Resource
43 Commissions?

44
45 MS. PERRY: Not to my knowledge, Madam
46 Chair, thank you.

47
48 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, do we have a
49 summary of written public comments?

50

00087

1 MR. KOLLER: Madam Chair, there were no
2 written public comments, thank you.

3
4 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, moving on to
5 public testimony, we have no blue cards in the room. Is
6 there anybody on the phone who wants to testify on this
7 agenda item?

8
9 (No response)

10
11 Okay, so at this point, I would look for
12 a motion from someone to adopt this proposal.

13
14 MR. HOLMES: Madam Chair, move to adopt.

15
16 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Pat. Is
17 there a second?

18
19 MR. RICHARDSON: Second.

20
21 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Brett.
22 Okay, discussion and justification. Any.....

23
24 MS. TRUMBLE: Madam Chair, this is Della.

25
26 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Go ahead, Della.

27
28 MS. TRUMBLE: I need some clarification
29 here, because when I look at page 70, as you go down
30 through the executive summary and it is, it is verbally
31 read it's -- and then the proposed regulation change and
32 then OSM preliminary conclusion is to support, but I
33 don't know that we heard from OSM staff, and then you're
34 reading like Park Service, BLM which I'm assuming is
35 because of the changes, this being under the Office of
36 the Secretary, because it's not on this listing and any
37 comments, like interagency, staff comments or ADF&G
38 comments, there's nothing here. So, I'm, I'm a little
39 bit -- to be honest with you, confused on this process
40 right now.

41
42 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So, I am going down
43 -- I'm referring to the list of agencies or subagencies
44 that I would -- so, I've been going by the list that I'm
45 provided with OSM, you did hear the report from Justin
46 Koller, so he's with the office of OSM, and we don't
47 have a separate call for comment from the Office of the
48 Secretary other than through the OSM biologist. So, I
49 guess I'm looking around to make sure I'm understanding
50 that correctly. Okay, so I'm getting nod, nods of heads

00088

1 in the room. So, we are hearing from OSM. That's when
2 Justin Koller gave his presentation, but we don't have
3 a separate kind of comment period from the Office of the
4 Secretary. Does that answer your question, Della?

5
6 MS. TRUMBLE: No, no it didn't, but
7 that's fine, that's fine.

8
9 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: DeAnna, go ahead.

10
11 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Madam Chair.
12 Della, I think what you are referring to is the executive
13 summary, and there are some blank spaces in that table,
14 is that correct?

15
16 MS. TRUMBLE: Yes, that's correct. It's
17 just that, when she's reading, as the Chair, reading off
18 these different, there used to be a card that I'm sure
19 that's what she's following, as a list to go through to
20 ask for various comments from different agencies. But I
21 just, that the BLM and Park Service and all these ones
22 are not on this list, so, I was just kind of curious
23 what the process must have changed.

24
25 MS. PERRY: In the past, it has just said
26 Agency comments, and just said Federal agencies, and so
27 as a cheat sheet so that we didn't forget to call on a
28 particular agency. That's why your Chair is going
29 through them separately. As far as the ADF&G comments,
30 sometimes they will comment at RAC meetings, but
31 particularly in the executive summary, you will see
32 comments at the Board meeting. So, I just wanted to
33 clarify that if that helps.

34
35 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Did that
36 answer your question, Della?

37
38 MS. TRUMBLE: Yeah, that helps, and then
39 maybe Madam Chair, in the previous proposal, I guess
40 where I missed was the -- and this one, it says to change
41 it to rod and reel. But the prior proposal didn't say,
42 like, gillnet or anything else, so. And this one is, its
43 limited to the rod and reel only, and that was the
44 purpose of the last one, is that correct?

45
46 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: No, the purpose of
47 the last one that already had a limit of -- for a gear
48 type for rod and reel, and so the last one was really
49 about reducing the harvest limit, so, the number of fish
50 that could be harvested. The proposal that's in front

1 of us currently, the main purpose is to limit the gear
2 type. So, not allowing gill nets that would go too far
3 up Afognak in the, the mouth of the river and limiting
4 the harvest to rod and reel gear type.

5

6 MS. TRUMBLE: Okay, Thank you. I just --
7 I see where I got mixed up, thank you.

8

9 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yep. Okay, are
10 there other Council comments or questions? Pat, go
11 ahead.

12

13 MR. HOLMES: Madam Chair, I'd like to --
14 correction for you on page 79. The bottom paragraph, it
15 says before many people had home freezers, pink salmon
16 were preferred over other species of salmon. That could
17 be true, but before freezers, the pink salmon runs were
18 much stronger than reds or silvers, throughout the Gulf.
19 It was really tough times, and so I don't necessarily
20 say they were preferred, but that's what they were, and
21 it's not anything in relation to freezers. Let's see,
22 excuse me a moment, find my markers. On page 83, I think
23 it has a comment in there, it's discussing limited gear
24 type to rod and reel only is a reasonable conservation
25 measure, considering there is no harvest limit for
26 salmon in this area. The area behind the markers, I
27 believe if you're still -- fed are still in line with
28 the State. That area, if it were open, would have the
29 25 fish per person limit, and so I don't know quite on
30 the phraseology of that if that's correct. And lastly,
31 or second to last.

32

33 Current Federal -- page 82, it says
34 current Federal elections -- regulations allow unlimited
35 harvest. Increased fishing pressure could lead to
36 conservation concerns and subsequent in-season
37 management actions. There are some management actions,
38 regardless of permits, if the escapement drops down and
39 it gets too low. And I again, I don't know that Federal
40 regulations prohibit an unlimited harvest, whether it's
41 rod and reel or gillnets, and I guess the basic thing
42 that I mentioned prior is that this area is closed, but
43 the markers can be moved in and out different distances
44 depending on the strength of the run. So, if they're
45 having a over escapement or really high, they'll move
46 it way in or they might move it halfway. And so that's
47 been a normal method of that, since they started doing
48 permits with the State or the feds, and I know my friend
49 Roger Malutin who passed away not too long ago. He and
50 his kinfolk, I mean, that's where they fished when they,

1 you know, when he retired from commercial fishing and,
2 and he just kind of go with the flow, and if the fish
3 are there, then they move the markers. So, I'll probably
4 vote against this proposal even though it has some good
5 logic. Thank you, Madam Chair.

6
7 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So, I have a
8 question, and I see Coral's hand up, and I'm not sure
9 if this question -- I guess I'll direct it toward Justin,
10 but it's based on something Pat just said. So, the
11 markers that Pat is talking about, those -- I assume
12 those are specific to State, on the Federal side, are
13 there markers that move? So, that's one question. And
14 then the other thing, do you have information on the
15 recent board of Fish Action that closed this area for
16 State subsistence?

17
18 MR. KOLLER: Thank you, Madam Chair.
19 Regarding the markers, the -- we don't have Federal
20 markers out there, but we have the ability to increase
21 opportunity based on the weir counts and based on the
22 availability out there, so, we can move that closure
23 zone that we're talking about right now or the previously
24 closed area. Yeah, we can, we can adjust that based on
25 fish availability. As far as the Board -- of recent
26 Board of Fish hatchery action that closed subsistence
27 there, I'm not I'm not aware of that one.

28
29 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, Coral.

30
31 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah, I guess I will not
32 be supporting this in that, I had heard testimony before
33 about the pressures on this area and that people might
34 overharvest and catch fish. And also, in the
35 justification in OSM, it said that the rod and reel is
36 a reasonable conservation measure, considering there is
37 no harvest limit. But I'm not seeing, first of all, the
38 need for a conservation measure in this area, and then
39 when I look at the harvest, it actually -- in the chart
40 here from 2009 to 2023 has actually decreased. So, I
41 guess for those reasons, I will not be supporting this.
42 And also, my reasoning of -- Litnik is a ways away. I
43 don't know how long it takes by skiff to get there, but
44 it's a bit. So, it's quite a ways to go and go out of
45 your way to get subsistence, and if you were to catch
46 by rod and reel, that adds time in addition to the costs
47 of fuel and boat and whatever, and your day and all
48 that, those time crunches. And so, I think for the sake
49 of subsistence and gathering as much as you can, making
50

00091

1 it as efficient as you can, that is also another reason
2 I will not be supporting this, thank you.

3

4 MS. HAYDEN: Madam Chair.

5

6 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Are there any --
7 go ahead.

8

9 MS. HAYDEN: This is Natasha. So, I think
10 -- so, I had -- I've been working for the ANCSA Village
11 Corporation that is Afognak Native Corporation, and some
12 of our staff are out on conducting marine tours very
13 frequently, you know, several times a week. And this
14 year and I don't I don't think it happened last year, I
15 think this year was the first time that they saw people
16 fishing with their gill nets, their subsistence nets
17 inside the markers. And so, that's where -- so my
18 comments earlier today were about the concern and of,
19 of gill netting pressure all the way up to the mouth of
20 the river. And with the local law enforcement not knowing
21 about the change. And what I hear in the discussion from
22 my fellow Council members is that -- I think that there's
23 just a little bit of confusion about the -- what exists
24 now is because the closure was removed, federally
25 qualified subsistence harvesters are able to gillnet all
26 the way up to the mouth of the river with no limits. And
27 I think, Pat, I'm hoping that maybe somebody from ADF&G
28 can confirm this, but I don't think that they're, that
29 the fish caught in that system count towards your limit
30 of 25 per person or, you know, or you're eligible people
31 at your household that, there isn't any limit over there.
32 And so, a couple of things now, people who can obtain
33 the subsistence permit are able to fish a gillnet from
34 a boat all the way up to the mouth of the river, and
35 there's no limit. And as of now, you can only get those
36 subsistence permits at the Refuge Center or the Buskin
37 Federal Wildlife Centre, which means that the people in
38 Ouzinkie or Port Lions would have to come into Kodiak
39 to get that permit to be able -- to be those -- to be
40 able to conduct their fishery in that way.

41

42 And so I am in support of this, and I
43 just want to make sure that my fellow Council members
44 understand what's happening now is that the people who
45 are able to go to the center here in Kodiak and get that
46 subsistence permit are then fishing all the way up to
47 the mouth of river and don't have any limits on -- or
48 don't -- you don't have any restrictions on the total
49 number that they're able to take. I do understand and
50 agree that managers, you know, if there's a, if there's

1 an escapement issue that they would, they would close
2 the sport fishery and then -- and the subsistence takers
3 would still be able to do that. But I don't -- I think
4 that this is just sort of like the tip of the iceberg
5 of what's going to be happening with people who are
6 becoming more aware and really savvy about the
7 subsistence opportunities, and there not being any time
8 constraints. Pat had mentioned that there were people
9 out with their nets out, you know, 5:30 in the morning,
10 this again, this is what was reported to me earlier this
11 year that people are able to have their fish, I think
12 their nets in, there isn't any time restrictions
13 throughout the day. And so I am supportive of it, I do
14 have a question though, and I don't know if, Madam Chair,
15 if, you know -- have the answer to this, but is there
16 any requirement for rod and reel users to be either
17 fishing from the riverbank or, you know, standing in the
18 river or a boat, or if there's any differentiation, maybe
19 there isn't any at all?

20

21 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: I'll defer that
22 question to Justin.

23

24 MR. KOLLER: Yeah, through the Chair. Ms.
25 Hayden, there's no distinction of where you're fishing
26 from, whether it be a boat or shore or wading, so forth
27 it's just a rod and reel fishery.

