

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

KODIAK NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE
VISITOR CENTER
Kodiak, Alaska
March 6, 2025

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Rebecca L. Skinner, Chair
- Jeffrey L. Wasley
- Patrick B. Holmes
- Samuel I. Rohrer
- Karen A. Kalmakoff
- Christopher L. Price
- Coral A. Chernoff
- Daniel J. Smith
- Natasha M. Hayden
- Brett J. Richardson

Regional Council Coordinator, Lisa Hutchinson

Recorded and transcribed by:

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

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Kodiak, Alaska - 3/06/2025)

(On record)

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. It's 9 am. I think we're going to go ahead and get started. All right. So, this is the Kodiak/Aleutians RAC meeting of March 6th and 7th, 2025.

(Pause)

Okay. We're going to go ahead and start with the invocation, and then there will be meeting announcements in a minute with all of the information that we need to report. Pat, I didn't check with you, but do you want to do the invocation?

MR. HOLMES: Yeah. Let's all kind of bow our heads and close our eyes. And I think it's so important to not forget all of our elders who passed away in recent years, and this year, and think about our duties to our communities rather than to ourselves individually, and I think that probably will sum things up. So brief pause and amen.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Pat. All right. We'll call the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. Roll call and establish quorum. Lisa, do you mind doing this?

MS. HUTCHINSON: Good morning, Council. Good morning, everybody. I will start the roll call on the Council. Jeffrey Wasley.

MR. WASLEY: Present.

MS. HUTCHINSON: Patrick Holmes.

MR. HOLMES: Here.

MS. HUTCHINGSON: Samuel Rohrer.

MR. ROHRER: Here.

MS. HUTCHINGSON: Karen Kalmakoff.

MS. KALMAKOFF: Here.

MS. HUTCHINGSON: Christopher Price.

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. PRICE: Here.

MS. HUTCHINSON: Coral Chernoff.

MS. CHERNOFF: Here.

MS. HUTCHINSON: Daniel Smith.

MR. SMITH: Here.

MS. HUTCHINSON: Natasha Hayden.

MS. HAYDEN: Here.

MS. HUTCHINSON: Brett Richardson.

MR. RICHARDSON: Here

MS. HUTCHINSON: And Rebecca Skinner.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Here.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, Chair -- Chair Skinner, we have ten members -- seated members present, and everybody is here in person. So, congratulations for everybody getting here. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank you, Lisa. So, item number four on the agenda is meeting announcements. Lisa, if you'd like to do that.

MS. HUTCHINSON: Yeah. Good morning. First of all, I wanted to just -- I have to make notes you guys.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: I can start with some meeting announcements while you do that.

MS. HUTCHINSON: The phone number and everything is good.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Well, I was going to start with -- for the RAC we're going to do a Council photo at the break this morning. I don't want to cut into lunch because I think everyone's going to need the time for lunch. So, when we break, maybe around 10:30 or so, we'll go outside somewhere, maybe by the bear statue, maybe in the sun, maybe in the park across the street and get a group photo of the Council and then

1 also there was a request for staff as well. And, Lisa,
2 I'll turn it back over to you.

3
4 MS. HUTCHINSON: Okay. Thank you. So,
5 first of all, I just wanted to welcome our two new
6 Council members. Daniel Smith, he's from Kodiak, and
7 Karen Kalmakoff from Sand Point. So welcome to the
8 Council. And also, I wanted to congratulate our two
9 renewing Council members, Natasha Hayden and Brett
10 Richardson. So, thanks again for your commitment to the
11 Council and everybody else for being here and it's great
12 to have ten full-seated members. So, a quick statement.
13 First of all, for those attending the meeting in person,
14 all of you, the two of you out there. Please make sure
15 that you sign in at the front table and if you come back
16 tomorrow, do the same. And if you would like to address
17 the Council during the meeting for folks in the room,
18 please fill out a blue testifier form that's also on
19 that front table over there and then give it to me or
20 somebody else on staff. And then I can alert the Chair
21 that you would like to address Council. And for all
22 participants that are on the telephone, we're calling
23 in -- if you're calling in by Teams, you're -- if you
24 would like to speak, you can do the little raise hand
25 thing on the Teams thing, and I will be monitoring that.
26 And I'll let the Chair know that you would like to speak.
27 And then when she calls on, she or he calls on you. We
28 will let you know. If you're just calling in from the -
29 - on your telephone, on your remote phone, you can press
30 star five to raise your hand and we will be able to see
31 that on the monitor as well. And then we will call you
32 either by announcing your -- the four last digits of
33 your phone number. Since we won't be able to identify
34 who you are to see if you have an opportunity to speak.
35 For those of you online, you can also find the meeting
36 materials on the Council website at
37 doi.gov/subsistence/regions/ka as is in Kodiak Aleutians
38 underscore materials. You can also just google Federal
39 Subsistence Management Program and look for Kodiak
40 Aleutians Kodiak/Aleutians Council. And then the ethics
41 statement, a quick statement. Just a reminder to all of
42 you, our meetings are conducted by Robert's Rules, which
43 helps us provide structure and maintain order throughout
44 the meeting. All participants, Council staff and public
45 members are expected to be courteous and respectful in
46 all interactions as a matter of meeting etiquette. It
47 is understood that the nature of some of the issues
48 discussed at these meetings can be difficult and
49 controversial, although some comments shared throughout
50 the meeting may be passionate, no insults or foul

1 language will be tolerated in this public meeting. If
2 any kind of unruly behavior or insulting language from
3 anybody occurs during the meeting, please be advised
4 that I or the does as the designated federal Officer of
5 the meeting will intervene. And thank you for allowing
6 this time to share this information. Madam Chair.

7
8 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Great. Thank you,
9 Lisa. Okay. Agenda item five is welcome and
10 introductions. So welcome, everyone, to the March 2025
11 Kodiak/Aleutians RAC meeting. I'm going to start with
12 introductions in the room and then we'll go to online.
13 So, for introductions, if we can keep it fairly brief,
14 your name and where you're from or who you represent.
15 And then for Council members, you will have more
16 opportunity to share Council comments in a couple of
17 agenda items. So, this time I'm going to start over to
18 my right at Pat, and then we'll work our way around the
19 table.

20
21 MR. HOLMES: Pat Holmes, I've been on the
22 Council, I don't know. I can't remember 25 years or
23 pushing it. Anyway, been in Kodiak first got here in '63
24 and continues in '74 here and then out to Peninsula and
25 the Aleutians, and I passionately care about folks being
26 able to utilize their subsistence. Thank you.

27
28 MR. RICHARDSON: Brett Richardson,
29 Unalaska, Dutch Harbor.

30
31 MS. HAYDEN: Good morning. Natasha
32 Hayden, I'm from Kodiak.

33
34 MR. WALSEY: Hello, I'm Jeff Wasley from
35 Cold Bay. Thank you.

36
37 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Rebecca Skinner
38 from Kodiak.

39
40 MR. PRICE: Christopher Price from
41 Unalaska.

42
43 MS. HUTCHINSON: Lisa Hutchinson, the
44 Council Coordinator. Thank you.

45
46 MS. KALMAKOFF: Karen Kalmakoff from Sand
47 Point, Alaska.

48
49 MR. SMITH: Daniel Smith from Kodiak.

0006

1 MS. CHERNOFF: Coral Chernoff from
2 Kodiak.

3
4 MR. ROHRER: Good morning. Sam Rohrer
5 from Kodiak as well.

6
7 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: And then if we
8 could continue on around. Yeah. And if you're in the
9 room, if you can come up to the public testimony table.

10
11 MS. HOLMAN: Good morning, Madam Chair,
12 members of the Council. My name is Kendra Holman. I'm a
13 wildlife biologist with OSM.

14
15 MS. LA VINE: Good morning, Madam Chair.
16 Members of the Council, I'm Robin La Vine. I'm the
17 subsistence policy coordinator for OSM.

18
19 MR. VANHATTEN: Good morning. Kevin
20 VanHatten, Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge fisheries
21 biologist, pilot.

22
23 MS. FUJII-DOE: Good morning. Danielle
24 Fujii-Doe, deputy refuge manager for Kodiak National
25 Wildlife Refuge.

26
27 MS. KEATING: Good morning. Great to see
28 everyone. Jackie Keating. Division of Subsistence for
29 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

30
31 DR. ROBERTS: Good morning, Madam Chair.
32 Members of the Council. I'm Jason Roberts,
33 anthropologist with OSM.

34
35 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. If we
36 could move to online participants.

37
38 (Simultaneous speech)

39
40 MS. KRUEGER: Good morning. This is
41 Kelly.....

42
43 MR. CHEN: Good morning Madam Chair,
44 Council members.

45
46 MS. KRUEGER: Oh. Go ahead.

47
48 MR. CHEN: Sorry to interrupt. Good
49 morning, Madam Chair and Council members. This is Glenn
50 Chen. I'm the subsistence branch chief for the Bureau

1 of Indian Affairs.

2

3 MS. KRUEGER: Good morning. This is Kelly
4 Krueger with the Division of Sport fish for the Alaska
5 Department of Fish and Game.

6

7 MR. STONE: Good morning. Jarred Stone,
8 fish biologist with the Office of Subsistence
9 Management.

10

11 MS. LEONETTI: Good morning, Council
12 members, this is Ciisquq Crystal Leonetti, director for
13 Office of Subsistence Management, and I was happy to
14 join you last time in Unalaska. Sorry I couldn't be
15 there in person this time, but happy to listen in as I'm
16 available.

17

18 MR. MCKEE: Good morning. This is Chris
19 McKee. I'm the acting deputy director at OSM. Good
20 morning.

21

22 MS. KLEIN: Good morning. This is Jill
23 Klein. I'm the regional subsistence coordinator for the
24 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. I'm based in Anchorage
25 and I'm happy to be able to listen in. Good morning.

26

27 MS. MORROW: Good morning. This is
28 Kristen Morrow with the anthropology division at OSM.

29

30 MR. LIND: Good morning. This is Orville
31 Lind, native liaison for the Office of Subsistence
32 Management. Good morning, everyone.

33

34 MS. VANDERVOORT: Good morning. This is
35 Amy Vandervoort with Alaska Department of Fish and Game.
36 The wildlife biologist outta [sic] King Salmon.

37

38 MS. WILLIAMS: Good morning. This is
39 Alison Williams, wildlife biologist for Izembek National
40 Wildlife Refuge in Cold Bay.

41

42 MR. KALIN: Good morning. This is Jeff
43 Kalin, deputy refuge manager out of Cold Bay.

44

45 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Is there
46 anyone else online?

47

48 MS. DEBENHAM: Good morning. This is
49 Rosalie Debenham with the Bureau of Indian Affairs,
50 Alaska region. 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: All right. Thank you. Is there anyone else online who hasn't introduced themselves yet?

(No response)

Okay. Welcome, everyone. We're going to move then to agenda item six, Election of Officers, and I'll hand this over to Lisa.

MS. HUTCHINSON: Okay. For the record again, my name is Lisa Hutchinson Scarborough. I'm the Council Coordinator for this Kodiak/Aleutians Regional Advisory Council. In accordance with the Council charter, Council members elect a Chair, a Vice Chair and a Secretary for a one-year term. And elections are [sic] usually occur during the winter meeting, which is this meeting, first of the year. I would like to open the floor for nominations of the Council's Chair, and the nominations do not need to be seconded. Do we have any nominations?

MR. HOLMES: I'm Pat Holmes. I'd like to nominate Rebecca Skinner to continue as our Chair. She has a unique ability to multitask way beyond most folks and she does a great job. Thank you.

MS. HUTCHINSON: Okay, Pat, thank you. We have a nominated Rebecca Skinner as Chair. Do we have any other nominations? Okay. Rebecca, do you accept this appointment again?

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: I do, thank you.

MS. HUTCHINSON: Okay. We can just do a voice vote. All those in favor of Rebecca Skinner being your Chair for another year, please say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MS. HUTCHINSON: Any nays?

(No response)

Okay. Congratulations. You are now the Chair again.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank you. Okay. We'll move on to the officer position of Vice

0009

1 Chair, and I'll open the floor for any nominations.
2 Carol, go ahead.

3

4 MS. CHERNOFF: I would renominate
5 Natasha.

6

7 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you.
8 Natasha, do you accept the nomination?

9

10 MS. HAYDEN: Yes.

11

12 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Are there any
13 other nominations?

14

15 (No response)

16

17 Okay. Seeing none. All those in favor
18 of Natasha as Vice Chair say aye.

19

20 IN UNISON: Aye.

21

22 All right. Congratulations, Natasha.
23 Okay. And for the officer position of Secretary, are
24 there any nominations for the officer of Secretary?

25

26 MS. HAYDEN: Madam Chair, I nominate
27 Coral Chernoff.

28

29 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Coral, do
30 you accept this nomination? Was that a yes? Yes. Okay.
31 Are there any further nominations?

32

33 (No response)

34

35 All right. Seeing none. All those in
36 favor of Coral Chernoff as secretary signify by saying
37 aye.

38

39 IN UNISON: Aye.

40

41 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. And I
42 guess I should ask, are there any opposed? All right.
43 Congratulations, Coral. So, our officers then are Chair
44 Rebecca Skinner, Vice Chair Natasha Hayden and Secretary
45 Coral Chernoff. All right. Our next agenda item is to
46 review and adopt the agenda. Is there a motion to adopt?

47

48 MS. CHERNOFF: Motion to adopt.

49

50

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, Coral. Is
2 there a second?

3
4 MR. ROHRER: Second.

5
6 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Sam.
7 Okay. Is there a discussion or amendments? I'll just
8 jump in with some, I guess I'll call them clarifications
9 so that we're all on the same page. So, a reminder, that
10 for time certain, we're going to be hearing about the
11 Gulf of Alaska chinook ESA listing at 11 am today. This
12 afternoon, around 2:00 or 2:30, we'll be hearing from
13 Julie Matweyou, speaking about paralytic shellfish
14 poisoning and then tomorrow at 1:15, we'll be hearing
15 about the Bering Sea chum salmon bycatch item that the
16 North Pacific Council is taking up. Also, I do intend
17 to introduce the -- under action items under 13 to
18 introduce item D, the Federal Wildlife Proposal, item E
19 the Board of Game statewide proposal comment opportunity
20 of the Alaska Board of game call for proposals and G
21 Alaska Board of Fish call for proposals today. So, we'll
22 introduce those items today.

23
24 Get out on the table potential proposals
25 that people want to bring forward, but then not take
26 action until tomorrow so that there's opportunity
27 throughout the day and tonight for Council members to
28 if they need to have further conversation or come to
29 some sort of compromise position. And I think those are
30 all my clarifications. Are there any other amendments
31 or comments on the agenda?

32
33 Jason? Yes, thank you. So, another
34 change is going to be -- so just a clarification that
35 Jason Roberts is going to give an update on the Federal
36 Subsistence Board actions on the last set of fisheries
37 proposals before we get into the discussion about
38 further -- under G, right? Yeah. Before we get into
39 discussion about the Board of Fish proposals, and that's
40 just to remind everyone the action that came through
41 this process before we start talking about fisheries
42 related items under the Board of Fish. All right. Is
43 there any other discussion or questions? Okay. All those
44 in favor of approving the agenda as discussed, signify
45 by saying aye.

46
47 IN UNISON: Aye.

48
49 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Any opposed?

50

1 (No response)

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

Okay, we have an agenda. Agenda item 8, is review and approval of previous meeting minutes. Which is page seven in the original, the little book with the bears on the front. Is there a motion to approve the previous meeting minutes?

MR. PRICE: I make a motion to approve the previous meeting minutes.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Chris. Is there a second? Thank you, Karen. All right. Is there -- are there any corrections or discussion on the meeting minutes, or do people need a couple of minutes just to refresh your recollection? Pat.

MR. HOLMES: Just a comment on the minutes. On my quoting of my comments last time around. Down at the bottom it says fair to Midland. Midland. Like just somewhere in between. Not Midlands in the middle of the U.S. or wherever. Just a slight typo. And then I -- on the discussion of the Buskin River Salmon limits it had presented that the average number of federal permits last year was 26 a year. And I think that when we have discussion of subsistence harvest it would be important in the future to have both the state and federal because for the Buskin, 95% of it is through the state subsistence permits, and so that would present quite a different picture than just quoting the federal ones. And that's it. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks Pat. Are there any further corrections or comments?

(No comments)

Okay. Seeing none, is there any objection to approving the minutes as discussed? Okay. Hearing none, that motion passes. Okay. Next item number nine. Council member reports. This time I'll start at the Sam Rohrer end of the table.

MR. ROHRER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I don't have a lot to report. Just -- I guess things are -- most of my experience is centered on the west side of the island, and a series of easy winters. The last couple have really helped. Our deer numbers were quite down island wide, but particularly on the west side. With the easy winters we've been seeing a really healthy

1 rebound and so that's good. Of course, with this winter's
2 we can all see its basically spring, almost summer here.
3 So, we anticipate further, just continued recovery for
4 deer. So that's really good. Interesting, you know,
5 silver's, the coho numbers, I think, were down island
6 wide particularly on the west side. It was just a
7 fraction of what we normally see. So that was a
8 disappointment last year and, hopefully that was just a
9 weird anomaly, and we'll see those numbers come back
10 this year. So that was happening. And then I think
11 actually, I think that's about -- the only other thing
12 I'll comment on is just really disappointed to see the
13 emperor geese season shut down. Yeah, just really
14 disappointed to see that. So, anyways that's all I have.
15 Thank you.

16
17 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Sam.
18 Coral.

19
20 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah. I also don't have
21 much to report. As we know, we had so little snow this
22 year, and I think I also -- my family did their hunting
23 on the west side of the island and only came home with
24 two small deer and so, they didn't see a lot in the five
25 days that they hiked and hunted around. But that's
26 probably because the deer were up higher without snow
27 cover. So -- and then I'd also just like to recognize
28 Island Air for their commitment to subsistence foods.
29 We had some clams flown in from Larsen Bay the other
30 day. They fly food in free of charge, subsistence foods.
31 And I really appreciate that. And I ate the clams, and
32 I'm still alive. That's it. Thank you.

33
34 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Coral.
35 And Daniel.

36
37 MR. SMITH: Yeah. I just have a little
38 bit to report. For the crayfish, based on reports from
39 the Shungnak tribe of Kodiak, control efforts really
40 have been shown to significantly reduce the population
41 of signal crayfish in targeted areas within the
42 watershed over the last few years. Currently, the tribe
43 is being supported for one more year of funds underneath
44 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife grant for continued
45 suppression of the crayfish. And this year, we're going
46 to continue to host the community derby and boil events.
47 So be on the lookout for posts and flyers for crayfish
48 events. And they tentatively start for -- during the
49 month of June when the water temperatures rise a little
50 bit. Talking about salmon, cohos numbers were really low

00013

1 on the Road System it appeared. Especially in the
2 American River and Pillar Creek, leading to a sport
3 fishing closure on the American. I personally did not
4 harvest as many silvers as I normally do, and wasn't
5 able to both fill my freezer and share with my family
6 during this -- these reduced numbers. And then based on
7 the weir counts Buskin coho was lower than average. But
8 there seemed to be a decent push of silvers later in the
9 year. As I saw many spawning in December at the Buskin
10 Lake outlet and further downstream. Like Coral had
11 mentioned in her report, I was also seeing kind of a
12 lack of deer on the Road System, and it could be really
13 due to the warm weather. Where they weren't really down
14 low as much. And they could have been, you know, higher
15 up due to the lack of snowpack. The gray whales and
16 humpback whales on our Road System, or Chiniak Bay was
17 very low in town this winter so far, and I'm not sure
18 really why that is the case. As we usually have somewhat
19 decent numbers of whales that hang around the
20 wintertime, especially in Pasagshak and Kalsin Bay. And
21 see -- swans you know, over the last recent years, there
22 has been a really an increase in number of overwintering
23 swans on our Road System, specifically in Lake Rose Tead
24 as well as Carlson Pond. And I just looked up this
25 morning estimates in 1933 had less than 70 birds
26 remaining on the globe. But now that really appears to
27 be booming in a lot of areas in the State. They're even
28 going farther into Southcentral Alaska. Which is a
29 really a good sight to see.