28

29 MS. HAYDEN: Okay, thank you,
30 (distortion). So, I think -- I just want to reiterate
31 that there's a lot of people that go over there now. And
32 there's a huge amount of pleasure boat size traffic of
33 people that are able to launch over at Antone's [UI
34 1:39:29/2] in skiff over and people who are getting, who
35 have gotten that and I think we're going to see an
36 increase in the numbers for this year and next year in
37 particular, because, you know, people are aware that the
38 closure has been rescinded and so that they can
39 subsistence fish with the Federal permit inside the
40 existing markers that the ADF&G uses for a boundary for
41 subsistence fishing. And so one of the things that I was
42 thinking of, and I hadn't been paying close enough
43 attention to, or to have developed a proposal, or earlier
44 this year, was to reinstate a boundary for the
45 subsistence fishery to coincide with the ADF&G markers,
46 so that there's still a subsistence priority, but that
47 people are not able to go in and fish all the way up to
48 the mouth of the river. But I missed, I missed that
49 boat, so, sorry.

50

00093

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Is there
2 -- Coral, go ahead.

3
4 MS. CHERNOFF: So, I guess I'm thinking
5 about -- I do understand what Natasha is talking about,
6 is that you can no longer fish there under State
7 subsistence, I think that was.

8
9 (Simultaneous speech)

10
11 MS. HAYDEN: Can I provide a little
12 clarification, Madam Chair?

13
14 (Simultaneous speech)

15
16 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, go ahead,
17 Natasha.

18
19 MS. HAYDEN: The State subsistence
20 fishery hasn't changed at all, as far as I understand.
21 So, there's markers, there's the boundary markers that
22 are -- there quite a ways away from the mouth of the
23 river, you know, they're out half a mile or something.
24 And if you are only fishing on a State subsistence
25 permit, then you have to stay outside those boundaries,
26 unless managers get to a point in the season where
27 they're concerned about over escaping, and then they
28 pull those boundaries and you can fish further up towards
29 the, the mouth of the river. So, that's not changed at
30 all. What's changed is with the rescinding of the Federal
31 Subsistence closure, is that federally qualified
32 subsistence harvesters can fish all the way up to the
33 mouth of the river, that there aren't any markers that
34 you have to stay outside of, to prosecute that fishery.
35 And so, what this proposal is doing is, is reinstating
36 a closure for gillnets and seine nets is what I
37 understand inside the markers, and that federally
38 subsistence harvesters can still fish inside the markers
39 using rod and reel, and there's no limit on that. And
40 then I don't know if managers are, you know, if they get
41 to a point where they're way over escaped and, and Fish
42 and Game says, we want to pull the markers so people can
43 gillnet all the way up, you know, closer up to the mouth
44 of the river. At that point, the Federal -- that would
45 be like an emergency, an emergency action taken to
46 increase the area where you can fish. I hope that
47 answered your question.

48
49 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Coral, did
50 you have more comment or question?

1

2 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah, I guess I'm just
3 having a new thought process because Natasha was talking
4 about how she was going to propose something, but then
5 she was too late. So, now I'm thinking maybe how to vote
6 on this for myself is, or maybe even, I don't know,
7 maybe Natasha, I don't know if it would be appropriate
8 for Natasha to respond like, is what we're voting on
9 here, would that work better? Or do you see something
10 better in something you were going to propose, like
11 change markers or something like that? Because when I
12 look at this, this data shows -- when I look at the
13 data, the data doesn't really show me that there's that
14 much pressure in that -- when I said before, the chart
15 on page 82 shows that the reported harvest of salmon at
16 Afognak Bay under State subsistence has actually
17 decreased over the years. So, it's not like there's more
18 pressure, and then when I look at the Kodiak management
19 salmon weir counts for Afognak, the weir was pulled on
20 eight, eight. So, I don't know if that's kind of a
21 standard time, but the, the fish that passed over the
22 weir is, you know, in the upper levels of what has passed
23 through the weir. It might be the third highest or the
24 fourth highest in the last 10 or 11 years that are
25 reported here on this chart I'm looking at. So, I don't
26 see the need for conservation. And so that was my reason
27 for not supporting this, is because there was no
28 conservation that I could see and there was no higher -
29 - there's no, from what I can see from this chart, not
30 a higher impact with fishing that's happening there. So,
31 I'm wondering if I'm missing something, and so I would
32 hate to miss something in this process. So, I'm wondering
33 if somehow, if you had plans and with your knowledge to
34 enter a different proposal at a different time, if that
35 might be -- what we might want to do is, leave this
36 alone at this time and then have you propose in the next
37 cycle what you need to propose.

38

39 MS. HAYDEN: Madam Chair, may I comment?

40

41 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, go ahead,
42 Natasha.

43

44 MS. HAYDEN: Thank you, I really
45 appreciate that, and I think that you're following what
46 -- I think what I see on page 82 is that this is data
47 going to 2023, and the reports that I had were of this
48 year. So, we'll see that data come out two years from
49 now I think, is when we'll get our next report on the,
50 the fishing. And I think effectively this, this proposal

1 gets at what I was -- would have attempted to do, which
2 is to prohibit gillnet insane gear inside the markers
3 for federally qualified subsistence harvesting unless
4 there's an over escapement concern, and then the markers
5 get pulled by managers, or there's an emergency action
6 that gets taken to allow those gear types up inside the
7 bay and then this still allows for rod and reel to be
8 used for subsistence. And so, I -- anyways, like I had
9 said earlier, I'm supportive of this, I think that this
10 gets at it and I, and I think that this is also in line
11 with the direction that we've gone for allowing rod and
12 reel for subsistence harvesting in the different
13 systems, and -- can you guys still hear me?

14
15 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, we have --
16 do we know what that beeping is?

17
18 MS. HAYDEN: Okay, good, it wasn't me.

19
20 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, yeah.

21
22 MS. CHERNOFF: I've just isolated the
23 line and muted it.

24
25 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, all right I
26 think we've addressed the issue I'm sorry Natasha, if
27 you have anything else, you can go ahead.

28
29 MS. HAYDEN: No, I just wanted to make
30 sure that I answered Coral's questions, which I think
31 that this is, I think this is a good, I think this is a
32 good step to take, to allow, to -- it'll prohibit the,
33 the gillnet insane -- gear -- gear types inside the
34 markers unless there's a biological need to, you know,
35 do that and agree that the understanding is, is that
36 there wasn't a conservation issue this year. You know,
37 but this is the first year that we've heard reports of
38 people fishing all the way up inside there, And with the
39 huge variations in the returns that we've seen, I think
40 it would be better to be more cautious as far as being,
41 you know, what people are allowed to do all the way up
42 to the mouth of the river.

43
44 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, Brett, is
45 that your hand? Go ahead, Brett.

46
47 MR. RICHARDSON: Brett Richardson. I'd
48 like to thank Natasha for that clarification. It cleared
49 a few things up for me at least. Going over the general
50 description, it reads to limit the allowable gear type

1 to rod and reel in the previously closed waters of
2 Afognak Bay, and so I read Bay rather than river, and
3 inside the mouth of the river it seems, at least from
4 this photo, which is not easy to kind of see what is
5 river and what is land or what is bay. But clarifying
6 that this will, if I'm correct, match the State
7 regulations. Is that correct? If passed.

8
9 MS. HAYDEN: It matches the boundaries,
10 yeah.

11
12 MR. RICHARDSON: Okay, so the State
13 regulations do not allow for gill netting inside these
14 boundaries, correct?

15
16 MS. HAYDEN: Yeah, unless there's a
17 special circumstances like an over escapement that are,
18 you know, after a certain amount of time has passed, you
19 know, a month into the season or something, and then
20 managers will issue an emergency action to remove those
21 boundaries and allow people to fish all the way up to
22 the mouth of the river or someplace closer. So, yeah,
23 you -- I think you have -- understand it.

24
25 MR. RICHARDSON: Okay, understood, thank
26 you. And then lastly, reading from the justification on
27 page 83, limiting gear type to rod and reel only is a
28 reasonable conservation measure, considering there is
29 no harvest limit for salmon in this area. I guess my
30 question being why is there no harvest limit for salmon
31 in this area?

32
33 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Justin.

34
35 MR. KOLLER: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr.
36 Richardson, there has never been -- or let me start
37 over. In the Kodiak area, the only place there's a
38 harvest limit for salmon and Federal regulation is that
39 the Kodiak road -- road zone area, which is a very
40 specific area to Women's Bay. The -- so, anywhere else
41 outside of the Kodiak road zone, it's no limit for salmon
42 including this area, and it's always been that way.

43
44 MR. RICHARDSON: But do you need a
45 permit?

46
47 MR. KOLLER: Yes, you do.

48
49 MR. RICHARDSON: Okay, so, you need a
50 permit, but there's no

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

(Simultaneous speech)

MR. KOLLER: For reporting.

MR. RICHARDSON: For reporting, but there's no limit. So, if there's no limit, do you need to count your catch.

MR. KOLLER: Yes, you do. Yeah, here's no limit, but we need a report of how many fish are taken out of there for management purposes.

MR. RICHARDSON: I suppose, continuing that, while I understand that history, a rod and reel, on the one hand, seems an overly onerous conservation method, perhaps, and that a more reasonable conservation method would be to put a harvest limit on it. That said, with Natasha's clarification, I think I have a clearer picture of this. So, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Coral, go ahead.

MS. CHERNOFF: Thank you, I had a question. I guess I'm flipping through here. Do we have a -- do we have data for how many people and how much salmon is taken by Federal subsistence harvest in this area? Am I missing that chart somewhere?

MR. KOLLER: No, there's -- through the Chair, there's so little Federal subsistence harvest in the past, that I just put it in a paragraph right above that chart. Very little reported -- salmon reported harvested in this area on Federal permits. However, now that we've removed the closure there and there's no limits and there's -- you can fish nets inside there, we expect, there's probably going to be an increase in use of Federal permits in that area for no limit and nets. Which is why Ms. Skinner put forth this proposal.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, yeah. So, we wouldn't have historical data for Federal subsistence harvest, because, in fact, it was closed until we rescinded it a couple of years ago, and I think those just got -- those just went into place fairly recently. So, there is no fishing history because it was closed, essentially.

1 MR. KOLLER: Yeah, that's essentially
2 correct, Madam Chair. I do want to point out, though,
3 that there's always been a Federal Subsistence Fishery
4 here outside of that zone that we're talking about in
5 Afognak Bay, and there's so you can fish with gill nets
6 and seines out, on the outside of that line. You just -
7 - but you could also fish inside with a rod and reel
8 under this, if this is adopted, thank you.

9
10 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, are
11 there further comments and questions? Is that a hand,
12 or no? Okay, Pat, go ahead.

13
14 MR. HOLMES: I have a question for
15 Natasha. The people that were fishing up inside, were
16 they using gill nets, or were they -- I'm getting
17 confused on all this, thank you.

18
19 MS. HAYDEN: Madam Chair. Yes, Pat, they
20 were. There was people gill netting up inside all the
21 way up by the mouth of the river. I think that the
22 existing regulation is, I think it's -- there's some
23 distance that you have to stay away from the very mouth
24 -- the mouth of the river. It's like 100 yards or 300
25 yards, it's like a thousand, I think it's like 1000
26 feet. So, there is that, but it's -- that's still very
27 close.