30
31 I want to speak a little bit about
32 emperor geese. Reports from Akiak and Old Harbor are
33 that the emperors seem to be very healthy and more
34 abundant in their areas over the last few years. And
35 locally, more emperor geese to be -- appear to be really
36 making the Kodiak Road system their home. And the
37 Shungnak tribe has been leading a survey effort for
38 emperor geese on our Road System. And the estimates for
39 the emperor geese from 2015 and 2010, there seems to be
40 a like almost a twofold increase in numbers on our Road
41 System. Which has been very good to see, although the
42 statewide population trends have shown a decline in
43 them, but we're seeing more emperor geese in our area.
44 And Woman's Bay really seems to be -- have the majority
45 of the emperor geese on our Road System, but Middle Bay
46 and Kalsin Bay appear to have an uptick in those bays
47 over the last few years. And I've had conversations with
48 some local birders who have been really birding here
49 over the last 50 years or so, and he mentioned back in
50 the day that emperor geese really don't seem to reside

00014

1 in Middle Bay and Kalsin Bay, but it seems that they are
2 more so harboring in those bays throughout the winter
3 and so, they have stationed themselves there. And then
4 lastly there has been pretty healthy groups of dabbling
5 ducks on our Road System this winter. Such as mallards,
6 pintails and gadwalls and this was really in greater
7 abundance of what I normally see in all those bays. And
8 just yesterday at the head of Women's Bay, I found the
9 first group of spring migrants, the northern shovelers
10 are coming back, and it seems like it's a little bit
11 earlier than normal. That could be really weather
12 related. So, you know, we'll see. So yeah, that's all I
13 got.

14
15 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Daniel.
16 Karen.

17
18 MS. KALMAKOFF: Good morning. I'm Karen
19 Kalmakoff from Sand Point. I'm kind of new at this, and
20 it's very interesting to listen to all this information.
21 And I am a substance user with commercial fish out of
22 Sand Point. And it's been a pretty, pretty bad fishing
23 season last summer. I'm hoping it's going to be better
24 this coming summer. I had help from my tribe getting
25 fish through the Trident cannery. My tribe had help --
26 all of the tribal members get a case of salmon, and I
27 was able to smoke some fish. And this year, I was only
28 able to put up, like, 15 humpies for drying, because
29 usually we have (In Native). I was able to get seal and
30 put up the fat for seal oil and also the meat. And also,
31 we're able to go ptarmigan hunting on the island. Seem
32 like there is a good number of ptarmigan this year than
33 last year. I hear a lot of mallards and stuff where I
34 live. They fly over because they live right below where
35 our house is. And I was able to get some halibut for
36 subsistence. And hopefully this summer I'll be able to
37 put up more fish for drying and smoking. That's all I
38 have to say.

39
40 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Karen.
41 Chris.

42
43 MR. PRICE: Good morning. Appreciate
44 being here in Kodiak again. This is an amazing place to
45 visit and experience. Every time is amazing. And I'm
46 sure the weather's like this all the time. Just kidding.
47 Nice day we have here in Kodiak, everybody. It's really
48 beautiful and it's pretty sunny and warm, it feels like.
49 Thanks for coming out to Unalaska last fall to have our
50 meeting. I think it was successful, and everybody got

1 in and out. It seemed to be pretty, pretty good.
2 Subsistence wise in Unalaska, in our region, I would say
3 that the crab season and also halibut seasons have been
4 on the decline in general. I hear quite a few complaints
5 about crabbing and reduced quotas and the concerns about
6 the future of our fisheries and the concerns about these
7 warming waters in the Bering Sea and how they affect
8 commercial and subsistence fisheries throughout the
9 region. So that's something that's really important in
10 our community. There's long, you know, this issue of
11 trawl bycatch has been going on for some time, and
12 there's a lot of conversations about it in our community
13 and our region. There's concerns about salmon bycatch
14 and halibut bycatch. So, I'm glad to hear that we'll get
15 some updates this week about what's happening in the
16 Bering Sea with some of those issues. The Unalaska/Dutch
17 Harbor AC we met, we sort of have been down for a couple
18 of years, but we were getting it back up. The Fish and
19 Game Advisory Committee. So, we had a meeting a couple
20 of weeks ago, and we hope to get the minutes out for
21 that. And there should be some people testifying at the
22 Board of Fish meetings later this month in Anchorage.
23 Thank you, guys, for having this meeting.

24
25 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Great. Thank you.
26 Jeff.

27
28 MR. WASLEY: Hello, Jeff Wasley. Cold
29 Bay. I was unable to attend last summer or spring --
30 summer fall meeting in Dutch. So just last summer, our
31 sockeyes were still down in Mortensen but appeared to
32 be healthy on the Swan Lake. And on into the fall we had
33 good number of salmon berries. Our brant appeared to
34 have a really good hatch with lots of young birds, so
35 that's a good sign. There's a fall progress. We had a
36 really mild fall, sounds like, everywhere. We had lots
37 of ptarmigan, seem to be nearing a peak population, it's
38 good to see. With the warm weather, a lot of the ducks
39 stayed around. A lot of the puddle ducks and divers,
40 along with our sea ducks and brant and emperor geese.
41 Silvers were kind of up and down, which was, you know,
42 a little down for us on some of the streams. But
43 Mortenson again appeared to have a real weak run for
44 silvers, which was kind of troubling to see. I have not
45 seen that in a long time, but the other creeks seem to
46 be maybe down a little but still had good pulses of
47 silvers. Yeah. Again, the emperor goose thing is, very
48 sad to see that closed. You know, we -- I represent the
49 sport side of things and, you know, sport harvest is
50 extremely low on these birds and unfortunately, we will

1 not be able to hunt those geese at probably for a while,
2 so it's kind of sad to see how they are being managed.
3 So, thank you.

4
5 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Jeff.
6 Natasha.

7
8 MS. HAYDEN: Thanks Madam Chair. Natasha
9 Hayden, I'm from Kodiak. My -- I want to report on the
10 marine mammal harvesting activities that I've been able
11 to engage in this year, this winter, done. I've gone on
12 a couple of seal hunts and sea otter hunts. The
13 populations are very -- they appear to be very robust.
14 Very healthy animals. Lots of them. Hard to get. They're
15 crafty and so that's been really nice on these -- that's
16 one of the nice things about these somewhat -- well, I
17 mean, we've had a mild winter, but we had one storm
18 after another after another as far as wind. We've had a
19 lot of heavy wind events this winter. It's kind of calmed
20 down here in the last six weeks or so, which has been
21 really nice for us to be able to get out in the small
22 skiff and go pursuing those seals and sea otters.

23
24 So, and I am on the Kodiak or, excuse
25 me, the native village of Afognak Tribal Council and I
26 serve on the Kodiak Island tribal coalition as their
27 representative. And we've been working with U.S. Fish
28 and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries
29 regarding marine mammal harvesting eligibility. And I
30 know that sea otters is a topic that we've talked about
31 pretty extensively in recent years. So recently, U.S.
32 Fish and Wildlife issued a legal opinion on marine mammal
33 harvesting eligibility, and they had issued that as a
34 formal notice out. And we are -- they're working with
35 us, and we've been working really hard to collaborate
36 with our neighbors in the Chugach region and Southeast
37 Alaska, regarding this issue because it's the harvest
38 eligibility that had been interpreted as being solely
39 on a blood quantum designation. And that's not the only
40 criteria that is in the regulation. And so, U.S. Fish
41 and Wildlife has issued that legal opinion recently,
42 which is really encouraging. And we're looking forward
43 to the next steps as far as co-management. And we've
44 been advocating for regional co-management similarly
45 with the other regions around the State so that we can
46 have dome management for -- that suits our needs and our
47 people best and our resources.

48
49 National Marine Fisheries Service
50 manages seals, harbor seals, and a couple others -- or

1 actually a lot of other species. But in our region, it's
2 harbor seals is the main species. And so, they are --
3 they're a little bit behind in getting moving along this
4 process. So, we're engaging with them and are hopeful
5 that we will be able to help them make this determination
6 about what eligibility criteria is, and what the
7 interpretation has been by that agency. One of the things
8 that we were tracking is the halibut and sablefish IFQ
9 programmatic review that the North Pacific Fisheries
10 Management Council had to do that was -- the draft was
11 issued in December, and it showed that the communities
12 that are considered to be CQE eligible, which is a
13 community quota entity, there's 46 communities that are
14 eligible. They have to have certain criteria like be --
15 have a population less than I think it's 1500 people.
16 They can't have a major airport. They can't be connected
17 to a hub community via Road System. And so, Kodiak Island
18 has got six villages that are eligible for that program.
19 So, across the -- from the Aleutians, the entire Gulf
20 Coast down to Southeast Alaska, these 46 communities out
21 of the 46, 43 of them have got a net negative holdings
22 of halibut quota that are ranged between like 30 to
23 100%. And so, this is something that is just a huge
24 issue for our communities that don't have people that
25 own those quotas anymore. And so, working on that and
26 trying to find solutions to be able to return halibut
27 fishing access to those communities. And then the other
28 thing I want to highlight, as far as what I've seen, is
29 I have seen more snowshoe hares around this year, which
30 has been nice. Last year we didn't see very many. And
31 also, I haven't seen very many rats, which is really
32 good. I -- there was a couple of years ago where there
33 was rats everywhere. And so, I think the rat population
34 is down a little bit. And maybe that's helping the rabbit
35 -- the hare population. So, thank you.

36
37 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you,
38 Natasha. Brett.

39
40 MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you. I'm Brett
41 Richardson, Unalaska, Dutch Harbor. I reported on summer
42 activities at the fall meeting. I just want to follow
43 up on that a little bit. Mostly due to the sockeye salmon
44 being down with the weir at Mcleese Lake not being
45 functional. It's hard to know exactly, though, you know,
46 personal anecdotal information is kind of a consensus
47 in that regard. It was difficult to get fish. Had to go
48 out multiple times with minimal success. And, you know,
49 I'd like to get more information on how we can address
50 that issue, get that weir installed, you know, on a

1 longer basis. Look at funding sources and get that
2 figured out so we don't come to these meetings and wonder
3 how many fish we're going to get in in three months.
4 Other than that, post fall meeting the whales were all
5 over the place in the bay and out of the bay in Unalaska;
6 healthy marine mammal activity. A lot of humpbacks,
7 minkes, seals and sea lions, tons of otters. Otters right
8 outside my house. On a quiet day, you can hear them
9 crunching on the sea urchins. The echo is pretty, pretty
10 cool. I lived in Japan, and we used to eat sea urchin
11 all the time, but we obviously don't eat this because
12 of the risk of PSP which I think killed a woman a few
13 years ago and is still a pretty, pretty big issue where
14 we are. It'd be great to hear that report on that as
15 well for the Unalaska region. If we can get some
16 information on that at some point.

17
18 So overall fishing harvest, sockeye was
19 down. Silvers, I felt was better than 2023. I was more
20 successful than I was. I don't think I really went out
21 more times to set a net, but you know, maybe 5 or 6
22 times overall, got about 20 silvers. One time, set a
23 net, didn't get any salmon, got five rockfish and three
24 puffins. So, you never know. Crab .set a pot a few times,
25 I caught four bairdi. So, you know, not bad, not
26 horrible. Berries, typical places. None to be found.
27 Atypical places. Just a boom, total boom year as far as
28 I was concerned. But you got to hike. So, it was a win-
29 win for me. Hiking and berries. So yeah. Since late
30 October, haven't really done much just due to the
31 weather. Not that it's been bad. It's been kind of like
32 this. About 30 degrees, but no snow. Very little
33 precipitation and just a lot of wind. So, it was good
34 during the fall meeting that everybody got in and out.
35 And hopefully we can do it again sometime soon. Thank
36 you.

37
38 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Brett.
39 Pat.

40
41 MR. HOLMES: I think things have covered
42 pretty well. Some general observations. Seems to be
43 fewer sea otters here in Woman's Bay, and in our walks
44 with Patty and I at the Buskin, I've noticed earlier
45 some exuvia, the shells cast off of two different age
46 classes of Dungies at the Buskin. So, perhaps we might
47 be able to wring out a few crab off the Buskin. Being
48 that otters are down or discouraged by local hunters,
49 which I applaud. I wanted to thank the Rose family and
50 Tim Longrich for sharing their fish with us. Makes a big

1 difference. Paul Chervenak down the street is a guide,
2 and he usually brings us by a box of deer meat and goat
3 meat, and I just really can't climb the mountains
4 anymore. I go out with my scope to see if there's
5 something within reasonable access for deer hunting. But
6 as everybody has mentioned, most of the deer I saw with
7 my scope were up at 2-3000ft along the Road System. Some
8 observations people mentioned on nut, berries, not so
9 hot last year. And I think that comes from the cold
10 temperatures. And if we have a really wet April-May,
11 then the bumblebees, which are our main pollinators. I
12 think that they must get a fungus disease and just not
13 have a good early hatch. They didn't really show up in
14 our yard until way late. This year, I'm hoping that
15 things might be better because in our walks out at
16 Abercrombie, I've noted that the highbush blueberries,
17 the salmon berries, and even the devils club are all
18 coming up early. They're starting to -- you can see the
19 buds and the new growth, and that's like two months
20 earlier than you normally would see it. So, keep your
21 fingers crossed on that.

22
23 And one thing I wanted to acknowledge
24 is the Native corporations and villages on the PSP
25 monitoring, because that allows a person -- you can find
26 out when they're going to do the monitoring and get your
27 clams and then hold them and, if you can, and then find
28 out whether or not they're going to be hot. And I think
29 the -- over the years it's become more traditional now
30 to clean the clams in a different way. Cutting off the
31 siphon tips and cleaning out the guts and gonads does
32 seem to remarkably reduce the toxin, not completely. But
33 if you combine those with the monitoring from our Native
34 community corporations that do that, I think that's made
35 a significant positive step forward on things. I don't
36 think we'll ever get back to the way it was 50 years
37 ago, where you could eat anything, anywhere you wanted.
38 But at least that, I think, is a big improvement. And
39 anyway, I think it's just such a good thing to live in
40 our community where people share, and that makes a big
41 difference in our lives as geysers. Thank you.

42
43 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Pat.
44 Okay. Thank you to all the Council members for your
45 reports. Next agenda item is the Chair's report, so I'll
46 go ahead and give that. So, since the Kodiak/Aleutians
47 RAC met back in September, I did attend the Federal
48 Subsistence Board meeting in February. So last month
49 representing our RAC, and Jason Roberts is going to give
50 an update in a later agenda item on the actions the

1 Federal Subsistence Board took. But all of the Kodiak
2 proposals were on the consensus agenda, and they all
3 passed the Federal Subsistence Board. The -- they -- the
4 Federal Subsistence Board meeting was scheduled
5 overlapping the North Pacific Council, I think as well
6 as the Board of Fish. So, there's a lot of consternation
7 about that. But it did allow an opportunity for people
8 who came in for the Federal Subsistence Board to go over
9 to the North Pacific Council meeting to testify on the
10 chum bycatch item. So, this is chum salmon bycatch in
11 the Bering Sea. At the Council, that did get a lot of
12 comment. I think the last time I checked there was 188
13 or 189 people who signed up to testify. And so that --
14 the -- while overlapping the meetings was frustrating,
15 it did provide that opportunity for people to go back
16 and forth between the meetings.

17
18 At the Federal Subsistence Board
19 meeting, Ketchikan was approved for rural status. So,
20 this is something that originally Ketchikan was kind of
21 held up as the example of a community that is not rural,
22 and they've been trying for years to be recognized as
23 having rural status. So, at the Federal Subsistence
24 Board meeting in February of '25, the Board did approve
25 Ketchikan having rural status. So that was, I think, a
26 historic and exciting thing to happen. In January, so
27 right before the Federal Subsistence Board meeting, I
28 attended the International Pacific Halibut Commission
29 annual meeting down in Vancouver. And I do want to share
30 with halibut the abundance levels are at a low level.
31 They're about at the level that was seen from around
32 1930 to 1980. So, when I say they're at a low level,
33 this isn't an emergency low level, this is closer to
34 historical low levels, but it is a lot lower than it was
35 in the 90s. So, in the 90s is when halibut was
36 rationalized. So, I think a lot of participants in their
37 minds, they kind of anchored the amount of halibut they
38 should be getting to this, like huge, huge spike in the
39 halibut population, which is probably not realistic
40 going forward. So, to me, the important takeaway is that
41 halibut is at a level that it was at for decades, you
42 know, from 1930 to 1980. It's probably going to continue
43 at those low levels. Halibut are fairly slow growing,
44 and recruitment is very low right now. So, we need to
45 be prepared to live with those low levels. I would say
46 probably for at least a couple of decades, if not more,
47 because there's just not another, you know, year class
48 of small halibut that they're seeing that we can expect
49 to grow up. And even if they did, it would take a while
50 for them to grow up and be available for the fishery.

1 So, I just -- I've been trying to share this so that
2 everyone has an understanding that that's where we are,
3 and that's what we should be expecting for the next,
4 like I said, probably at least a couple of decades.

5
6 The Kodiak Fish and Game Advisory
7 Committee met last week, I think. The minutes were shared
8 with the RAC, so you can see what was of importance to
9 the Kodiak AC. Those minutes have already also been
10 submitted to the Board of Game. And then I guess, I
11 forgot, I was going to say at the Federal Subsistence
12 Board -- and I'm going to report this because I don't
13 think OSM staff are going to report it. There was a lot
14 of discussion about the uncertainty with federal
15 staffing, with federal funding, and federal priorities.
16 So, I think it's just important for the RAC to be aware
17 of kind of the landscape that we're in. And, you know,
18 I think we all got the emails about the -- that this
19 meeting might not be able to happen in person because
20 of the -- well the charge cars were cut off so travel
21 wouldn't be able to be paid for. Luckily, OSM was able
22 to ask that, I guess we get a dispensation. So, this
23 program was recognized as an important thing that needed
24 to happen. So, I'm very grateful for that. But the
25 reality is there is a lot of -- kind of uncertainty and
26 noise that is in the system right now. So, I don't think
27 there's anything we can necessarily do about that. But
28 just an awareness that that that's going on and it's
29 having an impact on people and on the system that that
30 we're interacting in.

31
32 And then the last thing I wanted to
33 comment on, Lisa had forwarded a letter that was
34 generated by the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Subsistence
35 Regional Advisory Council, so the YKRAC. And it had to
36 do with salmon management, and it was a request for --
37 that basically the different regulatory bodies, the
38 North Pacific Council, the Federal Subsistence Board
39 would be the Board of Fish and/or Fish and Game that
40 they, they get together and talk about how to better or
41 more, kind of holistically or comprehensively, manage
42 salmon. So, I bring that up because that was actually
43 one of the major themes of the KARAC letter that we did
44 coming out of the All Council meeting last March. And I
45 also bring it up because there were a number of other
46 RACs that were CC'd on the letter, and KARAC was not one
47 of them, but we did get forwarded this. But to me, it
48 highlights the importance of -- and maybe later in the
49 agenda, we can talk about it if the RAC wants to. The
50 importance of interfacing with other RACs, that it may

1 not seem like we have a natural connection with. So, we
2 have interacted with the Bristol Bay RAC a fair amount
3 as far as the FRMP projects, because we are in a kind
4 of a shared region for FRMP; with the YK Delta RAC were
5 not geographically adjacent to them and so I can
6 understand why it may seem odd if we had -- if we did
7 more, you know, outreach or requested more and more
8 interaction with them, but with something like salmon,
9 I think we may want to talk about that because the kinds
10 of bycatch is an issue. The kinds of fishing that occur
11 in our region really are the only areas in the state
12 that have, for example, trawl fishing or with Area M.
13 So, our region, I think, is probably identified as a,
14 you know, problem region. And I think a better way to
15 move forward is to have dialogue and not and not have
16 discussion with other regions; to try to gain a, you
17 know, a common understanding, I think we're all probably
18 trying to get -- go in the same direction. We just have
19 different ways of getting there. So that is my
20 observation and that was a letter dated -- it had a
21 March 3rd timestamp on it. But yeah, Lisa forwarded that
22 out to the RAC. So, as far as Chair comments and Chair
23 report, that is what I have. All right. And then I am
24 planning on doing a break around 10:30. So that's in
25 about 30 minutes. We'll go out and do the photo and then
26 we have the time certain item at 11 am. Natasha, go
27 ahead.

28
29 MS. HAYDEN: Thanks, Madam Chair. I just
30 want to add that regarding the halibut biomass and the
31 concerns that you're raising regarding the levels being
32 what they are going to be for the next, you know, several
33 decades, that -- and that wasn't mentioned in our region,
34 in the Gulf of Alaska there's up to 4 million pounds of
35 halibut that's allowed to be discarded in the trawl
36 fisheries on an annual basis, and I don't know how long
37 that has been the amount that has been allowed to be
38 discarded in trawl fisheries, but I think it probably
39 coincides with that time frame of the decline. And so,
40 I just want this to be included on the record, since it
41 was brought up that this is the state of the commercial
42 halibut or, you know, from the IPHC, they don't set the
43 subsistence halibut stocks, but they do the science on
44 it, and that it needs to be included as far as the
45 discussion of the nature of that resource for -- in
46 particular our region. Thanks.

47
48 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. And that
49 may be something, we could invite scientists from the
50 IPHC to come in and talk about because the -- yeah,

1 definitely the peak and the halibut abundance was, I
2 think, happened irrespective of trawl bycatch. So, it's
3 really interesting when you look at the history of it.
4 But I think and I realize halibut is not a Federal
5 Subsistence Board item, but for our region it's really
6 important. So, I think getting -- bringing some -- the
7 IPHC scientists in to talk about that would be really
8 helpful. Go ahead, Natasha.

9
10 MS. HAYDEN: Thanks, Madam Chair. I also
11 want to add that, you know, as somebody who is -- you
12 know, I was born and raised here, and my family's been
13 here for thousands of years. And so, I bring a lot of
14 traditional knowledge and indigenous science. And I just
15 want to present that in a way that is credible, that
16 it's not anecdotal. It's not something that is, you know,
17 just you know, based on headlines or reports or
18 something, but something that, you know, as somebody
19 who's been a part of this ecosystem for -- you know,
20 it's in my DNA. And so, I just would like to also, you
21 know, qualify my comments as not necessarily needing to
22 have, you know, a IPHC scientists come and, and you
23 know, validate the information that that we bring to
24 this process. So, thanks.

25
26 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, Natasha.
27 Okay. Our next agenda item is public and tribal comment
28 on non-agenda items. I'll start in the room. Is there
29 anyone for public comment? Oh, sorry. Go ahead, Coral.

30
31 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah. Thank you, Madam
32 Chair. I did just want to say I appreciate any
33 conversation about halibut commercial because it does
34 affect -- all those numbers affect what we see when
35 we're subsistence halibut. I remember years ago, like
36 when I was in my 20s and 30s, we could go right out here
37 and catch a big old halibut. Any time now, we probably
38 catch a halibut one in every 3 or 4 trips. And they're
39 usually fairly small. So, it definitely affects
40 subsistence users. It takes a lot more effort to catch
41 and you catch a lot smaller usually. So, I do appreciate
42 the halibut conversation. And hopefully, we'll have more
43 about halibut on the agenda in the future.

44
45 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Chris, go ahead.

46
47 MR. PRICE: I want to say thank you,
48 Rebecca, for that Chair's report, and those reports are
49 really important because we can't always be there and
50 having our Chair there is very useful and helpful, and

1 Natasha's comments, I want to respect those too. That's
2 really important to have our opportunity to communicate
3 with the other regions and to be diplomatic and try to
4 break through all the, you know, the talk that's -- it
5 seems not productive. So, I appreciate Rebecca being
6 there at those meetings and speaking for our region in
7 a way that's trying to encourage open dialogue,
8 transparency, information sharing, scientific
9 approaches, and also native traditional values and
10 native traditional science as well, to be included in
11 that. So, thank you guys for that work.
12

13 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thanks,
14 Chris. Okay. So, agenda item public and tribal comment
15 on non-agenda items. I don't see anyone in the room. Is
16 there anyone online?
17

18 MS. HUTCHINSON: This is Lisa, the
19 Council Coordinator, for the record. Is there anybody
20 online that would like to speak to the Council regarding
21 anything on the non-agenda item? And I can remind you,
22 if you're calling in on Teams, you can raise your hand,
23 and I can alert the Chair to address you, or if you are
24 calling on the phone, just press star five and raise
25 your hand. I currently do not see anybody at the moment.
26

27 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Thank you.
28 Okay. So, moving on to the next agenda item, Council
29 member training. This is proposal development and that
30 will be Kendra Holman, OSM wildlife.
31

32 (Pause)
33

34 MS. HOLMAN: Good morning, Madam Chair,
35 Members of the Council. For the record, Kendra Holman,
36 OSM wildlife biologist. So, this PowerPoint can be found
37 on page -- starting on page 21 of your meeting book. I
38 was going to have it going, but I need my computer up
39 here for notes in the chord doesn't reach, so we don't
40 have it up here. So, I apologize for that. It is in your
41 book, though.
42

43 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. In the skinny
44 book?

45 MS. HOLMAN: Yes.
46

47 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. So, it's the
48 book with the bears on the front of it?
49

50

1 MS. HOLMAN: 22. Okay. So, good morning,
2 Madam Chair, members of the Council. We are currently
3 in the open period for wildlife proposals. This call is
4 for proposals, closes on April 4th of this year. So, the
5 2025 Winter Council training. I'm going to do a brief -
6 - briefly cover proposals to change -- proposals for
7 changes to federal subsistence hunting and trapping
8 regulations. So, slide two. There are two main ways to
9 change federal subsistence regulations. First, via
10 special action. Second, via the proposal. The two key
11 differences between the two is that special actions are
12 for temporary short-term changes and can be submitted
13 at any time, whereas proposal changes codify regulations
14 and can only be submitted during these open periods.
15 Since we're currently in an open period, I'm going to
16 walk through this proposal submitting process. So, slide
17 three. So, if the Council would like to submit a
18 proposal, all we need is for one of you to make a motion
19 and have a vote to submit that proposal on the record.
20 OSM staff will help draft and submit that proposal. This
21 can happen at any time during the meeting. Any member
22 of the public can also submit a proposal via mail to our
23 office, hand it to me or any OSM staff during this
24 meeting or submit it through the regulations.gov
25 website.

26
27 So, slide four when submitting a
28 proposal from the public, please make sure to include
29 who is submitting the proposal. Include your contact
30 information, what regulation you want changed and which
31 units it would apply to, what you want the regulation
32 to say, why you want it changed, and any supporting
33 additional information that the Board or OSM staff will
34 need to help evaluate that proposal. So, slide five.
35 Sometimes proposals can be invalid, but that is because
36 they pertain to things that are outside the Board's
37 jurisdiction. Examples are halibut, marine mammals,
38 migratory birds, and non-federal lands. So, slide six
39 for reference. The subsistence regulations can be
40 changed through regulatory process are found in the Code
41 of Federal Regulations, subpart C and D. So those are
42 the only two sections that we can change through this
43 process. Slide seventeen -- seven, sorry, which covers
44 a wide variety of regulations from general, such as
45 sealing requirements and definitions to more specific
46 regulations like harvest limits, seasons, permits,
47 requirements, and customary and traditional use
48 determinations. So, that -- slide eight is the end of
49 the presentation. So, thank you. Please remember the
50 open period ends April 4th. If you have any questions,

1 the additional slides in your book are examples, if you
2 wanted to be able to take a look at those. So, thank
3 you, Madam Chair.

4
5 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank
6 you, Kendra. Are there any questions? Sam, go ahead.

7
8 MR. ROHER: Thank you. Through the Chair.
9 Thanks for that presentation. So, what what's the whole
10 timing, then, of the process? So, it closes April 4th.
11 OSM will do their review of those. They'll go out to
12 public comment, and then when do they come back in front
13 of us to look at and comment again? And then when do
14 they go in front of the Federal Subsistence Board?

15
16 MS. HOLMAN: So, through the Chair, this
17 is Kendra Holman again. So, those will -- so like you
18 said, the window closed April 4th. They'll come back to
19 OSM, we'll validate them, and then we will start working
20 on the analysis. Open the public comment period
21 typically ends up being sometime around June, so that
22 was when it'll be available for the public to send us
23 in comments on these different proposals. The analysis
24 will come back to the Councils at your fall meetings,
25 at which point they'll be presented to you and you'll
26 be able to take action on them, and make your
27 recommendations once we have those analysis done. They
28 will go back before the Board for a decision at the
29 April 2026 wildlife meeting.

30
31 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Kendra.
32 Are there further questions?

33
34 (No response)

35
36 Okay. So, everybody knows how to submit
37 a proposal now. Excellent. Okay. Thanks, Kendra.

38
39 (Pause)

40
41 Yeah. No, the next thing is that Council
42 charter review. So, you're off the hook.

43
44 MR. HOLMES: Brief question.

45
46 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Go ahead, Pat.

47
48 MR. HOLMES: Is this solely for
49 individuals or is this a process we would use as a
50 Council, or if we were doing it individually, does it

1 bounce back through the Council?

2

3 MS. HOLMAN: So, through the Chair, Mr.
4 Holmes. So, this proposal -- this process can be done
5 by either. If an individual wants to submit a proposal
6 they would be able to -- if you have it in writing, they
7 can hand it to me at the meeting or they can submit it
8 through the regs.gov, or there's an address that they
9 can be mailed into as well. But an individual who wants
10 to submit one does not have to go through the RAC to
11 submit it. But the RAC, if they wish -- if you wish to
12 submit a proposal, does need to make a motion and go
13 through that process here at this meeting. As there will
14 not be another meeting before the window closes.

15

16 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank
17 you. Any further questions?

18

19 (No response)

20

21 Okay. Seeing none, our next agenda item
22 is the Council Charter Review. So, the charter is in the
23 same book you were just in, the brown book with the
24 bears on front. The charter is on page 69 or starts on
25 page 69. This is listed as the Coordinators item. So,
26 Lisa, if you could go through it, and if you could
27 particularly highlight any changes that are new since
28 the last time we looked at the charter, that would be
29 helpful, if you have that. Thanks.

30

31 MS. HUTCHINSON: Okay. Thank you, Madam
32 Chair, Council. So anyway, yes, under agenda item 12C
33 is the charter review on page 69 of your book with the
34 bear on top. And so all ten Council -- Subsistence
35 Regional Advisory Councils were chartered under the
36 Federal Advisory Committee Act. Under the Act, each
37 Council charter needs to be renewed every two years, so
38 approximately a year before it is renewed, each Council
39 can have a discussion to see if there's anything you
40 want to change. So, this is a -- this is a -- if you see
41 anything you want change, just let us know. But if not,
42 we can just accept it and move forward. Thank you.

43

44 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank
45 you. And was there any -- were -- there weren't any
46 changes you wanted to highlight?

47

48 MS. HUTCHINSON: Not that OSM has. Thank
49 you.

50

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Is the youth
2 seat new?

3
4 MS. HUTCHINSON: Yes, we did add the
5 youth seat. And by the way, we did submit -- solicit
6 that, as well as new Council appointments to time. It
7 kind of came in a little bit later and so not a lot of
8 outreach was done. But we did get a few applicants for
9 the youth seat, but none that I recall for the -- this
10 region, unfortunately. But we'll be doing it again next
11 year and hopefully get more promotion. But that was in
12 the new charter. Actually, it was added to all the ten
13 charters for that. So, we're trying to get -- just to
14 remind of people that don't know, we wanted -- all the
15 Councils wanted to add a youth seat, which is basically
16 a non-voting seat and -- for somebody that's 18 to 21,
17 to come into the Council, they would, you know, be able
18 to participate in the process and be included in coming
19 to the meetings and such. So, we would want to try to
20 reach out more to get younger people involved in this
21 process, which I think is a wonderful step forward. So,
22 we're just kind of getting that offline and we'll have
23 a few this year and then hopefully we'll, for this region
24 I'd like to get more. Thank you.

25
26 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thanks,
27 Lisa. Sam, go ahead.

28
29 MR. ROHRER: Thanks. Through the Chair.
30 So, I was excited about the youth member part. I thought
31 that was a kind of neat idea, but I didn't realize the
32 age range, so I just read the age. The non-voting young
33 leader member must be between the age of 18 and 25.
34 That's not a youth. That's an adult. I was -- that's the
35 age I was when I was first appointed, I think I was I
36 might have been 21, but I don't know. That's a little
37 bit unfortunate. A youth member should be a 15 or 16-
38 year-old, 17-year-old. I mean, that's the age we need
39 to be grabbing people. If they're 18 or, you know, if
40 they're 18 to 25, they should be just a full serving
41 member anyways. That's my thoughts. Thanks.

42
43 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, that was my
44 thought as well. I think there were probably concerns
45 with them being a minor and travel being required. That
46 could be somewhat problematic. But I also thought when
47 you get to be 18 to 25, you can just -- and you have the
48 background, you can just apply for a regular seat and
49 get to vote. Anyway. Thank you. Coral, go ahead.

50

1 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah. And I think I do
2 recall that being part of our discussion at a meeting
3 one time. And so, I was interested to see that this came
4 through as an adult range.

5
6 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: No, don't give her
7 a mic. Pat, go ahead.

8
9 MR. HOLMES: I -- on the age issue, I
10 have to agree with other folks that it should be some
11 ability to have it at a younger age, but we could perhaps
12 -- I wonder if it could be developed to where it would
13 be in cases where they didn't have to travel, because
14 you can be a member, a young adult or a non-adult, but
15 a youth, and you can communicate in internet now or it
16 could be when they're in the community, because I can
17 see that we're basically going to be meeting here. We're
18 going to have at least one meeting a year here. And
19 also, out west you know, it'll either be Dutch Harbor
20 or Cold Bay, as probabilities. And so, the person should
21 be able to either physically attend it in their own town
22 or by -- on the internet. And I think the age should be
23 lower. I think on the notice that came out on this, I
24 did send copies of it to the two tribes, and I also sent
25 a copy to the editor of the paper here. But things that
26 go into the paper here, if it's coming from the
27 government, they kind of expect the government to buy
28 an ad or, you know, have it written up in such a way
29 that it is a news item. And so, I think that certainly
30 should be considered. But I think it would definitely
31 have merit because I can remember Mr. Rohrer when he was
32 a young puppy, I mean, he'd be down, go to the City
33 Council where his brother, you know, and here's a high
34 school kid standing up in front of the City Council
35 saying, you need to think about this. And so, I think
36 that's very, very important. But we also need to -- if
37 we can change that, that would be great. But we also
38 need to have a better outreach to the communities that
39 this program is available. And I'd like to -- another
40 thing on the report, if I can go ahead back to item 9,
41 estimated number of frequency of meetings will meet 1
42 to 2 times a year. I think that we should request that
43 it would be twice a year, because that's what we've done
44 traditionally. And the way the federal funding is going,
45 I could see us ending up not being funded to do any
46 meetings except by internet, and that's really dumb. So
47 that would be something. Madam Chair, I'd like if we
48 could discuss later in this item. Thank you.

49
50

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, Pat. So
2 that does raise a question I meant to ask earlier. For
3 where we are with this, are we basically limited to just
4 approving what's here or can we propose substantial
5 changes? And if so, which provisions can we actually
6 propose changes on? Thanks.

7
8 MS. HUTCHINSON: Yes, Madam Chair,
9 members of the Council. It's up to you. You can change
10 it extensively. We're not encouraging you to just
11 because of -- it's just to get a charter changed is a
12 lot of different levels of -- it has to go through a lot
13 of different levels, and we're kind of at a different
14 administration now. So, I'm just hesitant to request a
15 lot of change, but it's totally up to you. It's your
16 charter, it's your Council, and whatever you would like
17 to do. Thank you.

18
19 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So, it says in
20 here, if we don't have a charter that's approved, then
21 we can't meet. If we attempt to make extensive changes,
22 will that slow down -- let me back up. So, us approving
23 this, does that mean it's an approved charter? I assume
24 no. I assume we need to vote on it, and then it needs
25 to go up and get some sort of federal stamp of approval.
26 So, if we do propose substantial changes, is that going
27 to slow down that approval process, or are they just
28 going to cross them out -- the ones they don't like,
29 they'll just cross them out and approve? Okay.

30
31 MS. HUTCHINSON: I'm going -- Robbin La
32 Vine, I'd like to -- maybe if you could take this answer.
33 Thank you.

34
35 MS. LA VINE: Thank you, Madam Chair. I,
36 I defer to Katya Wessels, who is the Council Coordinator
37 Division supervisor. I don't believe she's online right
38 now. She was earlier, but to me, it -- I understand that
39 in the past, when we have the -- when the Councils have
40 forwarded recommended changes to the charter, it did not
41 interfere with your ability to meet. Just not approving,
42 right. Not approving the charter would potentially
43 interfere with your ability to meet. But requesting
44 changes is continuing the process. Thank you, Madam
45 Chair.

46
47 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Robbin.
48 Chris, go ahead.

49
50

1 MR. PRICE: On number 12, page 71, it
2 talks about Secretary of Interior does the appointments,
3 and then it says concurrently the Secretary of
4 Agriculture. Is that new? I should know why, but I think
5 it's because forestry is part of agriculture. But what's
6 the -- is that new or is that how it's always been?
7 Okay. Okay. Thank you.

8
9 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. So, this is
10 an action item. So, if anyone wants to propose a change
11 this would be the time to do it. Pat, go ahead.

12
13 MR. HOLMES: Madam Chair, I'd like to
14 present a motion to change item number nine that we
15 continue to meet at two times a year with hopes that we
16 can do that. Thank you.

17
18 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Is there a
19 second?

20
21 MR. PRICE: Second.

22
23 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Chris.
24 Discussion. Natasha, go ahead.

25
26 MS. HAYDEN: Thanks, Madam Chair. Just
27 for clarification, would we word it at least two times
28 a year, or would it just be a fixed two times a year?

29
30 MR. HOLMES: I think at least, and then
31 hopefully we'll get to meet once, but, yes, at least.

32
33 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Thank you.
34 Any further discussion?

35
36 (No response)

37
38 And then based on what Pat said, the
39 kind of the record for this proposed amendment would be
40 that as a Council, we have -- at least as long as I've
41 been involved, we have met two times a year, and that
42 going down to meeting one time a year. I think it would
43 be highly problematic, as far as the proposal process.
44 It would either mean we couldn't introduce proposals as
45 a RAC, or we wouldn't get to review proposals as RAC.
46 So, it would -- it doesn't fit with the existing
47 regulatory proposal cycle. Is there any more discussion
48 or comments? Pat, go ahead.

49
50

1 MR. HOLMES: I was wondering if we wanted
2 to continue more on Mr. Rohrer's comment on the age?

3
4 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: No, let's finish
5 this up motion first and then we can go to the age. Yep.
6 Okay. Well, I'm not seeing more discussion on the
7 proposed amendment, which is under paragraph nine. It
8 would read the Council will meet at least two times per
9 year. Is there any objection?

10
11 (No response)

12
13 Okay. Hearing no objection, that motion
14 passes unanimously. Pat, go ahead with your next
15 amendment.