28
29 MR. HOLMES: And did somebody ask them
30 if they had a Federal permit or were they pushing the
31 margin? Anyway, in that case, if I didn't know and I saw
32 that happening, I'd sure be taking a lot of photographs
33 and then clarified afterwards, but did they actually say
34 they had permit Federal one?

35
36 MS. HAYDEN: Through the Chair. I am not
37 the one that made contact with the individual fisher
38 people, but it was reported to me that, yes, they did
39 that they people were -- had queried them. As you know,
40 there are people that have got cabins up there, and
41 there's a couple of lodges up in there, and the people
42 that have -- that spend time up there are very interested
43 in all hunting and fishing activities that are happening
44 outside. And it was reported to our land security patrol
45 guys, and I got calls, and there was quite the hubbub
46 about it here, at the north end of the island earlier
47 this summer. So, yeah. And that was reported that they
48 -- there were Federally subsistence people that had
49 those permits and that knew the regulations and that
50 there -- they were allowed to do that.

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

MR. HOLMES: Thank you. I can't help but think that they must have been somebody from off island or somebody I don't know, because anybody with Alutiig background or lived a long time in Kodiak wouldn't do such a thing. So, I think that's pretty terrible. And one question for Jeff. What happens in this case if, either way, if there's, somebody uses one regulation for one, for the State or they use a different one. But in this case, would the State be able to bust them? Because they were fishing with a permit inside closed waters, with a gillnet.

MR. KOLLER: Through the Chair. If I understand your question correctly, if somebody has a Federal permit which allows them to fish in this particular area, through -- it doesn't matter if it's closed under State regulation, it's open under the Federal regulations, so, they can't be cited.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Are there further questions and comments, or are we ready to vote on this proposal?

(No comments)

Okay, I'm not seeing or hearing any other questions or comments. DeAnna, can you take us through a roll call vote, please?

MS. PERRY: Yes, Madam Chair. The motion was to adopt FP 25-05, which was the Afognak Bay rod and reel only. A vote, let's see. Christopher Price vote for or against?

MR. PRICE: Yes, for.

MS. PERRY: Thank you. Coral Chernoff.

MS. CHERNOFF: No.

MS. PERRY: Della Trumble.

MS. TRUMBLE: Yes.

MS. PERRY: Thank you. Natasha Hayden.

MS. HAYDEN: Yes.

000100

1 MS. PERRY: Brett Richardson.

2

3 MR. RICHARDSON: Yes.

4

5 MS. PERRY: Patrick Holmes.

6

7 MR. HOLMES: Yes

8

9 MS. PERRY: And Rebecca Skinner.

10

11 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes.

12

13 MS. PERRY: Madam Chair, this motion
14 passes six to one.

15

16 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, thank
17 you, DeAnna. It is 3:30, so we're going to go ahead and
18 take a 10 minute break, come back at 3:40 and we will
19 start with proposal FP 25-07, which is Russell and Trout
20 Creek salmon limits and permitting, thank you.

21

22 (Off record)

23

24 (On record)

25

26 Okay, it's 3:40. If we could have
27 Council members come back to their seats.

28

29 (Pause)

30

31

32 Okay, let's go ahead and call the
33 meeting back to order. We'll be doing Fishery Proposal
34 25-07, Russell and Trout Creek salmon limits and
35 permitting, and I'll hand it over to Justin.

36

37 MR. KOLLER: Thank you, Madam Chair,
38 members of the Council. Once again, this is Justin Koller
39 with the Office of Subsistence Management. Fisheries
40 proposal FP 25-7 was submitted by the Southern Alaska
41 Fish and Wildlife Field Office of the U.S. Fish and
42 Wildlife Service. It seeks to prohibit the use of nets
43 and establish more conservative daily harvest limits for
44 Russell and Trout Creek drainages near Cold Bay. It also
45 proposes to require a Federal permit to fish in the
46 Alaska Peninsula area, and requests removing regulatory
47 language that is no longer relevant to the Federal
48 Subsistence Management Program. The Federal Subsistence
49 Board rescinded fishing closures in Russell and Trout
50 Creek drainages during the last regulatory cycle,

1 resulting in the Alaska Peninsula area wide Federal
2 subsistence fishing regulations applying in these
3 locations. The proponent states that these regulations
4 are insufficient to protect fish populations in Russell
5 and Trout Creek drainages due to their proximity to Cold
6 Bay and potential for overfishing. The proponent also
7 states that some regulations should be removed because
8 they are outdated and unnecessary. The proponent further
9 states that requiring a Federal permit will help to
10 better account for fish harvested under Federal
11 regulation and aid management of the fisheries. In the
12 Alaska Peninsula area, you're required to have a
13 subsistence fishing permit when fishing for salmon under
14 Federal subsistence regulation. Currently, only a State
15 subsistence fishing permit is available. Therefore,
16 Federal -- federally qualified subsistence users fishing
17 under Federal regulations must obtain and report their
18 harvest on a State subsistence permit.

19
20 If adopted, this proposal would have
21 four distinct effects. Number one, the permit
22 requirement for federally qualified subsistence users
23 harvesting under Federal subsistence regulations in the
24 Alaska Peninsula area would be required to obtain a
25 Federal permit, which has not previously been required.
26 Number two, the allowable gear, federally qualified
27 subsistence users will not be permitted to use nets to
28 harvest salmon in Russell or Trout Creek drainages, and
29 will no longer be allowed to take salmon without a permit
30 by snagging with a handline or rod and reel using a
31 spear, bow, and arrow, or capturing by bare hand in the
32 Alaska Peninsula area. Allowable gear would include gear
33 types from general regulations that are not nets.
34 Examples of practical gear types allowed would be rod
35 and reel, handline, and spear. It is likely that
36 federally qualified subsistence users would primarily
37 use rod and reel in this situation, based on previous
38 documentation of harvest methods in these drainages. The
39 third effect would be the harvest limits, federally
40 qualified subsistence users harvesting salmon at Russell
41 or Trout Creek drainages will be limited to five salmon
42 per day, plus an additional five salmon per household
43 member listed on their Federal permit. Compared to the
44 current Federal subsistence regulations, this would
45 reduce harvest opportunity. These limits are also more
46 restrictive than State sport fishing regulations, which
47 permit an individual to harvest up to five sockeye, coho,
48 pink or chum salmon 20 inches or larger, or longer, and
49 up to ten salmon less than 20 inches long. Therefore,
50 an individual harvesting under State sport fishing

1 regulations could potentially harvest up to 15 salmon
2 per day, not including the permitted harvest of king
3 salmon, which are not known to occur in Russell and
4 Trout Creek. Adopting the proposed harvest limits for
5 Russell and Trout Creek drainages may help mitigate the
6 potential for conservation concerns, but it may also
7 unnecessarily restrict the harvesting efforts of
8 federally qualified subsistence users in these areas.

9
10 The fourth effect is a regulation
11 simplification; Alaska Peninsula area regulations will
12 be simplified by removing unnecessary language. The
13 primary language -- regulatory language to be removed
14 relates to marine waters and specifying items regarding
15 take on permits. First, there are no longer marine waters
16 under Federal jurisdiction in the Alaska Peninsula area,
17 so regulations referring to marine waters are
18 irrelevant. Second, the only way to change Federal
19 subsistence regulations regarding take of fish is
20 through a proposal during the Federal fisheries
21 regulatory cycle or in-season by special action. So,
22 regulations referring to exceptions contained in permit
23 condition language do not apply to the Federal program
24 and can be removed. The OSM preliminary conclusion is
25 to support this proposal with modification to adopt
26 current State sport fishing harvest limits and oppose
27 requiring a Federal permit. Also, the regulations
28 permitting the use of certain low-impact methods and
29 means without a permit should be retained. Rescinding
30 the Federal subsistence fishing closure and Russell and
31 Trout Creek drainages created opportunity for federally
32 qualified subsistence users but could lead to
33 conservation concerns if nets are allowed, and up to 250
34 salmon could be harvested at a time.

35
36 Prohibiting nets and adopting smaller
37 daily harvest limits for Russell and Trout Creek
38 drainages, will help mitigate the potential for
39 conservation concerns. Current State sport fishing
40 harvest limits permit an individual to harvest up to 15
41 sockeye, coho, pink, or chum salmon, depending on
42 length, which is more harvest opportunity compared to
43 the proposed daily harvest limit of five salmon per day.
44 Implementing State sport fishing harvest limits for
45 Russell and Trout Creeks would provide more opportunity
46 than the proposed -- the proposed harvest limit, and
47 would follow previous actions taken for a portion of
48 Women's Bay. Requiring a Federal permit for the entire
49 Alaska Peninsula area would be burdensome for federally
50 qualified subsistence users, because the only Federal

1 issuing office is the Izembek Refuge Office in Cold Bay.
2 The Federal Subsistence Management Program does not yet
3 have a system to issue permits and report harvest online.
4 However, the current system is being revised and the
5 online issuing and reporting capabilities may be
6 available for the 2025 regulatory year. In 2007, the
7 Board adopted regulations allowing certain methods of
8 means to be used in the Alaska Peninsula area without a
9 permit. This allowance should be retained because there
10 is no evidence to suggest it has had a negative effect
11 on fisheries resources. Alaska Peninsula area
12 regulations will be simplified by removing unnecessary
13 language that is not applicable to the Federal
14 Subsistence Program. Thank you, Madam Chair.

15
16 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. And if
17 I could ask anyone online, if you're not speaking to
18 please mute your phone. Okay, we will walk through again.
19 We have no reports for Tribal or ANSCA Corporation
20 consultations. Next section, agency comments. Is there
21 anyone from Alaska Department of Fish and Game that wants
22 to give a comment?

23
24 (No comment)

25
26 Okay, is there anyone from a Federal
27 agency that wants to give a comment?

28
29 MR. GERKEN: Madam Chair, this is Jon
30 (distortion) Fish and wildlife service.

31
32 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, go
33 ahead, Jon.