16
17 MR. HOLMES: I guess I would like to toss
18 that one to Mr. Rohrer and if he might have a suggestion
19 of an age range for younger leaders keeping in mind that
20 they would not necessarily have to travel, but they could
21 communicate through the internet.

22
23 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Sam, go ahead.

24
25 MR. ROHRER: Thank you. Through the
26 Chair. Thank you, Mr. Holmes. So, I guess I would make
27 a proposal that we lower the age be 14 to 18, in a non-
28 traveling seat. So maybe non-traveling, maybe non-
29 compensated, whatever nons we have to throw in there so
30 that it's -- so that we don't have the issue of the
31 underage. So not -- maybe not compensated, non-
32 traveling, and that's probably it. But I'm certainly
33 open to suggestions from staff on that. Thanks.

34
35 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Is there a
36 second?

37
38 MR. HOLMES: I'll second that. I totally
39 agree. I find it so encouraging reading the Kodiak Mirror
40 with the little news clips and opinion things that the
41 high school kids are doing and occasionally been picked
42 up on the public radio. I think it's marvelous. I'm just
43 amazed at their depth of thought and consideration. So,
44 I definitely second.

45
46 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Brett, go
47 ahead.

48
49 MR. RICHARDSON: Brett Richardson,
50 Unalaska. Would there ever be an opportunity for a local

00033

1 person, say, there in Kodiak to attend a Kodiak meeting,
2 even if they're under 18 and vice versa for Unalaska?

3

4 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So, Robbin's
5 approaching the mic. My thought is that the intent is
6 with this youth seat, that they would attend the meeting,
7 they just wouldn't be traveling because they're a minor
8 and introduces all kinds of complications. I did have a
9 thought, though, that I mean, right now we have a daytime
10 meeting during school, so are we expecting somebody to
11 take an entire one day or two days out of school, or
12 would they just kind of come in for an afternoon? That's
13 probably open for discussion, and you know, working out
14 the logistics. But, Robbin, did you have anything you
15 wanted to add?

16

17 MS. LA VINE: Thank you, Madam Chair.
18 Yeah, I did want to add that in some of the other regions
19 we -- our program works closely with the schools.
20 Sometimes we meet in the schools, and that gives the
21 high school students or the middle school students an
22 opportunity to participate in some cases, quite
23 extensively. And my thought is that it wouldn't be
24 something we could necessarily initiate. We wouldn't
25 have the capacity in our program. But in other places,
26 there are teachers and programs either at the high school
27 level, or the college level, that creates curriculum and
28 acknowledges and recognizes academic effort when the
29 students participate. Thank you, Madam Chair.

30

31 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Pat, go
32 ahead.

33

34 MR. HOLMES: Oh, Madam Chair, that just
35 got me thinking back several years ago, that we had an
36 outreach to the schools to let them know what was going
37 on, because there was one of the -- oh, that -- sorry,
38 I can't remember her name. The lady that was -- did the
39 fisheries classes. She would bring her students to the
40 Fish and Game Advisory Committee meetings, and I do
41 recall she brought them to one of our meetings one time
42 when we were meeting over at Shungnak or someplace, and
43 just so that they could come spend the morning and just
44 see the general outlook on how the game was played. And
45 anyway, maybe that's how Sam got started. I don't know.

46

47 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, Pat. Yeah.
48 Based on comments from Robbin about the OSM'S capacity
49 to kind of initiate or grow a program, I think that if
50 our communities, our various communities in our region

1 want to do this, it's probably something that maybe would
2 be best started by RAC members reaching out to the local
3 educational systems. So, it's probably identifying a
4 teacher who wants to try to incorporate this kind of
5 experiential learning into their curriculum and working
6 closely with them to work out the details. I think that's
7 probably the most successful path. But I guess getting
8 back to the proposed amendment, is there any further
9 discussion? So, the proposed amendment is to lower the
10 age range from 14 to 18, and note that it would not
11 require travel or compensation. Is there any further
12 discussion?

13

14 (No response)

15

16 Okay. Is there any objection to the
17 amendment?

18

19 (No response)

20

21 Okay. Hearing none that passes
22 unanimously. Are there any further proposed amendments?

23

24 (No response)

25

26 Okay, and then I wanted to note that for
27 our region -- so one of the that particular things that
28 specific to our region is the ideal residency
29 requirement which is for members from the Kodiak
30 Archipelago, three members from the Alaska Peninsula,
31 and three from the Aleutian and Pribilof Islands. So,
32 there's a lot of standard language in the charter, but
33 then there's specific provisions that are kind of unique
34 to our region. So that's one of those areas. And that's
35 on page 71 in paragraph, under number 12. Lisa, go ahead.

36

37 MS. HUTCHINSON: Yes. Madam Chair,
38 Council members, I just wanted to just remind you that
39 too that for example, the distribution of members,
40 that's something you can put in the charter, but it's
41 not something that's guaranteed because its -- it goes
42 through the whole selection process. It depends on who
43 applies and then then if you actually get vetted and
44 then how many seats are available. But we do try to, you
45 know, it's good to have that in there and to know the
46 Council's intent to have good distribution. Thank you.

47

48 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Coral, go ahead.

49

50 MS. CHERNOFF: So, I'm wondering, there's

1 a lot of talk all the time about hubs. Is that
2 appropriate to put into a charter or is that something
3 that's outside of the range of a charter? Is declaring
4 our hubs?

5
6 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: I suspect it's
7 outside of the charter. I -- we can certainly have that
8 discussion and generate either a letter or put it in a
9 report or something so we can bring it up. I don't think
10 it's a charter item necessarily. And I am looking to
11 staff and they're kind of shaking their heads a little
12 bit.

13
14 MS. CHERNOFF: And I guess, I'm looking
15 at we have so many conversations about that that it
16 would be nice to just have a piece in writing that
17 discusses it.

18
19 MS. LA VINE: Thank you, Madam Chair. I
20 believe the identification of hub communities and those
21 communities approved for travel based on, I think,
22 sometimes cost and the challenges to get to different
23 communities is decided within OSM. I think it's outside
24 the charter, but you can request identification of hub
25 communities for future meetings and given our budget,
26 it would be up to our director to approve. Thank you,
27 Madam Chair.

28
29 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Thank you.
30 All right. Are there any further proposed amendments or
31 comments on the charter?

32
33 (No response)

34
35 Okay. Is there any objection to
36 approving the charter as amended?

37
38 (No response)

39
40 Okay. Seeing and hearing none, we have
41 an approved charter. Okay. It is 10:33. So let's go
42 ahead and take our break. So, we'll do -- for people on
43 the phone, let's say come back at 5 to 11. We do have a
44 set presentation time at 11 a.m. For photographs, if we
45 can go ahead and head downstairs. Let's try the bear
46 statue. So, if you go out the front door and then the
47 bear statues on the back side of the building here.
48 Hopefully, the light is okay there. If not, we'll find
49 something. What's that? Five 'till [sic]. 10:55. Okay.
50 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

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. It's 10:56.
And we have Council back. Oh, we have an echo.

(Distortion)

Okay. That's better. Okay. So, we'll go ahead and call the meeting back to order. We're doing the time certain agenda item. The Chinook Salmon ESA Listing. So, it's 14A1 and it's in tab ten of the big book. And we'll also be projecting it up on the screen in the room and hopefully shared through Teams. So, everyone should be able to see the presentation as we go through it. And then I know this is scheduled for 11. I guess I'll check. Dani Evenson, are you on the phone?

(No response)

Okay. We're not hearing anything. Lisa, are you going to text her? Okay. And it's not quite 11 yet. So, if she's not on, that's understandable.

(Pause)

Do we know? Is she on page two of the participants?

(Pause)

So, while we're waiting, we'll do hopefully this presentation, which is the Chinook Salmon ESA listing update, and then we'll move back under action items, back up to review and approve the FY 2024 Annual Report. And hopefully we can get through both of those before lunch. And if we do, we'll just keep moving down the action items list.

(Pause)

Okay. Well, we can always go in reverse order and move to the -- to our -- approving our annual report, and hopefully we'll make contact with Dani. So as soon as she gets online, we'll switch over to that. Okay. So, we're actually going to switch over to item 13B, which is review and approve the FY 2024 Annual Report, which is in tab 2 -- tabs 2 and t3. And this is

1 listed as a Council Coordinator item. Did you have things
2 you want to share?

3
4 MS. HUTCHINSON: No, I just wanted to say
5 that -- thank you, Madam Chair. The annual report is
6 again on -- in your tab 3 in your supplemental materials.
7 And we've asked all of you to look at that prior to this
8 meeting. But if you have any additions, it's just a
9 reminder, so you -- the annual report provides the
10 Councils an opportunity to address the directors of each
11 of the four departments of Interior Agencies and the
12 Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, in their
13 capacity as members of the Federal Subsistence Board.
14 And also, the Board is required to discuss and reply to
15 each issue in every annual report and to act when --
16 within the Board's authority, and also there is
17 additional or public members on the Board in addition
18 to those directors. Anyway, this is an opportunity for
19 your Council to make any edits to the annual report. You
20 guys came up with these topics at your last meeting in
21 Unalaska, and we went through the transcripts and wrote
22 those up, and Rebecca carefully helped me review them,
23 but that doesn't mean that we didn't represent
24 everything that you intended. So, this is your
25 opportunity to make any comments or any additions to
26 that. But right now, we're not allowing any additional
27 topics because it's just a really time consuming to have
28 to rewrite these and get more approvals. So, if you have
29 any additional topics, you can add it to your annual
30 report this fall. You can bring it to the table today,
31 but we won't be adding them anyway. So, but if you have
32 any information or needs to be updated or amended, the
33 Council can do that now. Thank you. Madam Chair.

34
35 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Great. Thank you.
36 So, what I'm going to do is read the main -- the bolded
37 underlined topic heading for each of these sections to
38 remind everyone what's in our report. And then if there
39 are any corrections within the paragraph underneath this
40 would be a good time to do that. So, number one is need
41 for online access to federal subsistence harvest permits
42 and this generally related to the challenges with having
43 to -- in our region having to get into brick-and-mortar
44 offices to get physical paper permits. So, are there any
45 corrections or clarifications that need to be made
46 within the paragraph under number one?

47
48 (No response)
49
50

1 Okay. Seeing none. Number two is lack
2 of fisheries research monitoring plan, or FRMP, funding
3 for weir projects. Generally, this highlighted for our
4 region the importance of weirs and the recognition that
5 funding is scarce, and particularly because with weirs
6 you want to have ongoing existence of the weirs. If you
7 don't have separate funding or you have inadequate
8 funding year after year, that can really impact the
9 ability to track salmon that are coming upstream. So are
10 there any clarifications or corrections within that
11 paragraph two.

12
13 (No response)

14
15 Okay. Seeing none, paragraph three
16 dedicated funding for weirs -- go ahead.

17
18 MR. RICHARDSON: I wanted to ask on page
19 two it says proving the Council. Should that be
20 providing?

21
22 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Probably. As soon
23 as I find it. Yes, sorry. So, in that -- the first
24 paragraph of the top of page two, I think the last
25 sentence, it starts with proving the Council, and that
26 should be providing the Council. And I'm looking -- did
27 you catch that? It's on page two of the report. It's
28 under number two. It's the last sentence in that section.
29 You want me to just tell you later? I can tell you later?
30 Okay. All right.

31
32 (Pause)

33
34 Okay. So, number three, dedicated
35 funding for weirs. This is going back to the weir issue,
36 expressing the importance of having dedicated funding
37 that can basically fund these weirs on an ongoing basis
38 and have it be separate from FRMP. So, we're not giving
39 up the other things that FRMP does. Are there any
40 clarifications or corrections within paragraph three?

41
42 (No response)

43
44 Okay. Seeing none, paragraph four, lack
45 of law enforcement officers for monitoring and
46 enforcement and enforcing subsistence, sport and
47 commercial fishing violations. This is something our
48 region has discussed, I think, particularly out on the
49 peninsula and the chain. Enforcement has been
50 challenging, although I think we've also have some --

1 had some observations for the Kodiak Road System as well.
2 Are there any corrections or clarifications for number
3 four?

4

5

(No response)

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

Okay. Seeing none. Number five challenges in ensuring subsistence access to resources arising from fragmented management approaches. So, this paragraph could probably be about ten pages long. But it has to do with, particularly, resources that are not -- they don't fall completely under one regulatory body and/or there's multiple regulatory systems that impact -- that help manage a resource. And when those systems aren't coordinated together, or they don't talk to each other very well, it can be very frustrating for users, for any user. So, are there any clarifications or changes to paragraph five? Pat, go ahead.

MR. HOLMES: Yes, Madam Chair. I like the phraseology of your first sentence there. Our Council once again notes federal agencies often operate in silos. Excellent phrase. Operate in isolation. And I was wondering, for example, fragmented management structures, perspectives and mandates. And that says, for example, the fragmented jurisdiction over salmon management between the Federal Subsistence Board and state authorities. I assume that Fish and Wildlife interactions is -- their input is through the Federal Subsistence Board. That is correct?

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So, for the federal side, you would have the Federal Subsistence Board and then you would also have for salmon, the bycatch measures that come out of the North Pacific Council. So, you have two completely unrelated federal regulatory bodies that have an impact on management related to salmon. Was that your question?

MR. HOLMES: Yes. I guess basically where it says the Federal Subsistence Board, their main agency and the interactions on this is Fish and Wildlife Service, but I think that's covered because the Subsistence Board, that's one of their management groups and then you have the State and NOAA, so I think that takes care of itself. I wanted to make a comment on number four. I wasn't quite quick enough to respond, but you had in your verbalization, you mentioned the lack of enforcement on the Alaska Peninsula as well as Alaska and Kodiak Road systems. And basically, there's almost

00040

1 none at all. A little bit of Cold Bay, but that's --
2 they have the same problems. So, I wonder if you'd want
3 to insert in there Alaska Peninsula communities?

4
5 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, I think we
6 can add that. So, at our -- I think I'd like to reword
7 that sentence. At our Council, reports of subsistence
8 and sport violations have increased, especially along --
9 - okay, I'm going to reword that sentence. But Pat, yes,
10 we will include a reference to the Peninsula in there.

11
12 MR. HOLMES: Thank you, Madam Chair.

13
14 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Any
15 other comments on paragraph four?

16
17 (No response)

18
19 Okay. Anything else on paragraph five?

20
21 (No response)

22
23 Okay. Number six, importance of FRMP
24 funding for statewide salmon research projects. This
25 paragraph notes the -- potentially the need for having
26 FRMP projects that are statewide instead of -- and so
27 instead of breaking the money up into regions so, you
28 have smaller pots of money, maybe having some kind of a
29 statewide salmon research project. Are there any
30 clarifications or corrections to this paragraph?

31
32 (No response)

33
34 Okay, and paragraph -- and then there's
35 a note that the rest of this report is for informational
36 purposes only and we don't need a response. Number seven,
37 eradication of signal crayfish and Buskin River system
38 in Kodiak. And we will hopefully be learning more about
39 crayfish tomorrow. And are there any corrections or
40 clarifications to section seven?

41
42 (No response)

43
44 Okay. Can we get a -- oh, sorry. Go
45 ahead, Daniel.

46
47 MR. SMITH: Yeah. Thank you, Madam Chair.
48 I would just like to suggest in that second sentence,
49 the Council is concerned that these crayfish prey on
50 salmon eggs and fry? I was wondering if we could add

00041

1 carcasses in there as well?

2

3 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So, salmon eggs,
4 comma, fry comma and carcasses?

5

6 MR. SMITH: Yeah, that would be good.

7

8 (Pause)

9

10 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat, go ahead.

11

12 MR. HOLMES: Yeah. I was wondering, they
13 do feed on the carcasses, but how does that relate to
14 their interaction with salmon because the carcasses are
15 there or are they taking the nutrient source away that
16 might be utilized by fry in the future, or why the
17 carcass? I know they feed on them, but how is the
18 connection with salmon productivity in the future?

19

20 MR. SMITH: Yeah, through the Chair. So,
21 what they're doing is basically consuming the carcasses
22 and sequestering that nitrogen that could be used for
23 other things in the environment, other animals. The
24 productivity of the whole entire lake is kind of being,
25 you know, broken down into what the crayfish are actually
26 eating. And so, some of that nitrogen that could be used
27 up by other organisms is going to be kind of lost in,
28 in the crayfish basically, if that makes sense.

29

30 MR. HOLMES: Perhaps you might want to
31 work with the Chair and have maybe a separate session
32 because they're not necessarily -- pardon my semantic
33 discussion, preying on the carcasses, but you might say
34 their use or utilization or feeding on carcasses might
35 affect other components of the lake's ecosystem. There's
36 some phraseology like that. Rather than tie it into the
37 previous sentence following that, in addition to sort
38 of thing.

39

40 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, and I'm not
41 seeing concern with that. I'm happy to work with Daniel
42 to create another sentence. So, the sentence would stand
43 as it is prey on salmon eggs and fry, and we'll add
44 another sentence about the carcasses and the
45 sequestration of nitrogen. Okay. Are there any other
46 clarifications or corrections that need to be made?

47

48 MR. PRICE: Quick one.

49

50

00042

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. So -- oh,
2 sorry. Go ahead, Chris.

3
4 MR. PRICE: Can -- on the CC's, can we
5 add the Alaska Department of Public Safety; that the
6 troopers can get the (indiscernible).

7
8 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, I think so.

9
10 MR. PRICE: Alaska Department of Public
11 Safety. The Trooper's office.

12
13 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. If there's
14 nothing else, can we get a motion to approve the FY 2024
15 Annual Report?

16
17 MR. HOLMES: Move to approve.

18
19 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Pat. Is
20 there a second?

21
22 MR. WALSEY: Second.

23
24 MR. ROHRER: Second.

25
26 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: We'll take Sam, I
27 think. All right. Is there any further discussion?

28
29 (No response)

30
31 Okay. Not seeing any. Is there any
32 objection?

33
34 (No response)

35
36 Okay. Hearing no objection. That motion
37 passes unanimously. So, we have our Annual Report
38 approved, and I think that -- okay. All right. So, we
39 have Dano Evenson on now. Oh, there's Dani. Hello. Okay,
40 and are we going to be sharing the presentation via
41 Teams or Zoom, or whatever? Kendra. Are we going to be
42 sharing the presentation or...?

43
44 MS. EVANSON: It can go either way. If
45 you want me to do it, I can do it, I think. How's that?

46
47 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. That looks
48 good. Great. We can see you up in the corner of the
49 screen and we can see the presentation. So, Dani, go
50 ahead and take it away.

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. EVENSON: Excellent. I'll take that as a win. I'm Dani Evenson. I am -- extended jurisdiction program manager for the Department of Fish and Game. Effectively, that means I handle a lot of stuff that hits us from outside the State. Particularly when it comes to salmon. And I apologize for being late here. I'm at a Pacific Council meeting in Vancouver. The Council didn't break until right at their noon hour, and I realized I didn't have a link for this meeting. So, a lot of scrambling. But I'm here now. So, I was invited to speak on the status of the Gulf of Alaska Chinook ESA petition.

On January 11th, 2024, NMFS, the National Marine Fisheries Service, received a petition to list all Gulf of Alaska chinook salmon as threatened or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act.....

(Distortion)

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Oh, we lost -- we lost your audio, Dani.

(Distortion)

Dani, can you hear me? Dani, can you hear us here in the room? Dani, can you hear us? Can you hear us from the room?

(No response)

Can anyone online hear us when we are talking in the room?

(No response)

MS. EVENSON:sighted missed escapement goals, as folks probably know, at KARAC, we haven't been doing so well meeting the Karluk or Chignik, and decreasing size and age at maturity. That kicked off.....

MS. HOLMAN: Dani?

MS. EVENSON: Yeah.

MS. HOLMAN: Dani, can you -- sorry. This is Kendra Holman with OSM. Can you hold up a second?

00044

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. EVENSON: Sure.