34
35 MR. GERKEN: Yeah, I'm the Federal in-
36 season Manager for the area. So, and just hoping to
37 provide a little more context. The Fish and Wildlife
38 Service has conducted a couple of public meetings in
39 Cold Bay over the last two years in response to the
40 rescinded fisheries closures that occurred on, on Trout
41 and Russell Creek. So, the first one was in July of last
42 year. We had, you know, approximately 25 people attend.
43 And you know, last year the, the Federal regulations did
44 not go into effect. So, it was more of a outreach event
45 and telling local area, rural users, federally qualified
46 users that this was coming. We had another meeting this
47 year in July, we did have attendance from Council member
48 Wasley there as well, there was -- it was a smaller
49 attendance, there was roughly ten people in attendance
50 there. And following that meeting after, you know, sort

1 of talking with those that were in attendance I did
2 issue a special action to remove or excuse me, restrict
3 the use of nets in the entire Federal area around Cold
4 Bay, and so, that would primarily include Trout, Russell
5 Creek, Thin Point Lake, Swan Lake and Mortensens Lagoon.
6 So, in that special action, we did require people to use
7 -- or come to the local Cold Bay office to get a Federal
8 permit if they were going to participate in that fishery.
9 We did not issue any permits and have not received any
10 phone calls or any other questions or concerns regarding
11 the special action as of today.
12

13 And so, I guess just a few more
14 comments. Just kind of piggybacking on what Justin
15 presented. It is the -- the idea is to mirror the sport
16 fish regulations in these areas. There is a little bit
17 of biological information on Trout Creek, bear with me
18 here, and these are primarily coho streams and that's
19 what's targeted on both Russell and Trout Creek by the
20 sport fishery. In total, the, roughly 1990 to 2008
21 average for Trout Creek is 950 coho total, and in Russell
22 Creek that during that same time period, 1990 to 2008,
23 it's roughly 3,000 coho in the system. So, we are talking
24 about populations that are pretty small. And that was
25 also part of the reasoning with respect to kind of
26 mimicking the sport fish regulations of five per day. I
27 would argue a little bit with the OSM review specific
28 to it being more restrictive under the Federal
29 regulations. It is true that State sport fishing
30 regulations allow you to harvest up to five sockeye,
31 coho, pink and chum. However, there are different run
32 timing. And so being able to pick up you know, you know,
33 increased beyond the five fish limit would be difficult.
34 And, you know, there, there are options to harvest ten
35 fish under 20 inches, but those fish are indeed rare.
36 So, I think the, you know, the idea was, again, to mimic
37 the sport fish regulations it does provide additional
38 opportunity for federally qualified users. There is a,
39 the ability to use hook and line, which is the primary
40 mechanism for capture in these two areas. I think I'll
41 leave it at that and then hope to answer any questions
42 that I can. Thank you, Madam Chair.
43

44 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, is there
45 anyone else from a Federal agency that wants to give
46 comment?
47

48 (No comment)
49
50

000105

1 Okay, hearing none. Do we have any
2 Tribes that want to give comment?

3
4 (No comment)

5
6 Okay, seeing and hearing none. Do we
7 have any comments from advisory groups, which includes
8 other Regional Advisory Council, State Fish and Game
9 Advisory Committees and Subsistence Resource
10 Commissions.

11
12 (No Comment)

13
14 Okay, seeing and hearing none. Do we
15 have any written public comments?

16
17 MR. KOLLER: Madam Chair, there were no
18 written public comments.

19
20 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, we have no
21 blue cards in the room. Is there anyone on the phone
22 that wants to give public testimony?

23
24 (No comment)

25
26 Okay, here I would look for a motion to
27 adopt this proposal.

28
29 MR. HOLMES: Move to adopt, Madam Chair.

30
31 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Pat. Is
32 there a second? Thank you, Chris. Okay, discussion and
33 justification, are there Counsel -- Council comments,
34 Council discussion. Pat, go ahead.

35
36 MR. HOLMES: I have some questions for
37 you, Jeff. What, what are the Federal waters there off
38 of Russell and Trout Creek? Because I know over the
39 years there's been various strong debates between the
40 feds and the State as to which waters. Is it waters
41 inside of the sand spits or, or what?

42
43 MR. KOLLER: Yeah, through the Chair, Mr.
44 Holmes, in our Federal regulations we define Federal
45 public, or the boundary of -- downstream boundary of
46 Federal public waters and drainages is a headland to
47 headland, yeah.

48
49 MR. HOLMES: I was wondering if you folks
50 feel that this will help solve some of the problems,

1 because when we were out at Cold Bay from the last time
2 we were there for a meeting there was quite a bit of
3 emotion on folks that lived and worked there, not being
4 able to get their fish because of competition from sport
5 users that were particularly bothersome, were ones
6 flying in from Europe to hunt geese and brant, and so,
7 they were quite miffed about it. Is -- are they gonna -
8 - will this give the locals some advantage on being able
9 to get their fish?

10
11 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: And I'm not sure
12 if that question is directed toward Justin or Jon, and
13 I see Glenn approaching a microphone as well. Do you
14 want to speak now or? Okay, we'll (indiscernible) Glenn.
15

16 MR. CHEN: Oh, Madam Chair, I wasn't
17 gonna address Mr. Holmes question, but I was going to
18 bring up another point. When I had an opportunity.
19

20 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, let me see
21 if Jon -- Jon, are you still on? And did you hear Pat's
22 comment? And if so, we'll finish that line of thought
23 and then we'll move to, to Glenn.
24

25 MR. GERKEN: Madam Chair, this is Jon. I
26 did, I did get the question. Let me go back and answer
27 Pat's first question. So, Federal waters are basically
28 the lakes and the non-tidal segments of all of the rivers
29 within the area. So, even though Trout and Russell Creek
30 are under -- do have, have different ownership, they
31 still fall within under Federal fishing subsistence
32 regulations because of the water rights that are given
33 to the Refuge, and that's the Izembek Refuge, the Alaska
34 Peninsula Refuge and the Maritime Refuge, all within
35 this area. So, you know, the area around Trout Creek is
36 -- does not have Federal ownership, but it is under
37 Federal fishing regulations because of the water rights.
38 So, functionally anything that's freshwater is Federal,
39 falls under Federal regulations, and anything that is
40 saltwater or tidally influenced falls within under State
41 regulations.
42

43 MR. HOLMES: Thank you very much.
44

45 MR. GERKEN: And then the second
46 question, when we initially had conversations or when I
47 initially had conversations with the RAC specific to
48 rescinding the fisheries closures, there was talk about
49 trying to provide additional, you know, Federal or
50 fishing opportunity for federally qualified users, and

1 so that is difficult to do without having biological
2 information that says whatever stock is, you know, under
3 some level of risk. And so typically, as a Federal
4 Manager, what I would do would be to eliminate non-
5 federally qualified users from phishing if there was a
6 conservation concern. So, hypothetically speaking, if
7 the numbers of fish that were running up Russell Creek
8 were, you know, were not very high, and high is sort of
9 a hypothetical here because we don't have a lot to
10 compare it to. Then, you know, my first, first idea
11 would be to eliminate federally qualified users, which
12 would indeed provide a hardship for those folks that are
13 coming from out of town. You know, if they're duck
14 hunting or brant hunting and then fishing at night, they
15 would not be allowed to, to fish because they are not
16 federally qualified users. But it is difficult to really
17 justify that without some level of biological
18 information that you know, allows me to justify that
19 there, there were a lot of comments when we talked about
20 rescinding this closure, about using the, you know, the
21 traditional knowledge and, and using that to justify the
22 closures, and I certainly welcome, you know, any of that
23 input and would look forward to, you know, figuring out
24 how to use -- utilize that information. But
25 traditionally speaking, we usually use some level of
26 fisheries counts or those kind of things to make those
27 justifications.

28
29 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thanks,
30 Jon.

31
32
33 MR. HOLMES: Roger that, thank you, and
34 I remember Jeff used to try to get any way he could to
35 get some escapement there. So, I hope his successor is
36 doing the same and working with you. Thank you, bye.

37
38 MR. GERKEN: Yep.

39
40 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, Glenn.

41
42 MR. CHEN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Glenn
43 Chen for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. And I want to
44 apologize for not stepping forward earlier when you were
45 asking for agency comments. But something did occur to
46 me after that point in time, and that has to do with the
47 fact that the matter of a Federal priority, and one of
48 the things that our solicitor, Ken Lord, who just retired
49 from the program, constantly reminds us that we have to
50 provide some kind of priority and over what the State

000108

1 is providing for -- to meet the requirements of ANILCA.
2 And so, that can be in the form of more generous bag
3 limits, perhaps extended harvest seasons and, or more
4 liberalization of harvest methods. So, as you continue
5 to deliberate on this proposal, I would recommend that
6 you guys consider how to provide that priority over the
7 State sport fishing limits and, and to meet the mandates
8 of ANILCA, thank you.

9
10 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Can you
11 repeat the three things again? I missed the second one.
12 It was bag limits, something and something.

13
14 MR. CHEN: So, in general, there's
15 several options for providing that priority, Madam
16 Chair. And as I mentioned, either through larger bag
17 limits, harvest limits, increased harvest time periods,
18 seasons and so forth, or expanded harvest methods. So,
19 instead of road and rail, allowing other types of methods
20 that the State does not allow for sport fishing.

21
22 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, thank you.
23 Pat, go ahead.

24
25 MR. GERKEN: Jon, this is Jon.

26
27 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yep, Jon, we're
28 going to take Pat and then I'll come back to you. Go
29 ahead, Pat.

30
31 MR. GERKEN: Thank you.

32
33 MR. HOLMES: I'm not being facetious, but
34 I was wondering if there would be a way, I remember one
35 person talking that, you know, he worked ten hours a
36 day, five days a week, but on the weekend he couldn't
37 get in. So, would it be possible to have Sunday as a
38 Federal subsistence fishing day? I don't know if you can
39 as far as time periods or something like that. Just a
40 question, can you change the actual date people fish or
41 does it have to be spread out? 8 to 5 for residents and
42 whatever, I don't know, sorry.

43
44 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Do you have a
45 response? Justin.

46
47 MR. KOLLER: Yeah, through the Chair. I
48 just wanted to say that I think if I understand you
49 correctly, you're basically talking about a closure to
50 non-Federally qualified users on Sundays. So, that's

000109

1 it's possible, but that's, that's a, outside the scope
2 of the proposal right now.

3

4 MR. HOLMES: Thank you.

5

6 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Jon, go
7 ahead.

8

9 MR. GERKEN: Yeah, Thanks, Madam Chair.
10 Just to add to what Glenn was saying. So, you know, the
11 delegated letter of authority that I have allows me to
12 change method and means, which is the gear types, there
13 are opportunities to change time, and then the third,
14 which is most commonly what I use is to restrict
15 different user groups. So, those are the three things
16 that I can do under delegated -- under my letter of
17 delegated authority. But again, it's attached to a --
18 you know, some level of abundance, right. So, there's
19 got to be a reason, typically a biological reason to
20 make restrictions. So, I, you know, as a Federal Manager
21 I'm providing opportunity if there's a lot of fish there,
22 then, you know, and the regulations are basically wide
23 open, no restrictions then that, in my opinion, is
24 providing the opportunity. It's differing levels of
25 opportunity based on user group if it's low abundance.
26 So, thank you.

27

28 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, thanks.
29 So, I'll say this, I'm not expecting a response, but it
30 is interesting what you just said, that you -- we lack
31 the biological data to limit certain user groups. But
32 then when we think about how this proposal got to the
33 floor at all, it's because there's a concern about
34 overharvest, so, it sounds like there's a concern with
35 the resource, but we don't have any data to really
36 support that. So, it seems like there's a little bit of
37 a disconnect there. So, I'm looking down the table, are
38 there additional comments or questions? Pat, go ahead.

39

40 MR. HOLMES: Yeah, Madam Chair, I was
41 wondering -- I hope Della is on because I know folks
42 from King Cove when -- particularly with not having any
43 commercial fisheries going, would go over to the other
44 side of Cold Bay to do their subsistence fishing, and
45 folks used to do their gill netting at whatever the
46 limit was from the mouth of the stream. And I'm -- I
47 don't know, I just hope that there's some way -- as this
48 probably going to take a few years to get sorted out,
49 thank you.

50

000110

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, are there
2 other comments or questions?

3
4 MS. TRUMBLE: Chair, this is Della.

5
6 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Go ahead, Della.

7
8 MS. TRUMBLE: I think in regard with what
9 Pat said. You know this is fairly new to the region. I
10 wasn't able to make the July one last year for health
11 reasons, and then this year in July was not in King
12 Cove, I was in Wasilla, so I didn't -- the only question
13 I had was whether or not anybody reached out to people
14 in King Cove in regard to this proposal, but saying that
15 in what Pat was -- just said is, it's a start, you know,
16 and I think this is going to be a process as we move
17 forward to watch closely and work with the communities
18 and that it effects. But I'm happy to see something. I
19 hoped to help with this, but I didn't, so I'm glad to
20 see something on the books.