MS. HOLMAN: We lost our recorder, and we haven't been able to hear you?

MS. EVENSON: Oh, and you're coming in double. Okay. You want me to pause until you get it fixed? You're going to tell me when I -- when you can hear me?

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. Yeah. If you could hold on for a sec, and the as soon as we figure something out we'll let you know.

MS. HOLMA: Can you hear -- okay. So -- this is Kendra again. So, we are trying to get the recorder.

(Pause)

MS. EVENSON: We can hear you. Can you hear us? We'll do another sound check.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, we can hear you. Okay. We were -- we weren't getting you hearing us. Kendra was trying to say that we only heard up to the second slide. I think she was saying, right at the beginning.

MS. EVENSON: So, what was the last thing you heard me say?

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: I think.

(Simultaneous speech)

UNIDNENTIFIED: I don't I don't know that we.....

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Say was chinook throughout -- all of the Chinook throughout Gulf of Alaska are -- were subject to this petition. And that's about where you cut out.

MS. EVENSON: Okay, okay. Well, we'll go back a bit then. Yeah. So, all right. So, this petition was filed by Wild Fish Conservancy, and they're a Washington state based environmental group. And the same group that sued NMFS, the agency over the Southeast

1 Alaska commercial troll hook and line fishery, and that
2 was all about southern resident killer whales. They
3 didn't get what they wanted through the court system,
4 so they've continued to attack on multiple fronts.
5 They've attacked our markets and now this petition to
6 list Alaska chinook under the ESA. And, you know, before
7 I go further, I want to take a step back because a lot
8 of folks in Alaska aren't familiar with the ESA. We
9 don't have any listed fish species in Alaska, and we'd
10 like to keep it that way. So, the purpose of the ESA is
11 straightforward. It's to recover species that are
12 threatened with extinction and not let them go extinct.
13 And it's implemented by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife
14 Service and NMFS. And in Alaska we do have some
15 endangered species. It's a species that's in danger of
16 extinction throughout all or a significant portion of
17 its range. And examples are Cook Inlet beluga, the
18 western population of Steller sea lions, the North
19 Pacific population of humpback whale, short-tailed
20 albatross, and then there are threatened species that's
21 a little less severe. It's likely to become an endangered
22 species within the foreseeable future throughout all or
23 a significant portion of its range. And examples in
24 Alaska include wood bison, polar bears, northern sea
25 otters, that's the Southwest Alaska population, and
26 Steller's eider.

27
28 So, on this slide on as -- I said on
29 January 11th, they filed this petition. On May 23rd,
30 2024, NMFS issued what's called a positive 90-day
31 finding. This positive finding indicates that NMFS
32 believes that the petition provides substantial
33 information that listing may be warranted. And what it
34 does is it kicks off a formal status review under the
35 ESA. And the reasons they cited for this positive finding
36 was that we had missed escapement goals. And folks know
37 around this table, I'm guessing, that we haven't been
38 meeting the Karluk chinook escapement goal and haven't
39 been doing well in Chignik. And they also say to
40 decreasing size and age at maturity. And so that kicked
41 off a one-year status review and there's really a lot
42 to unpack here. And I'm going to do my best. The slides
43 were really to keep me on point more than to be
44 informative. So, the way the process works is they get
45 a petition, they do their 90-day review, and in this
46 case, we had a substantial finding and as soon as they
47 have a finding, there's an open public comment period
48 and that was for May 23rd. I think we got that extended
49 to early September, and there's this 12-month status
50 review. The status review, the clock started ticking on

1 that one on January 11th when they received the petition.
2 So, they're actually past their statutory deadline now.
3 And Wild Fish Conservancy has already filed a notice of
4 intent to sue National Marine Fisheries Service over
5 missing that deadline.

6
7 At the end of the rainbow, once they
8 finish their status review, you can have one of three
9 outcomes. The first one is warranted but precluded. So,
10 it means that the agency believes the stock should be
11 listed under the ESA. But the agency has other priorities
12 right now, and we'll just add it to the candidate list
13 and reevaluate it annually. It could be warranted. And
14 that means there's a proposed rule initiated, which
15 opens another public comment period. And the final rule
16 gets published in the Federal Register and it becomes
17 effective 30 days later; or you can have a decision not
18 to list. And the third option that can come out of it
19 is they find that ESA listing is not warranted.

20
21 So, when you evaluate a petition, they
22 look at ESA listing criteria and there are five threats
23 that are spelled out in the Endangered Species Act. One
24 is present or threatened destruction, modification or
25 curtailment of the species' habitat or range. So, in
26 other words, your quality of habitat. The second is over
27 utilization for fisheries or scientific and educational
28 purposes. The third is disease or predation affecting
29 the species. The fourth is that there's inadequate
30 regulatory mechanisms in place to protect that species
31 from harm, and the fifth one is other natural or manmade
32 factors affecting the species continued existence. And
33 this one, fifth one, could open up a whole can of worms
34 that could be things like climate change or hatcheries
35 of other species affecting it. Whatever gets included
36 there.

37
38 The State's position on this, since I
39 am a state employee, I'm going to give that to you. And
40 the State of Alaska does not believe that the ESA is the
41 correct tool to address a downturn in chinook abundance.
42 Our escapement goals are based on maximum sustained
43 yield. That is not a metric of abundance to maintain a
44 viable population. It's far above the stock replacing
45 itself; it is managed to allow more fish to support
46 fisheries. So, failing to meet an escapement goal is not
47 evidence that stocks are at risk of extinction. We have
48 habitat that's largely pristine and we have a lot of
49 regulatory controls, which we believe are adequate to
50 manage for the conservation of these stocks.

1

2 In terms of next, steps what's
3 happening? NMFS has convened a status review team that
4 is composed of federal scientists. The State was able
5 to get two state scientists since we're the ones that
6 manage salmon and NMFS largely does not, but our two
7 scientists on the status review are non-voting members
8 and do not have a -- cannot write a minority opinion.
9 Tlingit and Haida was also successful in getting someone
10 added to the status review to coordinate tribal input
11 into that. And so, the first step in the chain of what
12 happens in a status review, they compile all their
13 information, and they synthesize information, and they
14 take that information and look at what they have, and
15 they delineate listable units they call evolutionarily
16 significant units. In other words, what is the stock
17 group that they're going to list? And then they do a
18 population assessment and a threats analysis. And I'm
19 going to talk a little bit more about delineating the
20 units next.

21

22 So evolutionary significant units,
23 those are defined as substantially reproductively
24 isolated from other non-specific population units. So,
25 are they super genetically different or, you know, is
26 it Southeast Alaska stock from Kodiak? Are they all one
27 stock group or are they so different that they have no
28 possibility of interbreeding? And the second piece is a
29 little more subjective. Let's say it's -- does it
30 represent an important component in the evolutionary
31 legacy of the species? And I don't know who gets to
32 determine whether it's important or not, in whose value
33 system, but that one is a lot more subjective and subject
34 to interpretation. In this map, I show all the areas in
35 blue have chinook spawning systems in our Anadromous
36 Waters Catalog. So, they could come in and say, the Gulf
37 of Alaska is all one unit that we're looking at to list;
38 or they could say Southeast Alaska, hey, you're one unit.
39 Copper River, you're one unit. Cook Inlet, you're one
40 unit. Kodiak, you're unto yourself; or they can come in
41 and say, Kenai late run chinook, that's a unit, right.
42 So, we have no idea at this point in time how those
43 units will get divided, and that's an incredibly
44 critical piece in this process because the more you have,
45 the more you are at risk. The smaller the units are, the
46 less fish there are in them, and the more that you are
47 at risk of getting a listing.

48

49

50

 So, what happens if chinook get listed?
Well, species management shifts from state to federal

1 control. It has the potential to affect nearly every
2 fishery in the Gulf of Alaska, and not just those
3 targeting chinook. In other words, if you're a sockeye
4 fishery and you happen to encounter some chinook, there
5 might be some additional restrictions there. There is
6 added complexity and a lot more regulatory hurdles.
7 There is -- take is prohibited, and by take, the federal
8 definition of take includes to harass, harm it doesn't
9 just mean dead fish. So, if a species is declared in
10 threatened, the agency will promulgate what they call
11 4D rules and they'll allow certain instances when take
12 is allowed of the species, otherwise if it's endangered
13 it will be even smaller amount that's allowed for any
14 purposes. And the last piece of that is designation of
15 critical habitat. This has the potential to really add
16 a lot of regulatory hurdles and costs and time to a lot
17 of projects, especially if the project receives federal
18 funding or needed a federal permit. So, let's say you
19 want to rebuild a dock, or you want to build a boat
20 launch. Those projects would need -- or you want to
21 restore habitat, or you want to build a building on
22 habitat, all of that would need additional permitting.
23 So, we could expect a lot more of that.

24
25 In closing, and I want to talk about how
26 you can engage in the ESA process, there are two points
27 where we're able to provide comments, and I will say
28 that in this process, the State of Alaska is the same
29 as the public. We have -- we don't have a different
30 standing when it comes to the ESA. It's a federal
31 process. So, there's an open -- 60-day open public
32 comment period statutorily after the positive 90-day
33 finding that happened last year. Because they decided
34 this in late May, and folks were out fishing, the state
35 went ahead and wrote a letter requesting that to be
36 extended. And we were successful because the folks --
37 the very folks that it's affecting were not accessible.
38 Everybody was out on the water. We can also comment
39 after the proposed rule to list as endangered -- or
40 threatened or endangered and species status assessments;
41 those all have public comment periods associated with
42 them. And finally, the public or the State might be
43 requested to provide information and scientific
44 expertise and analyses during the one-year status
45 review. And I think that's all I had for you. I'm happy
46 to take any questions.

47
48 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Great. Thank you so
49 much, Dani. Are there questions? Pat, go ahead.
50

1 MR. HOLMES: Excuse me. Good
2 presentation. What are the dates where we can comment?
3 I mean, we -- our Council can provide input, but also
4 as an individual, what's the time frame?
5

6 MS. EVENSON: Okay. So, this is a federal
7 process. Thank you for the question. And we expect that
8 the status review will be available sometime this
9 spring. And that will open up a comment period, and
10 it'll be a 60-day comment period. The State will try and
11 get that extended to allow fishermen additional time.
12 But I can't get you an exact date because it's federal.
13 It's not a state document, but I can notify folks of
14 that, and happy to do so.
15

16 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, Dani. On
17 the presentation, the -- I think the one that's titled
18 ESA listing process, it was kind of the timeline of the
19 process where we're at right now -- is it correct we're
20 waiting for the 12-month status review to come out and
21 that's the one where there's the three options of what
22 that status review could be? Is that the stage we're
23 waiting for?
24

25 MS. EVENSON: Correct. Correct. I think
26 they're probably somewhere around the 90% level on that.
27 The agency did the best they could to meet the deadline.
28 Now with the new federal administration, obviously
29 things are in flux. So, and I think progress may have
30 slowed a little bit, but I would still anticipate that
31 that would be done by late spring. And it's anybody's
32 guess what's going to come out the other side of this
33 thing.
34

35 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, thank you.
36 Pat, go ahead.
37

38 MR. HOLMES: Madam Chair, what I'm
39 wondering is, is we will not be meeting again until
40 September and then all of our comments on issues like
41 this go through the Federal Board of Subsistence. And
42 I'm wondering, how are we going to participate in this
43 if the deadline ends up being before we have our next
44 meeting, and then at our next meeting, we make a comment.
45 I'm wondering if we could frame up some sort of a general
46 position at this point to send on to the Federal
47 Subsistence Board as to what our feelings are on it. And
48 then once the things are more specific, if we can get
49 into that little niche -- time niche, down to revise or
50 update our comment. 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, Pat. So, my understanding is that for a comment letter, it does not have to go back through the Federal Subsistence Board. So, we can -- the RAC can generate a letter fairly quickly.

MS. HUTCHINSON: Yes. This is Lisa, for the record. Yes, Madam Chair. That's correct. If you want to write a letter directly to the Federal Subsistence Board about something, that is, then they do need to comment on something of this sort, you could just write -- the Council can vote right now to write a particular letter, and we can write it and submit the comments when they come available. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. And then my thought is that the timing is a bit awkward. I think it's going to be hard to write a decent letter without knowing what that 12-month review status or the 12-month status review says, because the three options are pretty far apart. They're very distinct options. I guess I'm hoping that maybe this takes a little bit longer for them to do the 12-month review, hoping the public comment gets extended, and I'm hoping that we do have time to have a RAC meeting and actually generate a letter. I think that would probably be best case scenario from, from our perspective. We certainly could try to generate a very broadly worded general letter at this meeting, I don't think it's going to be as strong as if we, you know, had that 12-month status review in front of us, is my thought. But are there more comments or -- Sam, go ahead.

MR. ROHRER: Thank you. Through the Chair. Dani, good presentation. I appreciate it. I have a question for you, but first, just a suggestion. The State might consider using the plight of the RACs. We want to comment, but most likely we can't have good comments because of the time period of our fall meetings. And when the comment period comes out, the State could use that in their argument for extending the comment period to say, hey, there's a whole bunch of RACs that might want to comment on this, and they're being disenfranchised, so extend their comment period. Anyways, just a suggestion for the State. My question is, can you just talk a little bit about the difference between a decision to list as threatened versus a decision to list as endangered? And, and I'm assuming that that will come out of the 12-month status review

1 they could say warranted or not warranted, like you said.
2 But that's also when they'll decide if they're
3 potentially endangered or threatened. Is that correct?
4 And then what's the implications of that difference?

5
6 MS. EVENSON: Yeah. Thank you for the
7 question. To your first suggestion, I appreciate that.
8 I don't think the State can speak on behalf of the RACs,
9 but the RACs could certainly write a letter to extend
10 the public comment period, whenever that comes out to
11 make sure that your voices are heard. That would just
12 be a letter to the National Marine Fisheries Service.
13 And I think that would be simple to do. The second piece,
14 just to let you know, I feel like I'm a little disjointed
15 because I just ran in from one presentation, is that the
16 State has been putting out, you know, two pagers or
17 three pagers synopsis of some of these federal documents
18 and sharing them with folks as these issues arise to
19 help guide folks and give our interpretation of these
20 things, and we're happy to provide that to you. On this
21 particular issue, one of the unique things about it is
22 that -- is the unity, is the absolute level of unity we
23 saw across Alaskans. We had Alaskans, we had tribes, we
24 had commercial fishermen, sport fishing interests. We
25 had, you know, development interests like the RDC. We
26 had Alaska based environmental groups all writing in
27 comments during the last open comment period that this
28 was an incredibly bad idea. So, and when do we ever see
29 that in the fisheries realm? Probably not since
30 statehood. So, it has been really a unifying issue across
31 the board. So, talking a little bit about endangered
32 versus threatened. So, take is prohibited except in
33 specific circumstances when an endangered or threatened
34 listing with a special rule. So, and take again is to
35 harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap,
36 capture, collect or attempt to engage in any such
37 conduct. When it is threatened but not endangered, they
38 will allow some level of take, so you might see some
39 incidental take in other fisheries. You might see
40 provisions to catch more hatchery fish. You might see
41 provisions -- so, the rules are much less restrictive
42 on the endangered side, but they still are restricted.
43 When they're endangered, it's pretty much a complete
44 closure. If you look -- you know, I kind of look to the
45 Pacific Northwest for clues on how this might unfold,
46 and it's a very different system than the one we have
47 up here. So, first of all, the escapement goals that we
48 manage to, that goes out the window if we're on a similar
49 system and it's an exploitation rate cap on fisheries
50 and what it takes into account when there's an

1 exploitation rate cap, all the harvests from all the
2 fisheries that might be taking these fish. So, if --
3 let's say you have and I'm just picking this for
4 argument's sake, a sport fishery in Kodiak that picks
5 up a couple of Kenai fish, right. That exploitation rate
6 gets added to the -- as part of the maximum for Kenai.
7 And so, there's a limited amount of taken and endangered
8 and threatened, sorry, but in endangered you don't
9 really see that level of it is the absolute minimum.
10 Does that help? I know I'm kind of a loosey goosey
11 explanation.

12
13 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, no, you're
14 getting a thumbs up. And your presentation was really,
15 really helpful. We have Natasha. Oh, not Natasha. Chris,
16 go ahead.

17
18 MR. PRICE: Hi, this is Chris Price from
19 Unalaska. Can you give us a real brief explanation of
20 the overall decline of the chinook salmon?

21
22 MS. EVENSON: An explanation? Are we
23 talking about the cause? Because the cause of that is
24 unknown. We've seen a decline, and we've seen it pretty
25 much across the board and, you know -- so that tells me
26 it's not an in-river issue. Yes, in some cases we've
27 seen some warmer water, but by and large some of our
28 systems are glacially dominated, like Southeast Alaska,
29 where there's still a lot of glacial dominance in those
30 rivers. So, it is largely believed to be something in
31 the marine environment that's impacting them. We are
32 investing in the cause of decline. But this -- for most
33 of these stocks, we haven't seen good production in the
34 last decade or more, last 12 or so years. I don't know
35 if that helps. What you will see on the State side is
36 an increasing number of restrictions moving forward,
37 because we have this petition looming out here and
38 because things really aren't rosy with chinook right
39 now. So, we are going to be taking more aggressive
40 management actions to protect these stocks, and some of
41 those will be very painful to Alaskans. But the goal at
42 the end of this is to ensure that when ocean conditions
43 turn around and become more favorable, that we can have
44 -- once again enjoy healthy and robust fisheries. I feel
45 like I'm striped here. Okay. Maybe that's -- no, let's
46 go the other way. Hotel room.

47
48 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thanks,
49 Dani. Natasha.

50

1 MS. HAYDEN: Thanks, Madam Chair. Thanks
2 for the presentation. It's really good. I -- similarly
3 to what Sam suggested, and what you spoke to, is that
4 us as a RAC, we could draft a letter to send to the
5 agency requesting to have a comment period that would
6 extend past our falls meeting series so that we have an
7 opportunity to digest what they -- their findings are
8 and then make a comment. So it is that what you had your
9 -- in your response to Sam was -- that us as a RAC we
10 could go ahead and do that, make that request to them
11 to make sure that the comment period is long enough so
12 that we have an opportunity to comment on it after it's
13 released. Is that right?

14
15 MS. EVENSON: Correct. I mean, I -- not
16 part of the federal process, but I would suggest that
17 you could do that as an individual RAC. You could
18 probably also look to the Federal Subsistence Board to
19 do that when that comes out because, I'm guessing if you
20 have comments, that a number of the other RACs are going
21 to want to comment as well, and I think you would have
22 a strong voice there. You know, this is going to be a
23 complicated one. Nobody's ever tried to look at all of
24 our stocks in Gulf of Alaska. It's a pretty heavy lift
25 and we're not sure, like I said, what's going to come
26 out the other side. It's very different than when all
27 the listings happened in the Pacific Northwest in 1999.

28
29 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Go ahead, Natasha.

30
31 MS. HAYDEN: Thanks, Madam Chair. So
32 slightly different topic. The -- is there an opportunity
33 for us to or do you know enough about the process to say
34 if there's a potential for an Alaska Native exemption,
35 similar to the Marine Mammal Protection Act for
36 endangered species? Is this where the point of entry
37 would be for advocating for if an -- if they do end up
38 doing, you know, having a finding that it's a threatened
39 or endangered species that there to request that that
40 get built in.

41
42 MS. EVENSON: I think that would be a
43 conversation with the National Marine Fisheries Service.
44 Not the State of Alaska. I can't really help you on
45 that.

46
47 MS. HAYDEN: Okay. Thank you.

48
49 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Are
50 there any other comments or questions? Pat, go ahead.