21
22 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, thanks,
23 Della. So, I can talk until somebody raises their hand.
24 So, when we rescinded a bunch of closures a couple of
25 years ago, most of the areas where a closure was
26 rescinded, we didn't have associated regulations to put
27 into place, so, we went from an area being closed to
28 Federal Subsistence to all of a sudden it was just wide
29 open. And there, we didn't have for the most part, an
30 opportunity to have more nuanced limits which would come
31 through these fishery regulations. So, I do appreciate
32 that this proposal is being brought forward. I really
33 appreciate the community meetings that were conducted
34 to engage with the community and solicit feedback. And
35 generally, especially for these smaller systems, I do
36 support some kinds of restrictions or limits and not
37 having it wide open. I guess I do tend probably to favor
38 the gear type restrictions because it still allows
39 people to go out and harvest, but a rod and reel is more
40 of a one at a time fishery, as opposed to a gillnet
41 where you could get a whole slew of fish in your gillnet.
42 So, generally, I'm leaning toward supporting some kind
43 of a proposal here, and I'm still thinking about the
44 specific changes that OSM is recommending versus what's
45 in the original proposal. No one has a hand up, so I
46 guess I'll ask a question. Around the permit, Justin,
47 can you speak a little bit more about, I mean, I know
48 you spoke to it in your presentation, but can you say
49 more about why OSM is opposing the Federal permit
50 requirement?

1

2 MR. KOLLER: Yeah, Madam Chair. We -- so
3 we oppose primarily because permit availability in this
4 area. It's difficult to get a permit, there's only one
5 issuing office right now, and right now we can't issue
6 permits online, and that's kind of in the works right
7 now, but a long way off. So, this Council could consider
8 this again in the future, if you oppose it now to for
9 the permit requirement. In regulation, it says a
10 Federal, or excuse me, a subsistence fishing permit is
11 required, and our definition of subsistence fishing
12 permit is one issued by the Federal Subsistence Board
13 or one issued by the State. So, you can use either one
14 right now. And right now people tend to fish, if they
15 are fishing under our regulations, they will fish under
16 us with a State permit and report their harvest on that.

17

18 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: And it is a
19 hardship to only have the one place to get the Federal
20 permit.

21

22 MR. KOLLER: Well, I don't want to speak
23 for anybody in that area, but it seems like it would be
24 a hardship, yes, to get a permit.

25

26 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat, go ahead.

27

28 MR. HOLMES: Can you delegate where the
29 permits are issued? I mean, you got the Izembek office
30 there. Can they do that?

31

32 MR. KOLLER: Through the Chair. Yes, Mr.
33 Holmes, that is the only place right now in this area
34 where you can get a Federal permit is the Izembek office.

35

36 MR. HOLMES: Well, I would assume most
37 of the people that would want that would be there in
38 Cold Bay or folks coming over with, from Dallas side.
39 And I want to clarify again prohibit the use of nets if
40 outside of the headland to headlands, I don't know what
41 the distance limit is, but the classic department
42 restrictions is 500 or 300 yards or something. So, if
43 that's in place, it would still provide some opportunity
44 for the Cold Bay folks to fish in more traditional method
45 than rod and reel. And yet, it's far enough out that it
46 shouldn't have a major impact, as if you were fishing a
47 gillnet right in the mouth of the creek.

48

49 MR. KOLLER: Yeah, through the Chair.
50 Yeah, there is, under State regulation, there is a I

1 believe it's 500 feet. But away from the river mouth is
2 where you can start to subsistence fish with nets. So,
3 yeah, anybody in cold Bay or, could get a State
4 subsistence permit and do just that.

5
6 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Before you ask your
7 question, Pat, I need to ask for a clarification. When
8 you made your motion, was it to support the proposal as
9 submitted or to support with the modifications proposed
10 by OSM? And I just want to make sure we know what we're
11 going to be -- what's on the floor right now.

12
13 (Pause)

14
15 MR. HOLMES: I guess the thing I just
16 wanted to mention on the distance there, I don't, I
17 don't know what it is, but I recall many years ago they
18 set a little broader extreme mouth limits there because
19 of problems with 1 or 2 seiners who had come in at night
20 and fish right in the mouth, and so that's one of the
21 ways they kind of separated them out, but that's just
22 sort of a general knowledge, so, thank you.

23
24 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. Pat, I was
25 looking for a clarification when you made your motion
26 to support or adopt this proposal, were you proposing
27 to adopt it as written or as modified by OSM?

28
29 MR. HOLMES: Well, I'm kind of inclined
30 to as written, but I'd like to hear some more discussion
31 from our Council. I'll just withdraw that motion for the
32 moment.

33
34 MS. TRUMBLE: Madam Chair, this is Della.

35
36 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Go ahead, Della.

37
38 MS. TRUMBLE: I got a question because
39 I'm looking at the modification, it's and -- and I, you
40 know heard the discussion in regard to the permits. Now
41 a couple of things. First of all if an opposed requiring
42 a Federal permit, so, if I wanted to go to Cold Bay and
43 subsist fish for three days and I just go get some fish
44 and say, hey, I'm, so many questions, me, I'm just saying
45 I'm getting, I'm on fishing under a Federal permit, but
46 I don't have one because they're not, they don't issue.
47 How does, how does Fish and Wildlife enforce something
48 like that? Can you answer that question first and then
49 I'll follow up with another one.

000113

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Justin, do you have
2 a response to that?

3
4 MR. KOLLER: Through the Chair. Yeah, so,
5 like I said, in our regulation a subsistence fishing
6 permit is one issued by the State or the Federal
7 Subsistence Board. So under our regulation you can use
8 either one, and I'll defer the enforcement question to
9 the Refuge or the in-season Manager, thank you.

10
11 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks.

12
13 MS. TRUMBLE: Madam Chair, but.

14
15 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yep, go ahead
16 Della.

17
18 Ms. TRUMBLE: So, what's the purpose of
19 this? You're saying, you're using -- use the current
20 State sport, so you're not requiring a Federal
21 subsistence fishing permit. What's the purpose of this?
22 And leading into that question, I think in the, in
23 Izembek having to issue these permits. And I know the
24 question, I think under the caribou was another example
25 is -- oh, about a year ago, I know there's the trend to
26 try to move toward the permits, just all coming from the
27 State and not Federal subsistence permits for caribou.
28 Now, in the past, for many, many years, when I worked
29 with the King Cove Corporation or the Tribe, I took it
30 upon myself to, people can come -- could come to me, and
31 I'd help issue those permits on behalf of Izembek. And
32 I'm not sure why there's not a better effort in our
33 communities for Izembek Refuge to be working closely
34 with the tribal governments, and this has been an issue
35 with me for many years to be able to work and, and do
36 those permits, because every one of these tribes has an
37 IGAP program and part -- resource program, and they
38 should be able to work, or there should be some sort of
39 agreement that can, that they're able to utilize some
40 of the staff that are working with the tribes. And I
41 think eventually as things evolve and you're able to get
42 these permits online is going to help a lot because we
43 all have better internet, whether it's Starlink or GCI,
44 now that, that is gonna to help the whole process. But
45 I just feel like I'm not sure what the purpose of this
46 is without a permit. Why are we doing this if you're not
47 required to have a permit?

48
49 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So, I'm gonna jump
50 in and explain or say what my understanding is, and then

1 maybe where we go from here. So, the proposal is
2 submitted, which is what Pat clarified, his motion was
3 to adopt the proposal as submitted. So, that's the
4 language that Jon Gerken wrote up, requires a Federal
5 subsistence permit. So, that would be the new
6 requirement under the proposal. When OSM reviewed the
7 proposal, they didn't like that requirement of a Federal
8 permit, and they're suggesting that the proposal be
9 modified to basically keep status quo, is my
10 understanding. So, right now, people who want to engage
11 in Federal subsistence fisheries can either have a
12 Federal permit or a Federal subsistence permit or a State
13 permit. There's not a requirement that they have the
14 Federal permit, but that's what the proposal is written,
15 does, is that it would require the, the Federal permit.
16 So, given that, Della, are you -- do you -- I guess
17 where - what, what is your recommendation based on your
18 experience with this, should a Federal subsistence
19 permit be required, or does the current system seem to
20 work right now? Where my understanding is you can have
21 either a State, you can fish either under a State
22 subsistence permit or under a Federal subsistence
23 permit.

24
25 Ms. TRUMBLE: Basically, I think.....

26
27 (Simultaneous speech)

28
29 MR. GERKEN: Madam Chair, this is Jon. I
30 can probably clarify a little bit here.

31
32 Ms. TRUMBLE: Go ahead.

33
34 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Go
35 ahead, Jon.

36
37 MR. GERKEN: Yeah, I would typically
38 agree with OSM that, you know, getting permits out is
39 difficult based on location. However, I do think the
40 Izembek office is in a pretty good spot with respect to
41 Russell Creek and Nurse or Trout Creek, you know, being
42 within a mile of, of where folks are fishing. But to get
43 to Della's point we, we regularly do that in other areas
44 where we have government to government consultations
45 where I can come in and let's just say this is
46 hypothetical, I would train Della in how to issue permits
47 in King Cove. The key is, though, there are criteria
48 with respect to getting those permits back within a
49 reasonable time, and there are penalties that if you
50 don't return your permit, that you can be eliminated in

1 the future from getting another Federal permit. So,
2 there's some stigma there with the permits when they're
3 issued. But there are alternatives to picking them up
4 just at the Izembek office, and the what we use in
5 Chignik is the, you know, government to government
6 consultation, which allows me to have tribal entities
7 issue those Federal permits on my behalf.

8
9 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Jon.
10 Della, did you want to add anything?

11
12 MS. TRUMBLE: Yes, thank you, Jon, and
13 thank you, Madam Chair. I think I'm gonna -- to be on,
14 and we think and look back to where this all basically
15 started, and the big question was from the public in the
16 community of Cold Bay and, you know, the ability to
17 utilize a Federal permit in the event that there are a
18 lack of resources. So, I from at this point would, you,
19 would go with accepting the proposal as is with the
20 general description of FB25-07, because it, it's
21 referring to Cold Bay. If I am in Cold Bay, let's say
22 I'm stuck over there for 2 or 3 days. I can run to the
23 Fish and Wildlife office and get a Federal permit,
24 subsistence permit, if I'm going to be there for any
25 amount of time and want to utilize it. So, that's an
26 easy thing for me for purposes of fishing, because this
27 is Russell Creek and Trout Creek and those are in Cold
28 Bay. So, saying that, I guess I agree with the proposal
29 as written and I don't, don't support the, the OSM
30 conclusions, thank you.

31
32 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Della.

33
34 (Pause)

35
36 Justin, go ahead.

37
38 MR. KOLLER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I
39 had to think about that one for a second, but the
40 proposal as written is to require a Federal subsistence
41 permit for the entire Aleutians or excuse me, Alaska
42 Peninsula area, not just Russell and Trout Creek. Just
43 for clarification, thank you.

44
45 MS. TRUMBLE: And this is Della again.
46 And Pat brought this question up earlier about the
47 jurisdiction between the Federal and the State because
48 like I said, I've been on here for 27 years, and that
49 question came every time we had a meeting in Cold Bay,
50 that question came up. And I don't -- I guess I'm trying

1 to figure out how all of this is under the Federal
2 guidelines. In Kodiak, it's clear which ones -- which
3 falls under the, under the Federal, or the Federal
4 regulations. But it just, this whole Cold Bay, Izembek,
5 this issue has with, has never been really clear to me.
6

7 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, we have our
8 -- a couple of our Federal staff conferring here. So,
9 just to clarify then the requirement for the Federal
10 fishery, the Federal subsistence permit is not just for
11 Russell and Trout Creek, Creeks, Creek drainages. It is
12 for the entire Alaska Peninsula area. So, if this
13 proposal as written, if we support it and it goes to the
14 Federal Subsistence Board and it's approved, anybody
15 engaging in Federal subsistence fisheries on the Alaska
16 Peninsula will have to have a Federal fisheries permit,
17 question mark.
18

19 MR. KOLLER: Madam Chair, that's correct.
20 The Alaska Peninsula area stretches at the north end
21 from Port Heiden all the way down to False Pass and out
22 to yeah, at the end of the peninsula there. So, anybody
23 fishing on Federal public waters in the Alaska Peninsula
24 area would be required to have a Federal permit which
25 is only available in Cold Bay. I'm not quite certain, I
26 seem to recall that the regulation specialist that was
27 in this position that I'm now acting in told me that the
28 only people that could issue Federal permits were
29 Federal offices, on subsistence permits. So, I'll put
30 that out there, that's the to the best of my knowledge,
31 that's true. And I just wanted to also point out that
32 the permit requirement is just one part of this proposal.
33 There's the permit requirement, there's the allowable
34 gear types, the harvest limits, and then simplifying the
35 regulations. So, I just wanted to just reiterate that,
36 thank you.
37

38 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. So, I
39 know Pat has his hand up, I am looking Jason you moved
40 up to the table. Are you just there for moral support
41 right now? Which is fine.
42

43 MR. ROBERTS: Madam Chair. I, --
44 primarily moral support as normal. But, yeah, I was just
45 reminding Justin of a few things. The other of which is
46 that, you know, we cannot, OSM support making this
47 harvest limits more restrictive than State sport harvest
48 limits. Which is something to keep in mind.
49

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, and I will
2 move to Pat.

3
4 MR. HOLMES: I'd say thanks for the
5 clarification, but I'm as confused as to start. The thing
6 that they pointed out, that this would, this would reply
7 to the whole Alaska Peninsula, we'd be ending up solving
8 things for Cold Bay, but creating problems for False
9 Pass, Nelson Lagoon, Port Heiden and anybody in between.
10 Because this would be, really buggers things for them
11 to be able to get a permit, and until you get an online
12 thing, it almost seems like Cold Bay is gonna have to
13 be a progressive thing that we're just gonna have to be
14 working on every year until you get some way to get the
15 permits. And so that question of the whole peninsula,
16 I'd be inclined to change my recommendation to adopt the
17 proposal as written and go with the one from OSM, because
18 from the description from the gentleman from the Refuge,
19 there's still a possibility of -- oh no, you'd have to
20 have the Federal permit to do that, never mind. I'd go
21 for that, sorry.

22
23 MS. PERRY: Madam Chair, pardon my
24 interruption, but point of order. We do have a pending
25 motion on the table, and it was to support FP 25-07 as
26 written. That was made by Pat and seconded by Chris for
27 a clean record, Pat could withdraw that motion with the
28 concurrence of the second and then remake a motion as
29 he just Stated.

30
31 MR. HOLMES: Madam Chair, I would like
32 to withdraw my motion, with permission of the second.

33
34 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Chris,
35 do you -- are you okay with that?

36
37 MR. PRICE: I'm okay with that.

38
39 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, the second
40 approves. Pat, do you have another motion to make?

41
42 MR. HOLMES: I'd support -- move that we
43 support the OSM preliminary conclusion.

44
45 MR. PRICE: Second.

46
47 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, so Pat made
48 a motion to support the proposal with the modifications
49 recommended by OSM, and that was seconded by Chris. So,
50 that is the motion on the floor. Is -- again the proposal

000118

1 with the modifications which are to have harvest limits
2 that are not less than the State sport fishing limits,
3 and opposing requiring a Federal permit for the entire
4 Alaska Peninsula, and also keeping -- continuing to
5 allow the low-impact methods and means, like catching
6 the fish with your hands in the streams, that those
7 should be retained. So, we have a new motion on the
8 floor, are there additional comments or questions?

9
10 MR. GERKEN: Madam Chair, this is Jon
11 Gerken.

12
13 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Oh, sorry. Yes, go
14 ahead Jon.

15
16 MR. GERKEN: I -- just respect to OSMS
17 comment on the entire Alaska Peninsula area there, there
18 is no Federal land around Port Heiden, Port Moller,
19 Chignik would fall into a whole different other area.
20 There's no Federal jurisdiction in Sand Point or in
21 Nelson Lagoon. The primary Federal lands with freshwater
22 subsistence fishing opportunity for federally qualified
23 users, only really occur in Cold Bay.....

24
25 MS. TRUMBLE: Thank you.

26
27 (Simultaneous speech)

28
29 MR. GERKEN: so, just to clarify
30 the Federal lands, but.....

31
32 MS. TRUMBLE: Thank you, this is Della.
33 That's what I was trying to get.....

34
35 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Go ahead.

36
37 MS. TRUMBLE: that's what I was
38 trying to get at, because Alaska Peninsula area, there's
39 only a small area, when you're looking at Russell and
40 Trout Creek within the Izembek Refuge, those are within
41 those boundaries. So, when you're trying to say Alaska
42 Peninsula area, I'm going, no, no, I'd stick, I'd stay
43 with the State, for my personal use, I use the State.
44 But just if I mean, like I say, if we're stuck in Cold
45 Bay and trust me, people from here are going to Nelson
46 Lagoon or False Pass, we do get stuck in the Cold Bay,
47 I think the last little bit of time somebody got stuck
48 over there about a month ago was six days, so. But yeah
49 that, that clarification is what I really was trying to
50 get at, thank you.

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

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, Della. Are there any other questions or comments? Go ahead, Coral.

MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah, I have a question, possibly for Della to clarify, if I could. I just have a question for you, Della, since it sounds like currently if you have a State subsistence license, you can fish this area. And so, like you were talking about, if this passes, then you will now have to have, or if we passed it, and you have to have a Federal subsistence permit, which it sounds like you're suggesting. Is that gonna prevent people like you were saying, like, yeah, if you get stuck in Cold Bay say, and you go fishing, say you already have a State, but now you're not used to having to have a Federal permit and say, you land there Friday at six o' clock and now the office is closed, then you're not going to be able to fish because now there's a Federal permit requirement. Do you see that as an issue in any way?

MS. TRUMBLE: No, no, thank you. Yeah, no. You're gonna be able to -- I can use the State one, I mean, I've got, I think in the times, let's say there were restrictions put in place, in that only Federal subsistence has a priority. Then that comes into play, I think more so. But for the most part, most people here, I think, are going to go into -- we're going to utilize the State program.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, did you have.....

MS. TRUMBLE: (Distortion)

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Sorry. Go ahead, Della.

MS. TRUMBLE: And this issue came mainly from people, some residents in Cold Bay. But it just -- like I say, it -- the other part of this was creating an opportunity in the event that there are low numbers of salmon. A few years back, there were numbers that were low, and so that's when this concern does come into play and this opportunity does help people, and if some -- if that happens using Buskin is an example, it can happen.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. So, I will have some comments. But first moral support is back

1 at the table. Is there -- are there any updates from the
2 table before I make -- okay, so my comments right now,
3 and then I will ask if we need to take a stand down so
4 that we can -- because I'm just seeing frowns around the
5 table right now. My comments are, at this point, unless
6 I hear something pretty strong that changes my opinion,
7 I'm inclined to support the motion on the floor, which
8 is the, the proposal with the OSM recommended changes,
9 because it does put some limits in place which aren't
10 there now. And I do support that, and it takes away, for
11 now, the requirement to have the Federal permit. So, I
12 do hear the, the comments being made that really there's
13 only the one area of Federal jurisdiction and that is
14 Russell and Trout Creek. So, having the Federal permit
15 that you would get in Cold Bay, isn't really a barrier
16 because that's where you'd be fishing, is in Cold Bay.
17 So, I hear those comments. But for me, I also think that
18 doing this in a staged approach is fine. So, if this
19 year, or in this cycle we approve this, we get some,
20 some limits in place. And then next cycle, if it seems
21 like we need to add in requirement for a Federal permit,
22 we can do that in the next step. It seems like that
23 might be a better step and less confusing because I
24 think there are a lot of things going on in this
25 proposal, and I do think that it -- like I said, it is
26 a bit confusing. So, I'm okay, again, getting limits in
27 place now and then we can readdress the requirement for
28 a Federal permit down the road. And those, those are my
29 comments. And I see Coral has her hand up, go ahead.

30
31 MS. CHERNOFF: So, can we clarify how --
32 who can currently -- so -- so, for subsistence people
33 can fish in this area currently, if they have a Federal
34 or, or State subsistence license.

35
36 MR. KOLLER: Yeah. Through the Chair.
37 Right now, there is no Federal subsistence permit
38 available. So, people fish if they want to fish under
39 Federal subsistence regulations. They just do so with a
40 State permit and report their harvest on that.

41
42 MS. CHERNOFF: Okay.

43
44 MR. KOLLER: Yeah.

45
46 MS. CHERNOFF: So, question two is, if
47 there -- if that ruling wasn't in place. Is it only
48 Federal public waters there? But because that ruling is
49 in place, you can use a State subsistence license. Which
50 then leads me to ask if there is a Federal permit to

000121

1 fish in that area, then will that rescind that ruling
2 where you can have either or?

3

4 MR. KOLLER: Yeah. Through the Chair. It
5 would, the proposal is to require a Federal permit so
6 that, that would mean that you couldn't use a State
7 permit, yes. And, and as far as Federal subsistence
8 fishing jurisdiction goes, you should have books in
9 front of you, the regulation books, the blue cover on
10 page 48, there's a map and the pink on the map, roughly,
11 and it's not inclusive, but roughly gives you an idea
12 of where Federal fisheries jurisdiction is on the Alaska
13 Peninsula, just, just for your information. Thank you.

14

15 MS. TRUMBLE: Madam Chair.

16

17 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Yep, go
18 ahead.

19

20 MS. TRUMBLE: This is Della. I guess in
21 thinking back through this whole process, we started
22 this with rescinding some State regulations for
23 subsistence on various systems, and that's, and then
24 that's why -- my biggest thing is having a problem with
25 the whole, the Alaska Peninsula area, is the issue that
26 I'm maybe Pat can add to that discussion or has any
27 thoughts in regard to that.

28

29 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So, I would
30 rephrase the question to make sure we're all on the same
31 page, but I'm not sure I completely understood. Pat, did
32 you understand Della's question? Do you want to respond?

33

34 MR. HOLMES: Not completely.

35

36 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, Della, can
37 you repeat what your concern is with the Alaska
38 Peninsula? So, say what you just said, but use maybe
39 more words and slightly different words, because I don't
40 think we tracked what, what you meant.