1

2 MR. HOLMES: This is very complicated,
3 but I think we still should have some kind of very simple
4 statement to go through the Federal Board and that we
5 object or disagree with the premise that they're
6 endangered, and that we feel that more time should be
7 allowed for comments from the respective RACs. And also,
8 from the tribal entities in Alaska. Something real short
9 and sweet like that, maybe two sentences, and I didn't
10 quite get it phrased, but I'd like us to consider
11 something like that just to kind of make the point to
12 the Federal Board that we need to have more discussion
13 on this. I honestly feel, for example, in Kodiak, because
14 of the Karluk run, the early run of sockeye is going to
15 be closed on the south and west side of the island. And
16 that's a tremendous change to increase the potential for
17 escapement of chinook. They're closing the sport
18 fishing. They're going to close the subsistence fishing
19 for Karluk kings. And so, I think that there are
20 processes in motion that should be examined or done
21 experimentally before they leap into threatened
22 decision. And I did look at all the information that was
23 presented when they did their initial discussion about
24 it being threatened, and I think a lot of the data they
25 took, they cherry picked and didn't have everything in
26 there and didn't have that -- there are methods of making
27 some adjustments at this point. Anyway, they're just not
28 playing fair.

29

30 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, Pat. Are
31 there any other questions for Dani? Kendra? So, there's
32 a question in the chat. When did the Alaska Department
33 of Fish and Game change escapement goals to maximum
34 sustained yield? Dani, is that something you can speak
35 to?

36

37 MS. EVENSON: Well, it's a little out of
38 my depth, but I believe it was when we adopted our
39 sustainable salmon fish policy and our escapement goal
40 policy. We have a lot of other department employees on
41 the line that might be able to phone a friend on this
42 one.

43

44 (Simultaneous speech)

45

46 And I'm hearing none. But I'll have to
47 respond to that later.

48

49 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, thanks.
50 Okay. Are there any other questions for Dani?

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)

Okay. I'm not seeing any. Dani, thank you so much. Your presentation was really helpful. So, thanks for taking the time to appear on the screen before us. We really appreciate it.

MS. EVENSON: Yeah, and thank you. Thank you for your patience in getting me online. And I'm happy to come back once this document's released, if you so desire, to talk about what's in it.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, and I was going to say, so your offer as the State of Alaska produces one pagers and two pagers, your offer to share those, is there a central OSM person those can go to that could.....

(Simultaneous Speech)

MS. EVENSON: Sure. I can make sure that Ben Mulligan gets a copy, who's our conduit with OSM, and that it gets distributed.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Thank you so much. All right.

(Simultaneous speech)

MS. EVENSON: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you and have a great rest of your day at the Pacific Council.

MS. EVANSON: You bet. Bye.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. So, at a Council level, it sounds like there may be interest in drafting a general letter, at the very least asking for comment period that extends into the fall to accommodate RACs being able to review the 12-month status review and generate comment. So, does someone want to make a motion that we send such a letter? Sam.

MR. ROHRER: Thank you, Madam Chair. Not quite a motion yet. Actually, a question. What about -- can we make two letters? One letter that says kind of guessing what they might do and saying, hey, we oppose you know -- we oppose listing or da da da da da, and

1 then if they make a decision that's substantially
2 different from what we're expecting, we can have a letter
3 that just says, hey, we need you to extend our comment
4 period. So maybe preempt it, come up with a couple
5 different letters that can just be sitting there
6 depending on what they come up with. Thank you.

7
8 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, so based on
9 that, I think maybe what we'll do is we'll handle the
10 letter thing tomorrow. So that'll leave the rest of today
11 for people to think about what they want to have in a
12 letter. And we'll just make sure to address it before
13 we close the meeting. Natasha, go ahead.

14
15 MS. HAYDEN: Thanks, Madam Chair. I am
16 wondering if there's an opportunity for us, or if can
17 we request that somebody from National Marine Fisheries
18 present -- give either present to us their perspective
19 on this topic and make themselves available for
20 questions regarding this? No -- in the -- I mean, I
21 wouldn't be -- I don't think it's possible this meeting.
22 But if it is then, yeah, but if not, then our next
23 meeting for sure.

24
25 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. Because I
26 think at our last meeting we did have someone from NOAA
27 fisheries present, so yes, we can -- on this exact issue.
28 So, we can ask them to come back in the fall to share
29 whatever they can. I think she seemed a little bit
30 limited in what she could share, but yes, we can try to
31 get that. Okay. Is there anything else on this item?
32 Yes, Lisa.

33
34 MS. HUTCHINSON: Yes, ma'am. I just
35 wanted to just remind that we do have a presentation
36 tomorrow. And it is with -- it's a time certain time
37 that is going to be just talking about the chum salmon
38 bycatch. And she's a -- Kate Haapala, she's a PhD, so
39 she's with the rural fishing community and a tribal
40 liaison. So anyway, she might be able to answer some of
41 those questions while we have her on as well, but -- or
42 who we could speak to later. Thanks.

43
44 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Let's go
45 ahead and break for lunch. We'll come back at 1:15.

46
47 (Off record)

48
49 (On record)

50

00057

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Well, it's
2 1:18, so if we can get back to the table. So, in a couple
3 of minutes, we'll start the next agenda item, which is
4 12C, the deferred wildlife proposal. And this will be
5 Kendra Holman and Jason Roberts.

6
7 (Pause)

8
9 Okay. So, item 13C deferred wildlife
10 proposal. Dr. Jason Roberts.

11
12 DR. ROBERTS: That's me. Good afternoon,
13 Chair, members of the Council. My name is Jason Roberts.
14 I'm an anthropologist at OSM for at least the remainder
15 of the afternoon. Let's see what happens. So, I think
16 most of you know that this particular proposal was really
17 taken on by another anthropologist, Pippa Kenner, in our
18 department. She was very much the expert on this one,
19 but I'm going to try to present it for her because she
20 is, I believe, traveling back from Bethel right now. And
21 so, the analysis for this proposal WP24-01, is located
22 under tab 4 in your supplemental materials. And if you
23 remember, this proposal was submitted a while ago by a
24 resident of McCarthy, Alaska, who requested that the
25 Federal Subsistence Board allow the sale of brown bear
26 hides under federal subsistence regulations. The Board
27 deferred this proposal at its April 2024 meeting. And
28 since then, OSM has had [sic] added an addendum and that
29 addendum starts on page 18 of that proposal in your
30 book. And so, the addendum adds new information and a
31 new revised OSM conclusion to the end of the analysis.
32 And it addresses the Board's reasons for deferring the
33 proposal and also identifies information the regional
34 Councils had not seen when they made their initial
35 recommendations in the fall of 2023.

36
37 So, the Federal Subsistence Board again
38 deferred action on this proposal at its most recent
39 February 2025 meeting. And at that time, the Board
40 requested all ten Regional Advisory Councils provide new
41 recommendations if they wanted to at their winter
42 meeting. So, at this meeting, based on the revised OSM
43 conclusion and the addendum. And so, this is a statewide
44 proposal, and it will be reviewed by all ten Regional
45 Advisory Councils. And each Council can determine
46 whether the regulation proposed is culturally
47 appropriate for their region and how they want, you know,
48 the regulation to look for their specific region. And
49 so, in the analysis addendum, the Federal Subsistence
50 Board deferred action on the proposal, because adopting

1 it as submitted might conflict with the Convention on
2 International Trade and Endangered Species, also known
3 as CITES. This is an international treaty. The U.S. Fish
4 and Wildlife Service has delegated to the State of Alaska
5 Department of Fish and Game the authority to provide for
6 the international trade of brown bear hides. Only if
7 ADF&G issues permits, reporting that the trade will not
8 be detrimental to the survival of the species in the
9 wild. Therefore, a permit from the Alaska Department of
10 Fish and Game is required. The Alaska Department of Fish
11 and Game issues a permit currently to sell the hide of
12 a brown bear only if it's taken in in an area with a two
13 brown bear harvest limit per year. So, as background to
14 the issue, brown bears outside of Alaska exist in much
15 smaller populations than in Alaska, and the State of
16 Alaska limits sales of hides because unlimited sales
17 might incentivize legal and illegal harvesting in Alaska
18 and elsewhere in North America. And for this reason, the
19 State's primary purpose is to prevent hides from
20 entering commercial markets. And so, while limiting the
21 sale of brown bear hides is necessary for the hundreds
22 of brown bears harvested in sport and general hunts each
23 year in Alaska, in which the edible meat need not be
24 salvaged. The much lower number of brown bears harvested
25 for subsistence, for which the edible meat must be
26 salvaged, does not need the same level of restrictions
27 on the sale of hides. And so, the revised OSM conclusion
28 begins on page 22. If you'll remember initially the OSM
29 conclusion was to support with modification to allow for
30 the sale of hides in areas where a two-brown bear per
31 year limit existed.

32
33 Our revised modification now is to
34 support proposal WP 2401 with modification that the
35 hides of brown bears, with or without claws attached,
36 may be purchased within the United States for personal
37 use and not to be resold. The hunter must request an OSM
38 customary trade permit and must return the permit.
39 Additionally, the modified regulation would align
40 federal sealing regulations with state of Alaska sealing
41 regulations. So, the justification for the revised
42 conclusion is that the Federal Subsistence Board
43 deferred this proposal in April 2024, because adopting
44 it as submitted might conflict with CITES. In response,
45 OSM created this modification to allow the sale of a
46 hide of a brown bear under federal subsistence
47 regulations in an area taken -- in an area with a 1 or
48 2 brown bear harvest limit. The focus of the OSM
49 modification is to limit sales to purchases within the
50 United States because CITES limits only international

1 purchases of brown bear hides. So, this modification
2 only allowing for domestic purchases, would be in line
3 with CITES.

4
5 So, the following two elements of the
6 OSM modification will align federal regulations with
7 state of Alaska regulations and permit requirements. The
8 first is the purchase of a hide must be for personal use
9 and not to be resold. This is intended to prevent a
10 customary traded hide from entering a commercial market,
11 and the seal number must be included in any advertisement
12 of sale, which allows law enforcement basically to track
13 and make sure that the brown bear was legally harvested.
14 The OSM modification goes on to allow a hide to be sold
15 with or without claws attached, which will allow
16 federally qualified users to remove claws to incorporate
17 into handicrafts to then also sell the hide. Finally,
18 the OSM modification removes federal regulations --
19 removes from federal regulations the requirement in some
20 areas of Alaska that at the time of sealing, the sealing
21 official must remove and retain the skin of the head and
22 the front claws of the bear hide. This will align federal
23 sealing regulations in those areas with current state
24 of Alaska sealing regulations. Current federal edible
25 meat salvage requirements will likely protect brown
26 bears from overharvest. So, in conclusion, the OSM
27 modification complies with the provision of CITES and
28 allows federally qualified users to legally sell the
29 hides of brown bears while balancing customary trade and
30 conservation. So that's the end of my talking points
31 here, and I'll try to answer any questions.

32
33 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Dr.
34 Roberts. Are there questions?

35
36 (No response)

37
38 Okay. I'm not seeing a question. This
39 is an action item. So, would anyone like to make a motion
40 to support this proposal as modified by OSM in February
41 of 2025?

42
43 MS. HAYDEN: Madam Chair this is Natasha.
44 So moved.

45
46 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Is there
47 a second?

48
49 MS. CHERNOFF: Second.

50

00060

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Coral.
2 Discussion?

3
4 (No response)

5
6 There's no discussion. I'm going to ask
7 if there's objections. All right, Coral, go ahead.

8
9 MS. CHERNOFF: I have a question, Jason.
10 The requesting of a -- let's see. The permit that you
11 would have to have, the permitting, would that be done
12 through a federal office?

13
14 DR. ROBERTS: Yeah. So, through the
15 Chair, member Chernoff, the sealing would be done by an
16 ADF&G certified sealing officer, but then the permit for
17 customary trade would be issued by a federal office, who
18 would be a federal permit.

19
20 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: We'll take Jeff and
21 then Coral.

22
23 MR. WESLEY: Would there be regional
24 limits on the number of these? Thank you.

25
26 DR. ROBERTS: Yes, that's a good
27 question. So, there are already, you know, various
28 regulations regarding the harvest of brown bears under
29 subsistence regulations. And so, this wouldn't change,
30 you know, how many you can harvest from an area. It
31 would just allow you to sell the hide if you harvested
32 legally under subsistence regulations.

33
34 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Coral, go ahead.

35
36 MS. CHERNOFF: So, this is a question
37 because I'm too lazy to figure it out, but is there --
38 do all areas have subsistence hunting, or do we know the
39 number of areas currently, or maybe the total overall
40 of permits issued throughout Alaska for subsistence?

41
42 (Pause)

43
44 DR. ROBERTS: Sorry. If you'll bear with
45 me, I know I had some information related to this. Okay.
46 So, Pippa provided us with some information, and I'm
47 assuming this is the most recent. It's in 2021. Seven
48 states subsistence registration hunts for brown bear
49 occurred. Seven permits were issued, three were used.
50 One brown bear harvest was reported. In 2021, again, 35

00061

1 state registration hunts took place. A little over 4000
2 permits were issued, about 2000 were used, 617 brown
3 bear harvests were reported, and over half of that
4 harvest was taken in Units 9B and 9C. In each of the
5 other management Units, harvests were between 0 and 54
6 brown bears. I also have state draw permits, about 130
7 state draw hunts occurred in 2021. 594 draw permits were
8 issued, 39 -- 397 were used, and 216 brown bear harvests
9 were reported. The majority of brown bears taken under
10 state draw permits were taken in Unit 8. In a state
11 subsistence registration permit is not available to hunt
12 in Unit 8. A federal permit is available instead, which
13 allows local hunters to participate without having to
14 compete for state draw permit.

15

16 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. How many
17 -- can you say again how many registration bears were
18 harvested? Was that 617 or was it less than 617?

19

20 DR. ROBERTS: So, it's two different
21 types of hunts. There's the state subsistence
22 registration hunt. Seven permits were issued and three
23 were used and one was harvested in the state. 35 state
24 registration hunts and 617 brown bears were harvested
25 in that one.

26

27 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: And 216 harvested
28 under the draw permits?

29

30 DR. ROBERTS: Yes.

31

32 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Thank you.
33 Carol, go ahead.

34

35 MS. CHERNOFF: So, I'm just going to
36 clarify, I was asking about just subsistence permitting
37 across the state. And just as another comment, I will
38 say that I think there's 13 available every year amongst
39 our villages for harvest limit. And the highest number
40 that was taken was in 2022, 2023, three were taken and
41 2015 and '16 three were taken. So out of 13 permits in
42 our Kodiak area, the most that's ever been taken, it
43 looks like since 2015, is three under the subsistence
44 harvest.

45

46 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Go ahead, Chris.

47

48 MR. PRICE: I just want to clarify. So
49 once a person, Native or non-Native, harvest a brown
50 bear, they can't sell the hide and then a non-native

00062

1 person that's selling jewelry arts can resell it. Is
2 that what I understand?

3

4 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Are you talking
5 about the OSM modification?

6

7 MR. PRICE: Yeah.

8

9 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Thanks.

10

11 DR. ROBERTS: So, the modification is to
12 allow for, specifically, the claws to be used in
13 handicrafts, and then the hide could be sold separately
14 from the claws.

15

16 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: But it can only be
17 sold once. It can't be resold after that.

18

19 DR. ROBERTS: Yeah, that's the intent.
20 Thank you.

21

22 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, thank you.
23 Sam.

24

25 MR. ROHRER: Through the Chair. Thank
26 you. I was -- I wish I would have been there for the
27 fall meeting to hear all the RACs discussion on this.
28 You know, in the past, our RAC has always been opposed
29 to selling of brown bear parts for Kodiak. For as long
30 as I can remember, we have been. However, I recognize,
31 as Coral pointed out, there's not very many subsistence
32 bears killed off of Kodiak. If this passed, it's probably
33 not going to increase that number very much. I still
34 don't like the idea of selling brown bear parts, but the
35 State kind of threw the doors wide open on that a number
36 of years ago when they started making it legal in two
37 bear areas. So, I don't know, I'm on the fence. I'm just
38 real curious to hear what other RAC members say. But I'm
39 not I'm not crazy about it, about the idea, but there's
40 probably not a lot of harm in it either.

41

42 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat, go ahead.

43

44 MR. HOLMES: Any of the federal or state
45 agencies, I mean, there has not been a large subsistence
46 harvest. And -- but what I wonder is, what's the best
47 guess? Is that going to increase it? Because our
48 fisheries are down, and folks need money. You know,
49 there's more -- what's the availability on all of our
50 villages here in Kodiak? What can they take for

1 subsistence? And would that increase the subsistence
2 harvest?

3
4 DR. ROBERTS: Through the Chair. Mr.
5 Holmes. So, I know that from previously reported
6 information, the State has noted that they did not see
7 a significant increase in harvest in these areas where
8 the brown bear hides were allowed to be sold. Here in
9 Unit 8, the harvest limits are not going to change. So,
10 it would be -- unless a reg -- a proposal is submitted
11 to change those regulations. So right now, the harvest
12 limits one bear by federal registration permit for each
13 of the following communities, Akhiok, two -- gets two
14 permits, Karluk one permit, Larsen Bay up to three
15 permits, Old Harbor up to three permits, Ouzinkie up to
16 two permits and Port Lions up to two permits. So, this
17 particular proposal would not change those regulations.

18
19 MR. HOLMES: Thank you.

20
21 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Further
22 comments or Pat, go ahead.

23
24 MR. HOLMES: Is -- this a general
25 comment, and I think it's a generational thing. I had -
26 - a few years back when we were talking about this, I
27 talked to you a lot of folks in my generation in the
28 villages, and I just remember conversations through the
29 years with folks like Larry (indiscernible) who was
30 actually a bear guide for a while. And he told me a very
31 passionate discussion on how when a young man came into
32 puberty, a rite of passage was for them to go out and
33 kill a bear, and they'd get out -- the young men would
34 prod the bear out of the den, and then the person that
35 was getting his rite of manhood would shoot the bear,
36 but that they'd use everything on the bear for food or
37 handicrafts or art within the community. And so, I called
38 around to some folks, like the lands over in Karluk and
39 other places, and I think a lot of the old timers just
40 -- it's not something that they would do. And it's too
41 bad we don't have an anthropologist or something to look
42 at this in perspective. It seems like the present
43 generation, then this is an acceptable thing. And so,
44 I'm -- I just really don't know how I'm going to go on
45 this because, you know, I'm not a Native, but I've known
46 lots of folks even like Swen Hawkinson, Sr.,
47 (indiscernible), with him waiting for planes, you know,
48 it was some things you would use a shoot-kill, but you'd
49 use everything. And, but then again, is selling a hide
50 and claws a use? It probably wasn't before, but anyway,

1 I'm still muddled. Thank you, Madam Chair.

2

3 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Further --
4 Coral. Oh, sorry. We'll go, Dr. Roberts, and then Coral.

5

6 DR. ROBERTS: I was just going to respond
7 to member Holmes. You know, this also won't change the
8 requirement that you have to salvage the meat and use
9 the meat. And you are correct in noting and, I kind of
10 breezed over that but, you know, we have unfortunately
11 not a ton of detail because it's a statewide proposal,
12 but we do have, you know, anthropological, ethnographic
13 information about sort of traditional practices
14 involving bears in the Kodiak regions. But, of course,
15 you know, these kinds of things do change over time. But
16 yeah, that's all I wanted to add.

17

18 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Coral.

19

20 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah. I will just say want
21 to say thank you to OSM for the extra work you did on
22 the proposal from the time it first came forward in
23 researching the CITES and coming up with a situation
24 where these can get tagged and sold in the United States.
25 So, I thank you for all that work. I appreciate that.
26 And then I will just say I am for this. I'm for full
27 utilization if an animal is killed and I believe that,
28 you know, we live today in a system where, you know, we
29 don't call it barter or trade anymore, but in fact,
30 exchange for money is a barter and trade system. And you
31 know, it's often costly to hunt. And I'm just all for
32 full utilization. I know there are already a lot of
33 bear, up to 200 every year, killed and the meat is not
34 utilized, and the hide and skull is utilized. So once
35 again, I'll just say I'm all for full utilization of an
36 animal killed. Thank you.