41

42 MS. TRUMBLE: It's the Federal FP25-07
43 seeks to prohibit the use of nets and establish more
44 conservative daily harvest limits for Russell and Trout
45 Creek drainages. It also proposes to require a Federal
46 permit in the Alaska Peninsula area. This, that my issue
47 is in the Alaska Peninsula area, and I think in when we
48 -- this referring to Russell and Trout Creek drainages,
49 not the Alaska Peninsula area. Alaska
50 Peninsula area is a big area.

1

2 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. So, what --
3 I think then, that, I think there are some of us at the
4 table are saying the same thing as what you just said.
5 We're concerned that the permit requirement in the
6 original proposal is for the whole Alaska Peninsula, and
7 that's why some of us are leaning toward the modified
8 language from OSM, which removes the requirement for the
9 Federal permit. So, basically it would be status quo.
10 So, whatever permit you use now to access a subsistence
11 fishery resources would be -- would continue to be the
12 same, period. So, I think we're, I think we're on the
13 same page about that. And I'm looking down the table to
14 see.

15

16 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Oh sorry, all
17 right. The table is nodding. Yes, so, what's on the
18 floor right now again, is to adopt the proposal as
19 modified by OSM. So, what that means is there's not
20 going to be the Federal permit requirement for the whole
21 Alaska Peninsula. The harvest limits will not be more
22 restrictive than State sport fishing limits. And I'm not
23 being super specific there because, if we signal that
24 that's the intent, then Justin can make sure the language
25 is correct. I don't want to get into wordsmithing that
26 on the fly during this meeting. I think that we're going
27 to get really tripped up there. But if we signal that
28 we don't want the limits to be more restrictive than
29 State sport fishing, Justin can make sure that gets in
30 there. And then, the other change would be retaining the
31 ability for the certain low pact, low impact method and
32 means. So, that's what's on the -- that's the motion
33 that's on the floor right now. Coral, go ahead.

34

35 MS. CHERNOFF: I just have a question,
36 about what is considered low-impact methods and means.

37

38 MR. KOLLER: Yeah, through the Chair.
39 There's currently a regulation that we are -- OSM
40 modification chose to preserve that it says, accept a
41 permit is not necessary to take salmon by snagging, by
42 hand or rod and reel, using a spear, bow and arrow, or
43 capturing by bare hand.

44

45 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, thank you.
46 All right, can I get a sense of whether people are ready
47 to vote, whether we need to discuss this more on the
48 record or if we need -- do we need to stand down so
49 people have a few minutes to have a mental break? So,
50 are we, are we ready to vote? Nods head. Okay, so I'm

000123

1 seeing some people seeing nods of heads. Is anybody not
2 ready to vote? Okay, then, one last chance, are there
3 any further -- any final questions or comments on this
4 proposal?

5

6 MR. GERKEN: Madam Chair, this is Jon
7 Gerken. I'll throw a wrench into the conversation.

8

9 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, go
10 ahead, Jon.

11

12 MR. GERKEN: The -- I think the name of
13 the proposal might be throwing everybody off. There are
14 other areas around Cold Bay that do account for much of
15 the subsistence sockeye harvest. And when we made those
16 rescind -- when we rescinded Trout and Russell Creek the
17 -- there were Federal regulations that were in place on
18 some very popular areas that people subsistence fish on.
19 So, Mortensen's, Thin Point, Old Man Lagoon or excuse
20 me not Old Man, that's not Federal. And then there's a
21 couple of, of tributaries/lakes and sort of northern
22 Cold Bay, Swan Lake and a couple of other named areas.
23 Depending upon the year, those things -- one produces
24 more subsistence opportunity than others, and these are
25 typically always harvested under State regs, but there
26 is some thought that, you know, now that we're bringing
27 more attention to Federal regulations in the area, that
28 people may utilize the subsistence, Federal subsistence
29 options on Mortensen's, Thin Point and Swan Lake. And
30 so, there was, you know, some thought that we would want
31 to track that additional harvest, now that we're
32 bringing more attention to the area with respect to
33 Federal subsistence opportunities. So, I think we're
34 getting tripped up on the name, but there's -- I just
35 want everybody to know there's other areas besides
36 Russell and Trout Creek under Federal jurisdiction that
37 do account for Federal subsistence opportunity in the
38 area, thank you.

39

40 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, Jon. So, a
41 question for you then, those other fishing opportunities
42 -- Federal subsistence fishing opportunities in the
43 area, is a Federal subsistence permit currently required
44 to fish in those areas?

45

46 MR. GERKEN: No, there's no Federal
47 subsistence permit requirement for fish in the area at
48 the moment. You would be -- if you fish under Federal
49 regulations, then you just record that on a State
50 subsistence permit, and then we would work with the

000124

1 State, I guess, to figure out how many fish were
2 harvested under State regulations versus Federal
3 regulations. And I'm not sure, currently we do that, or
4 we have a way of doing that. But just from my perspective
5 as a Federal Manager, you always want to know how many
6 fish are being taken out of a fishery so you can make
7 better decisions biologically and for escapement and for
8 opportunity. So, thank you.

9
10 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Thank you,
11 Jon. Pat, go ahead.

12
13 MR. HOLMES: Yeah, I'm getting ready to
14 just suggest we go for the question. I think the
15 discussions on Nurse Lagoon and Mortensen's those are
16 probably used more I would guess by folks from Cold Bay
17 and probably, I don't know if somebody correct me,
18 probably don't have the conflict that occurs in Cold Bay
19 with the Cold Bay residents. So, I would just leave that
20 out of the discussion and just go with the modification
21 that we have before us.

22
23 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. So, I
24 think we're ready to vote. Are there any final questions
25 or comments? Okay, all right. DeAnna, can you do a roll
26 call vote, please.

27
28 MS. PERRY: Yes, Madam Chair. Starting
29 with the maker of the motion, Patrick Holmes for or
30 against?

31
32 MR. HOLMES: Yes.

33
34 MS. PERRY: Christopher Price.

35
36 MR. PRICE: Yes.

37
38 MS. PERRY: Coral Chernoff.

39
40 MS. CHERNOFF: Yes.

41
42 MS. PERRY: Della Trumble.

43
44 MS. TRUMBLE: I'm gonna say no, I'm going
45 to say no. I've got a problem with the way this whole
46 thing is written. It's just, yeah. I'm, no.

47
48 MS. PERRY: Okay, thank you, Della.
49 Natasha Hayden. Natasha, I see that your microphone may
50 be muted. Star six to unmute yourself. And, Ms. Hayden,

1 we're still not hearing you on our end. I'll finish roll
2 call and call and come back. Brett Richardson.

3

4 MR. RICHARDSON: Yes.

5

6 MS. PERRY: Rebecca Skinner.

7

8 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes.

9

10 MS. PERRY: And, Natasha, were you able
11 to unmute your line?

12

13 (No response)

14

15 Okay, Madam Chair, without that vote,
16 you do have five for and one against motion passes.

17

18 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, thank you.
19 All right, I think that we will get through the last
20 proposal for action item, and then we will probably wrap
21 it up for the day. So, that means that tomorrow morning
22 we would be starting with the 2026 Fisheries Resource
23 Monitoring Program and PINS development item. So, the
24 last proposal we have is FP 25-08. This is Adak and
25 Kagalaska Salmon Limits and Permitting. Justin.

26

27 MR. KOLLER: Thank you, Madam Chair.
28 Justin Koller with the Office of Subsistence Management.
29 You'll hear a lot of similarities with the last proposal.
30 The same proponent with a couple of subtle differences.
31 So, fisheries proposal, FP25-08 was submitted by the
32 Southern Alaska Fish and Wildlife Field Office of the
33 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Very similar to the last
34 proposal, it seeks to prohibit nets and set more
35 conservative daily harvest limits for freshwater and
36 Adak and Kagalaska Islands and require a Federal permit
37 to fish in the Aleutian Islands area. It also requests
38 to remove the separate harvest limit for the Unalaska
39 and Adak districts, and to remove regulatory language
40 that is no longer relevant to the Federal Subsistence
41 Fisheries Regulations. The Federal Subsistence Board
42 rescinded the fishing closure and Adak and Kagalaska
43 Islands Federal freshwaters, during the last fisheries
44 regulatory cycle that resulted in the Aleutian Islands
45 area wide Federal subsistence fishing regulations
46 applying in those waters. The proponent states that
47 these regulations are not sufficient to protect fish
48 populations in these Federal waters, and that some
49 regulations should be removed because they are outdated
50 and unnecessary. The proponent further states that

1 requiring a Federal permit throughout the Aleutian
2 Islands area will better account for fish harvested
3 under Federal regulation and aid management of the
4 fisheries. If adopted, this proposal would have four
5 distinct effects. Number one is the permit requirement,
6 federally qualified users harvesting under Federal
7 subsistence regulations in the Aleutian Islands area
8 would be required to obtain a Federal permit. Currently,
9 a State permit is required for fishing in the Adak and
10 Unalaska districts under Federal regulations, but not
11 in other districts of the Aleutian Islands area.
12 Therefore, this proposal would introduce new
13 requirements to obtain and report with a Federal, excuse
14 me, with a subsistence permit for the Akutan, Umnak and
15 Atka, Amlia districts. This would improve harvest
16 enumeration, would make Federal subsistence permitting
17 requirements more burdensome than State subsistence
18 permitting requirements in these areas. Currently, the
19 only Federal permit issuing office is in the Aleutian
20 Islands area, in excuse me, in the Aleutian Islands areas
21 in Adak and federally qualified subsistence users,
22 fishing under a Federal permit in the other districts
23 would need to travel to Adak procure a permit, unless
24 the permits could be issued from other locations. Number
25 two is the net prohibition. Federally qualified
26 subsistence users would not be permitted to use nets to
27 harvest salmon in freshwaters of Adak and Kagalaska
28 Island. Allowable gear would include gear types from
29 general regulation that are not nets. And again,
30 examples of those practical gear types would be rod and
31 reel, handline and spear. The third effect is the harvest
32 Limits, federally qualified subsistence users harvesting
33 salmon and freshwaters of Adak and Kagalaska Islands
34 would be limited to five salmon per day, plus five
35 additional salmon per household member listed on the
36 permit. Compared to the current Federal subsistence
37 regulations, this would reduce harvest opportunity, and
38 also these limits are more restrictive than State sport
39 fishing regulations. Removing the 25 fish per household
40 member salmon limit for the Unalaska district would add
41 consistency across the Aleutian Islands area. All the
42 significant Federal public freshwaters in the Unalaska
43 district are closed to subsistence fishing under Federal
44 regulation, so the effects will be negligible unless
45 those waters are reopened.

46
47 The fourth effect is the simplification
48 of regulations. The Aleutian Islands Area regulations
49 will be simplified by removing unnecessary language that
50 is not applicable to the Federal subsistence program.

1 The primary regulatory language to be removed relates
2 to specifying items regarding take on permits. The only
3 way to change Federal subsistence regulations regarding
4 take of fish is through a proposal during the regulatory
5 cycle, or in-season by special action, so regulations
6 referring to exceptions contained in permit conditions
7 do not apply to the Federal program because those
8 conditions cannot simply be added to permits. The OSM
9 preliminary conclusion is to support proposal FP25-08
10 with modification to oppose changing the harvest limits
11 in the Unalaska and Adak districts and oppose requiring
12 a Federal permit in the Aleutian Islands area. Since
13 nets would be allowed in the majority of the Aleutian
14 Islands area. We modified to retain the current
15 regulation regarding attending nets in the Unalaska
16 area. Additionally, we'd like to retain the portion of
17 the regulations about obtaining an additional permit.
18 Rescinding the Federal subsistence fishing closure in
19 the freshwaters of Adak and Kagalaska Islands created
20 opportunity for federally qualified subsistence users,
21 but could lead to conservation concerns if nets are
22 permitted. Prohibiting nets will help mitigate these
23 conservation concerns. Without the use of nets,
24 subsistence fishers will be restricted to gear types
25 such as rod and reel, handline, and spear, placing a
26 practical limit on the number of fish that can be
27 harvested and mitigating the need for more conservative
28 harvest limit. A more conservative harvest limit, for
29 the Adak district in comparison to the wider Aleutian
30 Islands area, is already in regulation and should
31 provide for conservation in the Federal freshwaters of
32 Adak and Kagalaska Islands.

33
34 Additionally, the proposed harvest
35 limit would make Federal subsistence regulations more
36 restrictive than State sport fishing regulations. The
37 ability to obtain an additional permit in the Adak and
38 Unalaska districts should be retained to match State
39 subsistence regulations. The Federal in-season Manager
40 can issue special actions if necessary for conservation
41 purposes. Requiring a Federal permit for the entire
42 Aleutian Islands area would institute a new permit
43 requirement in three districts where the State does not
44 currently require a subsistence permit, making Federal
45 requirements more onerous than State subsistence
46 requirements. Additionally, requiring the permit in all
47 portions of the Aleutian Islands area would be
48 burdensome for federally qualified subsistence users
49 because the only Federal issuing office is in Adak.
50 Again, the Federal Subsistence Management is -- does not

1 have the ability to issue permits or report harvest
2 online. But it could be available for the 2025 regulatory
3 year. Aleutian Islands area regulations would be
4 simplified by removing unnecessary language that is not
5 applicable to the Federal Subsistence Management
6 Program. And finally, retaining the harvest limit for
7 the Unalaska district may be necessary for conservation
8 purposes in case the Federal public closed waters are
9 reopened. And those Federal subsistence closures and the
10 Unalaska area, we've talked about those in previous
11 fisheries cycles. Those will be reviewed and revisited
12 next fisheries regulatory cycle for potential action by
13 this Council and the Board, thank you.

14

15 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Okay,
16 again we do not have any reports on consultations with
17 Tribes or ANCSA corporations for this proposal. For
18 agency comments, do we have anyone from the Alaska
19 Department of Fish and Game?

20

21 (No comment)

22

23 Do we have any Federal agency comments?

24

25 MR. GERKEN: Madam Chair, this is Jon
26 Gerken.

27

28 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Go ahead, Jon.

29

30 MR. GERKEN: Yeah, thank -- thanks OSM
31 for the summary. This is very similar to the last
32 proposal. There were, you know, new Federal fishing
33 regulations put into effect when the fisheries closures
34 were rescinded, and so the intent of the proposal is to
35 you know, eliminate gear types that may you know, harvest
36 a lot of fish, those being nets in these small streams,
37 there is no real abundance estimates in any of these
38 systems. The majority of the subsistence that currently
39 occurs there now is within the State saltwater for, you
40 know, the bulk of the subsistence, and so we didn't
41 really feel like it was the intent of the rescinding of
42 the fisheries closures, to add additional gear types
43 into these small systems. And then similar to the last
44 proposal, the -- we mirrored this sport fishing
45 regulations in the area, to sort of minimize or somewhat
46 hold back some of the subsistence harvest in these, in
47 these small streams. And, and again, from a Federal
48 management perspective, knowing the amount of harvest
49 that's going on from a Federal user perspective, is, is

50

1 important for making those decisions on the Federal
2 side. So, thank you.

3

4 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, Jon. I'm
5 going to ask a question because this kind of relates to
6 Justin's presentation. I'm trying to understand with the
7 limits. The OSM report says that the proposed
8 subsistence limits are lower than the sport limits. I
9 hear Jon saying his proposal mirrors the sport limits,
10 so it sounds like he doesn't think those limits are
11 lower. So, I'm trying to understand, is there a conflict
12 in the numbers here or what is going on. So, either, I
13 guess I'll start with Justin, and then if Jon can weigh
14 in. Go ahead, Justin.

15

16 MR. KOLLER: Thank you, Madam Chair.
17 There's a subtle difference between the proposed
18 regulatory language and the OSM modification, which is
19 the State regulatory language. And that is the ability
20 to take 10 salmon under 20 inches. So, basically you can
21 take a certain amount over 20 inches under the State
22 regulation, and you can take ten additional under 20
23 inches. Now practically that's kind of hard to do, to
24 thread the needle and get all your fish above 20 and
25 then catch ten below 20. But on paper we can't -- OSM
26 can't recommend that there's a possibility that our
27 regulations are more restrictive than the State.

28

29

30 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. And then,
31 Jon, did you have anything you wanted to add?

32

33 MR. GERKEN: No, Justin did a good job
34 on the summary on that, that is the difference is, the
35 difference in the 10 and under. And then, you know,
36 species are going at different times. So, thank you or
37 running at different.

38

39 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, all right.
40 Are there any other -- so, moving back into our going
41 down the list. Are there any other Federal agency
42 comments.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 Okay, are there any tribal comments?

47

48 (No comments)

49

50

1 Are there any comments from advisory
2 groups that include other Regional Advisory Councils,
3 the State Fish and Game Advisory Committees and
4 Subsistence Resource Commissions.

5
6 MS. PERRY: No, Madam Chair.

7
8 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. And are
9 there any written public comments? Justin.

10
11 MR. KOLLER: Forgive me, Madam Chair. I
12 know there were no written public comments, thank you.

13
14 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, thanks.
15 We do not have any blue cards here in the room. Is there
16 anyone on the phone that wants to give public testimony?

17
18 (No response)

19
20 Okay. So, we were to the point where I
21 would like a motion to adopt this proposal.

22
23 MR. HOLMES: Madam Chair, I'd like to
24 make a motion to adopt the modified OSM preliminary
25 inclusion proposal.

26
27 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, thank
28 you, Pat. Is there a second? Thank you, Chris. Okay.
29 Council discussion, is there anyone wishing to speak on
30 this or ask a question? Brett, go ahead.

31
32 MR. RICHARDSON: Brett Richardson, I
33 support the proposal with the modification. I think it
34 makes sense. I do have an additional modification to
35 suggest in the proposed Federal regulation part two in
36 the Unalaska district, you may take salmon for
37 subsistence purposes from 6 am until 9 pm. I would extend
38 that time limit, or change the wording to say dusk,
39 rather than an hour time limit during the year, sunset
40 happens at all different times, and during the summer
41 it gets dark around 11, in June and July. And so
42 sometimes with weather concerns, not being able to set
43 a net until after work, which means starting out on your
44 boat at 6 pm, you may not be done in time. And you know,
45 putting it at dusk would give you kind of enough time
46 to set a net, get some results, and get back in before
47 for a night set in.

48
49 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Justin, do you have
50 a comment?

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

MR. KOLLER: Yeah, thank you. Through the Chair, Mr. Richardson, that that sounds like a perfectly reasonable modification to me. Unfortunately, I think it's outside the scope of the original proposal and the analysis right now. The proponent spoke to the Unalaska district strictly in terms of, of the changing the limits to make the limits the same area wide. So, I think if we wanted to modify regulatory language about the time period you can fish for subsistence purposes in the Unalaska district will have to be another proposal.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, are you absolutely sure or is that something you'd like to check on and, and confirm back with us?

MR. KOLLER: Well, absolutely is a strong term. I would say I'm 99% sure. And honestly, I don't have anybody else to check with other than myself, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, all right. So, I -- and I personally like that proposed change, but it does sound like it's outside the scope of what was analyzed and proposed. The public had no idea that that would -- that's something that we would be considering. So, that may be something that needs to get proposed for the next regulatory cycle, which I think is a really good suggestion. And then in case people weren't sure that -- it looks like that's on page 107, the little second paragraph from the top is where that language would go. Okay, is there any further discussion or questions on the motion? Pat, go ahead.

MR. HOLMES: My comment and brief question I had talked with Rick Oso [UI 3:24:19/2] yesterday or last night and it sounded like he wanted to call in and participate, but I, my phone battery is dead as a doornail to let him know we're doing it. If you want to take a short break, and if anybody's got his phone number, we could get him on-line, maybe. But we're moving beyond that. I would like to ask our OSM folks on the modified length proposed Federal regulation 117 through one -- page 118. At the bottom you have deleting keep a record on the reverse side of the permit for subsistence caught fish. You must complete a record immediately upon taking the subsistence caught fish and return it no later than October 31. I was wondering about the logic of that, dropping it.

1 MR. KOLLER: Through the Chair. Yeah, I
2 believe that in the spirit of simplifying regulations
3 and removing text that's unnecessary and also irrelevant
4 to the proponent. And I'll let him speak to this in a
5 minute, but I believe he wanted to remove that because
6 it's already in our regulations that you have to follow
7 the terms of permits when you get them, including
8 reporting periods. So, it's just unnecessary text that's
9 in regulation too many times, and we're trying to
10 simplify it for the user, thank you.

11
12 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, is there
13 any further discussion or questions?

14
15 MR. HOLMES: I'm sorry, I was wondering
16 if you wanted me to rattle Rick's cage or we'll just
17 proceed. I kind of got a good feeling that the modified
18 proposal is where we'd go, but I just want to see what
19 the rest of the board would like to know.

20
21 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, I think we -
22 - at this point, we will proceed because we've passed
23 the point of the public testimony.

24
25 (Pause
26
27 All right, if there's no further
28 questions or comments, then we'll move into a vote. So,
29 just to restate the final motion for the record, the
30 motion on the floor is to adopt this proposal as modified
31 by OSM. Okay, so, I'm not seeing any hands up. DeAnna,
32 if you could do the roll call vote.

33
34 MS. PERRY: Yes, Madam Chair. We'll start
35 with the maker of the motion. Patrick Holmes for or
36 against?

37
38 MR. HOLMES: For

39
40 MS. PERRY: Christopher Price.

41
42 MR. PRICE: Yes, please.

43
44 MS. PERRY: Coral Chernoff.

45
46 MS. CHERNOFF: Yes.

47
48 MS. PERRY: Della Trumble.

49
50 MS. TRUMBLE: Yes.

000133

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

MS. PERRY: Natasha Hayden.

MS. HAYDEN: Yes.

MS. PERRY: Thank you. Brett Richardson.

MR. RICHARDSON: Yes.

MS. PERRY: Rebecca Skinner.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes.

MS. PERRY: Madam Chair, that was a unanimous vote, 7 to 0, motion passes.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, thank you. Okay, so that takes us through all of our regulatory proposals. It's five after seven, so, we'll go ahead and break for the day and reconvene tomorrow morning at 9am, and the first item on the agenda will be 12C, which is the 2026, Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program, and Priority Information Needs development.

(Pause)

But before we do that, is there anything else for the good of the order that anybody wants to clarify or bring up?

(No response)

Okay. Well, we'll see everyone back here at 9 am tomorrow, thank you.

MS PERRY: Thank you.

(Off record)

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Rafael Morel, for Lighthouse Integrated Services Corp, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered ___ through ___ contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the KODIA/ALEUTIANS SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME II recorded on the 4th day of September;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and ability;

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

DATED at Isabela, Puerto Rico this #th day of September 2024.

Rafael Morel
Chief Project Manager