37

38 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Natasha.

39

40 MS. HAYDEN: Thank you, Madam Chair. I
41 just want to talk a little bit about some of the stories.
42 Pat was bringing up some of the conversations that he's
43 had with the elders. So, when I was young here, we had
44 a different -- in my family, we had a different
45 relationship with the bears than what exists now. There
46 was like there was human territory and there was bear
47 territory, and there wasn't as much overlap without some
48 reciprocity that would happen and communicating with the
49 environment and communicating with the other animals.
50 And we still have that with the way that we harvest our

1 sea mammals and the other land mammals and such. And I
2 got to have a conversation with an elder from the Copper
3 River area, and he reminded me of -- in their law, for
4 the Ahtna people about the relationship between the
5 humans and the bears, and that the reason why I'm
6 bringing this up is because it's not -- there isn't any
7 opportunity to overlay that into the Office of
8 Subsistence Management and the way that these
9 regulations are created and then administered. And I am
10 supportive of utilizing all of the bear and I'm
11 supportive of, you know, the people in communities that
12 are eligible to participate in a subsistence harvest,
13 to be able to have that, to be able to sell the hide
14 rather than having it either go to waste or, you know,
15 get piled up on somebody's floors, on somebody's wall,
16 you know, and which is what happens anyways, like Coral
17 was saying. I mean, there's hundreds of bears that are
18 taken every year out of Kodiak, primarily, for the hide
19 and for the skull. And, you know, that is a -- I don't
20 see what the difference would be for allowing federally
21 qualified subsistence harvesters to be able to do that
22 if they're successful in taking a bear. So, thank you
23 for the presentation and I also appreciate the
24 modifications. I do want to ask, I don't know if you
25 would know, but I saw and I don't know if it's just a
26 carryover. And I think it's because of the
27 administrative burden or potential administrative burden
28 that ADF&G is, in opposition to this. Do you know if
29 that's the only reason why they're in opposition to this?
30

31 DR. ROBERTS: I think that's part of that
32 and I probably shouldn't speak for the State, but I
33 think -- and it sort of misaligns things. Go ahead.
34

35 MS. HOLMAN: Through the Chair, Kendra
36 Holman with OSM. So, Ms. Hayden. So, the State has not
37 submitted a comment on the amendments at this point. So,
38 their initial opposition comment that you're seeing is
39 from the original proposal. So just kind of to help with
40 that. They have not provided us with an updated comment
41 on this addendum.
42

43 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Right further --
44 Sam, go ahead.
45

46 MR. ROHRER: Thank you. Through the
47 Chair. Dr. Roberts, question for you. Can you clarify
48 use of the claws, so this doesn't change? You could --
49 you can't currently sell claws, but under this you --
50 claws could be sold if they're attached to the hide you

1 mentioned. If you use the claws in a handicraft, you
2 could then sell the hide, which I get that part. But
3 it's still not legal to just sell claws, correct?
4 Although this would now allow it if they're attached to
5 the hide. Can you provide clarification on that.

6
7 DR. ROBERTS: Through the Chair. Member
8 Rohrer, this is to the best of my knowledge, and we may
9 have to ask Pippa, and I'll get back to you later, but
10 claws can be sold [sic] if incorporated into
11 handicrafts under our regulations in certain areas.
12 Certain areas, of which I do not believe Unit 8 currently
13 is one of those areas.

14
15 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So does this -- the
16 -- I'm just going to call the proposal meeting, the OSM
17 modification. Does it allow sales of claws in
18 handicrafts in our area? Does it change that
19 restriction?

20
21 (Pause)

22
23 MS. HOLMAN: So, Madam Chair, currently
24 claws for sales and handicraft are in Unit one through
25 -- Units one through five. I'm sorry. I'm looking through
26 the book here. Units -- Yeah. So not -- so what includes
27 this area is the skin, hide, pelt, or fur of a brown
28 bear, including claws taken from Units one through five,
29 9A through C, 9E. So that would kind of be the closest
30 area would be that Unit 9 portion.

31
32 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So, I'm asking if
33 this proposal as amended would change that restriction
34 for our Unit? For the Kodiak Unit.

35
36 DR. ROBERTS: So, I will look into that
37 to be 100% sure. But from my understanding it would not
38 change that.

39
40 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: And Natasha. Go
41 ahead.

42
43 MS. HAYDEN: Thanks. Just clarifying. I
44 think what I heard you say earlier is that if this were
45 to be adopted, that it would allow for the claws to be
46 sold with a with the hide. And that's the only changes
47 regarding claw utilization, right?

48
49 DR. ROBERTS: So, through the Chair. So,
50 this proposal would allow someone living in or

1 harvesting from a Unit where you can already incorporate
2 and sell claws into handicrafts to do that and to take
3 those claws off of a legally sold or harvested hide, and
4 then also sell that hide. But in this -- from my
5 understanding in this Unit 8, you cannot do that. So,
6 you would only be able to sell the hide under this
7 proposal, unless someone submitted a proposal to change
8 that use of claws in Unit 8.

9
10 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Hey,
11 we're getting some weird background noises.

12
13 (Pause)

14
15 Okay. So just a reminder, if you're
16 online and not speaking, which you shouldn't be at this
17 point, if you could just mute your line. Okay. Is -- are
18 there further comments? Sam.

19
20 MR. ROHRER: Thank you. Through the
21 Chair. I guess my way -- the way I'm leaning on this,
22 the reason that Kodiak -- the reason that Unit 8 and
23 Unit 10 are excluded from that list you just read is
24 because that's always been the position of this RAC.
25 That's how we've always voted, in the past when we voted
26 on this, when these proposals have come before us, we've
27 basically said we're not going to comment on what any
28 other region does. Southeast was gung-ho for it. They
29 said traditionally that's what they did. We never
30 commented. That's fine. Do what you want. But for here,
31 we don't want that. That's why we're not included in
32 that list. I think for those reasons, even though I
33 recognize -- it -- it's hard to say what it'll do as far
34 as if it'll increase harvest or not, probably isn't going
35 to make a huge difference, but I think just for the
36 tradition, for the reasons we've always opposed the sale
37 of brown bear parts, I'll probably be a no vote on this.
38 I think back to when I first got on the Board talking
39 with Pete (indiscernible) a bunch. He was on the Board.
40 He was one of those guys that whenever the subject came
41 up, he was always hard no. Nope, we don't sell brown
42 bear parts. Doesn't mean we can't utilize all the parts.
43 Doesn't mean you can't give the parts away. Doesn't mean
44 you can't use the parts in handicrafts and give them
45 away so they can be utilized, just not for dollars. So
46 anyways, I -- that's at least the way I'm leaning
47 towards. So, thank you.

48
49 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Further comments.
50 Go.....

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: Madam Chair. Pat Holmes.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: No. Sorry, Jeff first and then Pat.

MR. WASLEY: Jeff here. Just clarification from the State's perspective, they don't really have a stance on the one per year versus the two per year. Like, I guess I want clarification on how many more areas would be open. Thank you.

DR. ROBERTS: Through the Chair. Member Wasley. We have not received a formal comment from the State on this new -- our new conclusion, so I can't really say.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. And I guess I'm not sure I completely understood the question, but it's not opening any areas. So, it doesn't change harvest whether something is open or harvest limits or anything. It just changes what can be done with the hide. Yeah. I'm not sure if that was -- Pat, go ahead.

MR. HOLMES: Madam Chair, I was just thinking back to a visit with Johnny Wright before he passed away, and he's from Karluk and spent most of his time on this end of the island, and other folks that were at the get together and the efforts I made trying to talk to everybody and all the villages, and I just think that if we had an old timer for every village here, they would say no. And so, I can see the all other logic on the other side to say yes, but myself, I think I'll probably vote no on the proposal. I can recall going to some of the potlucks with -- my buddy Ivor invited me, and I recall a couple of them where I think Dick Morris sent in some meat to town because they wanted to have brown bear for the potluck. And some of the other guys had done -- do that, too. And I have no problems with folks using those things for themselves but selling them to make money is just sort of a foreign concept from what I've gathered in my years of talking to old timers around the island. We're just different here. And maybe things have changed. And so, this vote might change it, but I think I'll probably vote no. Madam Chair, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Further comments. Coral, go ahead.

1 MS. CHERNOFF: I guess I just want to
2 note that -- I don't know if I just said this in my
3 previous comment, but about 200 bears are killed on this
4 island every year, more or less. A lot of them through
5 sport or guiding services in the fall. I think,
6 essentially guiding is selling a hide and leaving the
7 meat. Those are sold for quite a lot of money. I think
8 that subsistence -- I think it's happened -- harvesting
9 of bears and use of bears has happened for centuries,
10 if not longer. It's well documented, the use and the
11 importance of bear. I think where we see -- yeah, I
12 guess that's all I have to say. I have to say, I think
13 I just want to emphasize that bear has been used over
14 time. It's still used today. Matter of fact, a couple
15 years ago, I received a couple packages of bear from
16 someone, and I think under the subsistence, I think we
17 should -- I feel very strongly that full utilization of
18 an animal is important in order to honor that life,
19 honor that hunt, and that's all. Thank you.

20
21 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Further
22 comments?

23
24 (No comments)

25
26 Okay. I guess I'll share my thoughts on
27 this. I do intend to support this motion. First, I would
28 refer back to the RAC discussion that we had on the
29 original proposal and incorporate that. And I do wanted
30 to voice appreciation for the work that OSM did to find
31 a reasonable way through the regulatory limitations that
32 we had. So, I appreciate the work and the time that OSM
33 put into that. In regards to, I guess I'll call it the,
34 you know, traditional view toward how subsistence
35 harvest is -- harvested bears are used, I place a lot
36 of weight on the current bear -- subsistence bear
37 harvesters that we have sitting at this table. So, I
38 know there's been discussion about previous feedback
39 received from people in the past, and I am giving value
40 to that, but I am placing more weight on the people who
41 are living today, and who are subsistence harvesting
42 bears today and are sitting at this table sharing their
43 perspective and their feedback. I also am considering
44 that -- so I realized this wasn't the most up to date
45 data, but the data that we have from 2021 statewide,
46 there was one subsistence bear harvested. Did I
47 understand that correctly? There were 617 bears
48 harvested under state registration and then 216 bears
49 harvested under drop permits. So, the amount of
50 subsistence harvest we're talking about is, I think,

1 literally a drop in the bucket. And we've heard feedback
2 from the State that when they started allowing the sale
3 of bear hides, there was not an appreciable increase in
4 harvest. So, I'm not concerned about that. But I also
5 think if that becomes a concern, it can be addressed
6 through maybe some emergency rulemaking and then, you
7 know, amending the permanent regulations later on. And
8 I think that that is all I had. So, I think we've wound
9 down the conversation. We do have a motion on the floor.
10 I think this one, we'll do a voice vote.

11
12 MS. HUTCHINSON: For the record, this is
13 Lisa Hutchinson, Council Coordinator. We're going to do
14 a Council vote on accepting wildlife proposal -- the
15 deferred wildlife proposal, WP2401, which is the
16 statewide sale of brown bear hides as OSM recommended.
17 Start with Christopher Price. Do you.....

18
19 MR. RICHARDSON: I don't know how the
20 Aleutians gets to play into this, but sure, I'll go
21 ahead and vote. Yes. I think it opens up opportunity for
22 people to utilize the -- these wonderful, amazing
23 creatures. And I have family that aren't handicrafts,
24 and if it can help them buy some of these materials to
25 help them with their business, I think that would be
26 great. But I have respect for other people's opinions
27 too on this. So. But I'll be voting yes.

28
29 MS. HUTCHINSON: Natasha Hayden.

30
31 MS. HAYDEN: Yes.

32
33 MS. HUTCHINSON: Daniel Smith.

34
35 MR. SMITH: Yes.

36
37 MS. HUTCHINSON: Jeff Wasley.

38
39 MR. WASLEY: No.

40
41 MS. HUTCHINSON: Patrick Holmes.

42
43 MR. HOLMES: No.

44
45 MS. HUTCHINSON: Sam Rohrer.

46
47 MR. ROHRER: No.

48
49 MS. HUTCHINSON: Karen Kalmakoff.

1 MS. KALMAKOFF: No.

2
3 MS. HUTCHINSON: Coral Chernoff.

4
5 MS. CHERNOFF: Yes.

6
7 MS. HUTCHINSON: Brett Richardson.

8
9 MS. RICHARDSON: No.

10
11 MS. HUTCHINSON: Rebecca Skinner.

12
13 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes.

14
15 MS. HUTCHINSON: Okay. We have five for
16 and five against, so we have a tie.

17
18 (Pause)

19
20 Okay. So, the motion fails.

21
22 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. So that
23 concludes this agenda item. The next item is 13D, call
24 for federal wildlife proposals. Again, with this one my
25 intent is to introduce this item, get a sense for what
26 proposals are going to be brought forward, but then
27 postpone postponed final decision until tomorrow, so
28 that we have opportunity for discussion later today. And
29 this will be Kendra Holman and not Dr. Jason Roberts.

30
31 MS. HOLMAN: Good afternoon, Madam Chair,
32 members of the Council. For the record, my name is Kendra
33 Holman, wildlife biologist with OSM. So now is the call
34 for wildlife proposals and the Council's opportunity to
35 submit proposals to change federal subsistence wildlife
36 harvest regulations. An informational flyer on how to
37 submit -- how to submit proposal changes to these
38 regulations can be found in tabs 5 and 6? It says both.
39 Tab 5 is where it can be found. As mentioned during the
40 training, Councils must make a motion and vote to submit
41 proposals. Information needed for those proposals again
42 can be found on that slide on page 22 of the bear book,
43 the little one. Also, the opportunity for Councils to
44 submit proposals is available during the entire meeting.
45 If a Council member thinks of a proposal later or in
46 response to another agenda item, they are welcome to
47 suggest submitting a proposal at that time. Of course,
48 anyone can submit a proposal as an individual before
49 this submission window closes April 4th. Thank you
50 (distortion), Madam Chair, members of the Council. I'm

1 happy to answer any questions. I know our Chair has kind
2 of wanting to leave this open throughout the meeting.
3 So, if there's any discussion or any questions you have
4 for me now or throughout the meeting, I'm happy to answer
5 any questions.

6

7 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Great. Thank you.
8 Are there questions from Council members?

9

10 (No response)

11

12 Okay. I'm not seeing any questions. I
13 did want to -- so I guess what I'll do is I will ask,
14 does anyone have proposals that they would like to alert
15 the Council they want to bring forward? Coral.

16

17

18 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah, I do. Do you want
19 me to...?

20

21 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, go ahead.

22

23 MS. CHERNOFF: Just checking in. Can I
24 borrow yours? I handed out all my copies, like. So, I
25 drew up two proposals. Do you want me to...? Is this
26 just my introduction to them? I'll go through the whole
27 thing? Read them? Or are we just saying, yes, I have
28 proposals I'm bringing forward?

29

30 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: No, I definitely
31 want you to go through them. I was thinking if I wanted
32 actual motions right now, but I think it'll just be
33 procedurally less confusing if you just speak to them,
34 and then we'll take motions when we actually take them
35 up.

36

37 (Simultaneous speech)

38

39 MS. CHERNOFF: Okay, I have two
40 proposals. One is to -- a request for a change to
41 customary and traditional use determination for the
42 Community of Kodiak. And I have defined that as the
43 Community of Kodiak, including the residents of the
44 Kodiak Road System, which is Monashka City, Bells Flats,
45 all the way out the Road, but not including the Coast
46 Guard Base residents and the Rocket Launch Facility
47 residents. Is that enough to read? And then my second
48 proposal is to request up to four brown bear permits for
49 harvest in the Community of Kodiak Unit 8, and that
50 includes the same residents on the Kodiak Road System,

1 Monashka, City of Kodiak, Bell's Flats, Chiniak and
2 Pasagshak, Anton Larsen Bay, not including Nemetz and
3 Coast Guard Base residents, and the Rocket Launch
4 Facility residents, and that would that would follow the
5 same system for issuing subsistence permits and the same
6 season that already exists for the islands -- the
7 villages around Kodiak that already have subsistence
8 permit regulations.

9
10 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank
11 you. Are there any questions for Coral to get a better
12 understanding of these two proposals? Pat, go ahead.

13
14 MR. HOLMES: Yeah, Coral. I thought --
15 it's pretty inspirational, some of these, particularly
16 the first ones on defining Road System.

17
18 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat, can you put
19 your microphone closer? Thank you.

20
21 MR. HOLMES: Beg your pardon. Beg your
22 pardon. I was just trying to get your attention. Anyway,
23 your first proposal, I think is swell. Now, I have a
24 question on your second one, for brown bear subsistence
25 harvest for the Kodiak Road System. Kodiak town but not
26 Coast Guard Base and for or the launch site. Is that
27 correct?

28
29 MS. CHERNOFF: That is correct.

30
31 MR. HOLMES: Okay. Thank you.

32
33 MS. CHERNOFF: And I'll just say on that
34 I define that because we had defined -- there is already
35 a exclusion of Coast Guard -- Coast Guard Base residents
36 in some other subsistence regulations. And the -- we do
37 have -- I don't know if we have full-time residents at
38 the Rocket Launch Facility, but I know that there has
39 been quite a large population out there from time to
40 time. And I do not believe, since it's such a new
41 facility, that they should be considered under customary
42 and traditional community.

43
44 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Dr. Roberts, did
45 you have a clarification?

46
47 DR. ROBERTS: Oh, no, I was just going
48 to -- saying that the example would be salmon.

49
50

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Are
2 there any other questions that RAC members would like
3 to pose to Coral? Natasha, go ahead.

4
5 MS. HAYDEN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just
6 a clarifying question. This C&T designation would be for
7 brown bear purposes only, is that correct?

8
9 MS. CHERNOFF: Yes. That is what the
10 proposal.....

11
12 (Pause)

13
14 Yeah, that was the intent. But I see for
15 the change, I've left it off, but that would be the
16 intent. And if we take it up, that's something we can
17 add to make sure that's understood. But that was my
18 intent.

19
20 MS. HAYDEN: Madam Chair, I -- you say
21 it in -- under the third category under current
22 regulation, Unit 8 allows for harvest of brown bear by
23 the residents. But it just doesn't -- it doesn't state
24 it explicitly in the proposal. So, I would just suggest
25 that that be added to for clarity. Thanks.

26
27 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Sam.

28
29 MR. ROHRER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I
30 have a question for staff about how the current permits
31 are issued, and then some about the including or
32 excluding permits and some other things. Do you want me
33 to wait till those -- till it's on? They're not really
34 questions for Coral. More for staff. Do you want me to
35 wait till there's a proposal on the floor or ask them
36 now?

37
38 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So hard to make
39 decisions right now. Yeah. Why don't you go ahead and
40 ask them now?

41
42 MR. ROHRER: Okay. It's two questions.
43 The first question is, how are we currently issuing those
44 permits that we give out in the villages? Are those
45 drawn or those first -- and I guess this would be for
46 Danielle, but are those drawn or are they first come
47 first serve? How are those being issued? And then I have
48 a -- and yeah, I guess I'll let you answer that and then
49 I'll ask my second.

1 MS. FUJII-DOE: This is Danielle, the
2 deputy refuge manager for Kodiak National Wildlife
3 Refuge. So, for bear permits, we work with Amy Peterson,
4 our community affairs liaison, and she will work with
5 the tribe or village. They nominate who they want, and
6 then she will let me know. I will issue the permits,
7 give them to her, and we usually send them out on Island
8 Air.

9
10 MR. ROHRER: Okay, thank you. That was
11 kind of how I thought they were done. So -- okay. That's
12 the first question. Thank you. The second question is -
13 - I could maybe find this if I looked real quick in the
14 book, but maybe staff knows this. Are -- I -- Coast
15 Guard Base -- if you live on the Coast Guard Base, you're
16 currently excluded from participating in subsistence in
17 Unit 8. Is that correct?

18
19 DR. ROBERTS: Through the Chair, member
20 Rohrer. Yes and no. So, the key example is that residents
21 of the Coast Guard Base do not have C&T for salmon.
22 However, if you look at other resources such as deer,
23 they are not explicitly excluded. Okay. So, yeah, it's
24 not like you can't say, you know, universally excluded.
25 No.

26
27 MR. ROHRER: Okay. Okay. Thank you for
28 that. So that does need to be -- and then I -- then just
29 the one other comment, I would say is including Rocket
30 Launch. I think that's it's kind of messy to include
31 Rocket Launch Facility residents. And the reason, I
32 don't know that anyone really lives -- well they bring
33 in people to live there. But we have long-time residents
34 who've -- who lived in Kodiak for a long time, who, you
35 know, very likely are subsistence users, whatever. They
36 might find themselves living out there. I don't know,
37 but that just seems like to put that one job. There's
38 lots of local -- several locals that are employed there.
39 And so that would get -- I think that would get weird.
40 It just seems that that would be cleaner to not include
41 that. But that's all I have for now.

42
43 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thanks,
44 Sam. Are there any -- Pat, go ahead.

45
46 MR. HOLMES: Madam Chair, I was wondering
47 -- I don't know if feds can answer this, but does Kodiak
48 have a registration bear hunt on the Road System? They
49 used to as opposed to a drawing hunt. And so, if somebody
50 wanted a bear, they can get the registration hunt and

1 go out and get one. And that just saves a whole lot of
2 interaction and bother.

3

4 (Pause)

5

6 DR. ROBERTS: Through the Chair. I can
7 just say on the federal side that, Kodiak does not have
8 a C&T for bear, the bear hunt that we have, the federal
9 registration permit hunt.

10

11 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: And also, that we
12 can get this fact on the record tomorrow as well. You
13 don't need to be on the spot. I will take Natasha next.

14

15 MS. HAYDEN: Thanks, Madam Chair. That
16 and this -- Coral's proposal would be applicable for
17 hunting only on the refuge, correct? It's not -- So,
18 Patrick -- Pat's question about Road System is -- there's
19 not Road System in the refuge, right?

20

21 MS. HOLMAN: So, through the Chair. So,
22 this would be federal public lands. So, it would be the
23 refuge, as well as I believe there is BLM lands or maybe
24 the BLM lands -- there's been a transition of like a
25 random piece of BLM lands, but I don't know what the
26 restrictions are on that, so I'd need to look into that.
27 But yes, the refuge -- anything else, any open public
28 federal lands that don't have a restriction preventing
29 it?

30

31 MR. HOLMES: So that would probably
32 include Nemetz Park, the residential site for the Fish
33 and Wildlife folks, where they live out there, and Buskin
34 Park on the Buskin River, Buskin Lake?

35

36 MS. HOLMAN: So, through the Chair. No.
37 And that's why I say where there's.....

38

39 MR. HOLMES: Where is refuge on this?

40

41 MS. HOLMAN: Where the -- the open
42 federal public lands. So, some of the refuge things like
43 around housing isn't necessarily open. That's why I
44 caveated with that. I would need to pull out all those
45 individual sites to let you know exactly what all of
46 those are, but all of the back parts of the refuge that
47 are safe from hunting, unless they have any restrictions
48 that I don't know about off the top of my head right
49 now, that says that you can't be back hunting in those
50 areas.

1

2 MR. HOLMES: I don't want to cause you
3 problems, but that's I think a pertinent part of this
4 question. I can recall several years back when Jimmy
5 (indiscernible) was the skipper of the Coast Guard Base,
6 and they were having problems with DLP bears and coming
7 into the Nemetz Park and trashing dumpsters and all kinds
8 of things. And basically, he had talked with the state
9 game biologist at the time and was saying, well, we're
10 going to clean up this. We're not going to leave stuff
11 out to attract the bears, which was -- some people were
12 doing that. They're getting their silvers and leaving
13 them out in the road at Nemetz Park. And so, he said,
14 if anybody does this, attracts them, then you can find
15 an early retirement. And -- but he also mentioned the
16 Road System, you know, being open for registration hunt,
17 would be the other way to solve it. And there was one
18 (indiscernible) chief said, that went out the next
19 season, and he probably got one of the third or fourth
20 biggest bears taken on the island, probably 300 yards
21 from Nemetz Park, you know. So, it just would be
22 interesting, roughly to know what the federal lands are.
23 Maybe our Fish and Wildlife person has a diagram of the
24 office, you know.

25

26 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Let's get -- let's
27 save the details for this to tomorrow. And I just want
28 to remind people with this one, with the C&T, we're
29 talking about people and where people live. We're not
30 talking about -- I mean, yes, it's relevant where the
31 bears live, but this is primarily about giving, like
32 giving permission to the people to hunt, and it's tied
33 to their residence. And then the hunting, of course,
34 would be on federal lands. And if we could -- if you
35 have something you need to do now. Otherwise, let's save
36 the details for tomorrow. Okay.

37

38 MS. HOLMAN: So, through the Chair, Mr.
39 Holmes, the answer regarding the state hunt, there is a
40 registration hunt for the northeast portion of Kodiak
41 Island, including all drainages into Chiniak, Anton
42 Larsen and Northeast. You get bays, including Spruce
43 near Long Woody, and you get islands. One bear every
44 four regulatory years is available in person in Kodiak.
45 There's a fall and a spring one, and then Unit 8
46 remainder is all draw hunts.

47

48 MR. HOLMES: That's a deer. So, I would
49 assume bear might be the same. I just don't know. But I
50 think maybe a key issue to discuss tomorrow is the C&T

00078

1 for brown bears on the center of the island. So, we'll
2 get that tomorrow. Thank you.

3

4 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Okay. If
5 we could have a motion to table this agenda item until
6 tomorrow, and then tomorrow will actually introduce the
7 motions, and any other motions that people want to make
8 and take action on it. So is there a motion to table.

9

10 MR. HOLMES: Move to table, Madam Chair.

11

12 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Is there
13 a second?

14

15 UNIDENTIFIED: Second.

16

17 UNIDENTIFIED: Second.

18

19 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Is there any
20 objection?

21

22 (No response)

23

24 Okay. So, agenda item 13D, we will pick
25 back up tomorrow. Now let's go to our time certain,
26 Julie Matweyou, to talk to us about paralytic shellfish
27 poisoning. Is this a good time? And this is agenda item
28 14F, little I. So, it's Alaska Sea Grant Marine Advisory
29 Program.

30

31 (Pause)

32

33 Is it possible to move Sam -- would
34 Sam's microphone fit? Oh, or maybe -- yeah. The problem
35 is we have two sets of cords and audio that need to
36 reach.

37

38 (Pause)

39

40 Okay. We're going to go ahead. We've got
41 -- oh, and are we able to share the presentation on...?
42 Is it just this system. Are we able to share online? I
43 guess that's what I was asking, on Teams or whatever it
44 is we're using. Okay.

45

46 (Pause)

47

48 Okay. So, for people who are wondering
49 what's going on, we're just trying to -- in the room,
50 get somebody in a location where we can project onto the

00079

1 screen and have access to a microphone, and then we're
2 also trying to get the computer hooked up to share online
3 so that everybody can follow the presentation together.
4 So that's what we're doing here, and it might be another
5 couple minutes.

6

7 (Pause)

8

9 All right; we're getting closer.

10

11 (Pause)

12

13 Okay. So, we are pulling the
14 presentation up on the screen in the room and I think -
15 okay. So, it looks like we have achieved screen sharing.
16 Can anyone online let us know? Are you seeing the butter
17 clam? Yes, we are okay. All right then I will turn it
18 over to Julie Matweyou. Thank you.

19

20 MS. HAYDEN: Sorry. Really quick. We're
21 going to have the coffee just dripping through her whole
22 presentation, is -- I don't know if there's a way to
23 turn that off or pause it.

24

25 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Well, at this
26 point, if you wanted to, you could move back over there
27 because now you're not tied to that space. So, and
28 thanks, Sam, for relocating, but you can go back to your
29 seat now if you want.

30

31 (Pause)

32

33 All right. We got it. We got it together
34 now. Okay.

35

36 MS. MATWEYOU: Well, thank you very much
37 for the invitation to come and I want to thank, Coral.
38 Coral's actually -- was a big part of the beginning of
39 this project, so when I ran into her, we were talking
40 about this. So, yeah. Let me get going. My name is Julie
41 Matweyou. I'm with the Alaska Sea Grant Marine Advisory
42 Program. It's hard to go backwards. I'm here in Kodiak.
43 Our program is statewide, but I'm based here. I've been
44 in my role for -- since 2011. What brought me to Kodiak
45 was to study paralytic shellfish poisoning. So, I was -
46 - I came here to study this issue, and then when I was
47 hired back on as faculty, I continued those efforts. So,
48 I've been working with our community since 2011 to
49 address different concerns in our community about
50 paralytic shellfish poisoning. I'm going to assume that

1 most people know about paralytic shellfish poisoning.
2 And I'm just going to only touch on this briefly. But
3 the mechanism for transfer of this toxin is through the
4 phytoplankton. The genus Alexandrium. There's multiple
5 species. It's a marine phytoplankton. It follows typical
6 phytoplankton bloom dynamics such as ramping up in the
7 spring and summer and declining over the winter. Any
8 kind of bivalve shellfish in particular is filter
9 feeding, and can consume this toxic organism and the
10 toxins -- and accumulate the toxins. And these are then
11 transferred up the food chain. We primarily talk about
12 PSP poisoning with humans, but it can also be -- the
13 toxins can be transferred to a variety of animals and
14 the more we look, the more we see these toxins present
15 throughout our Alaskan waters. The refuge here, Robin
16 Corcoran, was the first to document the transfer of
17 toxins. It first for -- in Alaska to Kittlitz's murrelet.
18 And so, it does impact our -- many different levels of
19 our ecosystem. But my focus is primarily on the human
20 dimension.

21
22 So, the filter feeding shellfish consume
23 the algae and accumulate the toxins, again can be
24 transferred up the food chain. The symptoms are per --
25 of PSP include tingling, numbness, nausea, headache,
26 shortness of breath, weakness, paralysis, and eventually
27 respiratory paralysis. Unfortunately, Kodiak has been
28 greatly impacted by this. We represent about 30% of the
29 cases, including deaths that have occurred in our State
30 because we have such a high percentage of subsistence
31 harvesters, and our remote locations are off site. If
32 you get medical attention for this, this can be treated.
33 You can treat the patient. You cannot remove the toxin
34 from the system other than let it flush out of the
35 system. But if somebody gets medical care immediately,
36 they can be sustained. One complicating factor of this
37 dynamic is that this Alexandrium, it's pretty brutal.
38 It undergoes overwintering resting stage, which allows
39 it to lay dormant in the sediment for many, many years.
40 We don't even know how long that cyst can survive. And
41 then in the summer, when conditions are ripe for it to
42 reproduce, it comes back up and proliferates. So pretty
43 much wherever we see this toxic phytoplankton, we can
44 expect to see it again. So, it is a problem in our
45 region, and we've been addressing it in a lot of
46 different ways trying to get a better understanding of
47 it. But again, it's very seasonal. The phytoplankton
48 bloom can come and go. If you think about the red tide
49 that we do see around here, it's called noctiluca, where
50 we do see the visible red tide. You see that it's patchy.

00081

1 It's -- coming in and out with the tide. It's moving
2 around. While that is not a toxic tide, it is an organism
3 similar to *Alexandrium*, which produces the toxin. So,
4 it's a difficult problem to work on, and the toxicity
5 of the cell and what happens inside the clam as well is
6 very complex. So, I'm just going to show you a snapshot
7 of the work that we've done.

8
9 This study has been -- was an extension
10 to the monitoring program that was established in 2012.
11 We set up a community monitoring program in the
12 communities of Old Harbor and Ouzinkie, and you can see
13 the dates on the axis there from 2012 to 2015. That
14 program was funded by the Alaska Department of
15 Environmental Conservation. It was the first attempt by
16 the State to address subsistence harvest of shellfish
17 and PSP. Our State does a very good job regulating and
18 monitoring shellfish for commercial harvest, but not for
19 subsistence harvest. That program had some successes and
20 some challenges and, in particular, because the toxin
21 was being tested by HPLC, which is above (indiscernible)
22 head there. It's a technique -- it's a chemical technique
23 of high-performance liquid chromatography. The lab
24 itself had difficulty turning the test results around
25 to our community. So, the idea was that we were
26 harvesting and holding and getting those results back
27 in a timely manner for people to eat the shellfish
28 safely. What would -- I -- what was really happening was
29 we weren't getting those results back until 10 to 14
30 days later and that was in part because of the transition
31 to this chemical technique. So, one of the -- that was
32 a very big factor in influencing this cleaning study
33 because the communities sent -- harvesters were holding
34 their product or holding their clams, and eventually
35 eating them, or they may eat them. And then I come back
36 with a high toxin level. And they said, well, we already
37 ate it and we're okay. Super challenging message. As you
38 can see with the data presented on the screen that, over
39 time, this is many years of sampling butter clams, again
40 the toxicity level was pretty much at or above regulatory
41 level, which is indicated by that red line, almost the
42 entire time of study. Every once in a while, it did dip
43 below that 80 micrograms of regular -- micrograms of
44 toxin per 100g of tissue. But we work quite consistently
45 over the limit. So, the messaging was very difficult and
46 again challenging.

47
48 Another thing I want to tease out of
49 this data set, not only it was extremely powerful data
50 set. Because we used that HPLC technique we were -- oh,

1 advanced. Sorry. We were -- are you just following my
2 lead? Okay, thanks. We were able to see the congeners,
3 the toxin profile. So, this toxin, again, is extremely
4 complicated. There's -- when we say the word saxitoxin,
5 what we mean is a suite of toxins. There's over 20 to -
6 - over 25 molecular compounds or congeners of this toxin.
7 We all -- we talk about PSP toxin and saxitoxin as if
8 it's one unit. But if it was just simply one toxin, I
9 think that scientists would already have this figured
10 out. But it's not one toxin, and what was an extremely
11 important part of the second half of this project was
12 we were looking towards a beach test kit. So, in order
13 to have a beach test, a simple test, that test had to
14 be powerful enough to see all the toxins. And we've made
15 some strides with that. I can share at a different time.
16 But what we found from this long study using the HPLC
17 technique was that we saw this changing profile of these
18 congeners, and what I want to highlight in particular
19 is this bottom portion of the graph. This is the GTX
20 portion of the congener, the profile. And that's the
21 congener that the phytoplankton is putting out
22 naturally. So, the phytoplankton is there; it's pumping
23 out GTX and that's entering our food web, our food
24 system. We see that primarily in the summer months
25 because of the phytoplankton are increasing during that
26 time. So again, it was extremely important that we could
27 develop a test kit that's going to target that toxin in
28 particular. This kind of caught the State and some of
29 our researchers not exactly by surprise, but a little
30 bit by surprise because we have so much GTX entering the
31 system that we're not used to. Well, the State in general
32 is not used to profiling the toxins. It's either toxic
33 or not and you don't care what part of the toxin. But
34 because we're looking at advancing technology, we did
35 care. So that's a component that leads into the cleaning
36 study that I wanted to share with you. And that's why
37 we're able to see the patterns that we did see and
38 throughout -- and I'm sharing an abbreviated amount of
39 data with you, just the overarching conclusions that we
40 saw.

41
42 So, setting that context, we started to
43 explore -- I know I keep trying to do mine and I'm not
44 -- sorry. Yeah. So, we started to explore this problem
45 with cleaning the clams because I had people saying to
46 me, well, we ate the shellfish and we're fine. And my
47 argument was, well, I sent it in, and it was tested
48 high. However, the State requires a whole clam is
49 submitted for testing, which means every part of that
50 tissue is mixed up and blended and then tested as a

1 whole component. And so, this really did come out of the
2 community here, particularly Old Harbor. Although I --
3 some of my earliest conversations were with Coral about
4 how people traditionally use -- utilize the clam, how
5 they eat it, how they clean it. And we started to explore
6 a few different varieties of cleaning techniques. And I
7 did a -- quite a bit of this study on my own, using more
8 of a Western approach with the clam tissue dissection,
9 and I'm not going to be sharing that -- those results.
10 But they do strengthen and solidify the results we got
11 from the cleaning study. So, I basically looked at three
12 different cleaning methods traditionally used or I --
13 typically used here in our community. And one was the
14 method one, real simple clam on the half shell, minor
15 cleaning conducted on that; and we'll go into more detail
16 there. A second method provided by an Old Harbor
17 Harvester, and a third method, method three, was our
18 most strongest -- robust study.

19
20 So, in general again, we see there's a
21 great variability of the toxins, the distribution in the
22 tissues and we definitely saw this seasonal change in
23 the congener distribution. As I pointed out in that
24 previous graph, these Gonyaulax toxins, these GTX,
25 they're highest in the summer. Because that's the --
26 that's indicative of the Alexandrium bloom. Alexandrium
27 are putting this toxin out there highest in the summer,
28 and therefore they're highest in the gut content of the
29 clam. The clam is eating the phytoplankton. So, when you
30 took out that gut ball, it was highly toxic with GTX.
31 Over the winter, butter clams are known to store the
32 toxins for long periods of time, and that toxin would
33 be converted and metabolically converted in the clam
34 tissues and converted to saxitoxin and neo saxitoxin and
35 primarily stored in different part of the body. So,
36 they're pushing the toxins up into the black tip, the
37 siphon in the neck. So, the toxins are found primarily
38 in the neck and the black tip in the winter months. You
39 could imagine that the clam is essentially starving at
40 this point in the winter. They're not eating very much.
41 So, their gut contents are low, and there's not any
42 toxic phytoplankton in the water in the winter in
43 general. And so, there's some clear seasonal
44 distribution of these toxins happening. And that's one
45 of the reasons butter clams are so challenging or all
46 of this is very challenging. But the butter clam can
47 hold the tissue. I put my own timer on because I
48 overtalk.

49
50

1 So again, looking at these, the three
2 different methods I used. The first method was very
3 minimal processing. This was basically clam served on
4 the half shell; a little bit cleaned up, a little bit
5 more for aesthetics. Sometimes that black tip got cut
6 off, but not always. It was mostly just cleaned up for
7 presentation, and that was a minimal process sample. The
8 moderate processing was essentially cutting out the --
9 all the dark tissues out. And the dark is relative, but
10 they really are the darker tissues, the tip of the siphon
11 neck, the gut, the viscera, anything slimy, the gills.
12 The difference between this moderate processing and
13 maximum processing is that instead of cutting the
14 stomach off, the harvester just squeezed the stomach so
15 gently squeezed, got most of that gut material out. But
16 that -- we called that the moderate processing. I was
17 trained by the harvester in Old Harbor, and then I
18 reproduced his results every time I collected for this
19 study. Our harvester in Old Harbor that conducted the
20 study, and we called his technique with a maximum
21 processing, and you can see from that picture that he
22 pretty much cut off about half of the clam. He cut that
23 stomach clearly away and this was the practices that he
24 had used all of his life, and he shared with his family,
25 and it was pretty much a 50-50 weight balance. So, we
26 took measurements on these. We not only tested the
27 toxins, but we had the weights to correspond. All of
28 this data is weight adjusted. So, the toxin
29 concentration was adjusted for how much that piece of
30 tissue weighed when you ate it. And in general, as you
31 can see, the method one reduced the risk of PSP toxins,
32 reduced the PSP concentration by -- between 7 and 18%,
33 method two between 12 and 76%, and method three with the
34 maximum processing also increased the reduction up to
35 89%. I was hoping with this study that we would just
36 solve the problem and say, do that, and you would always,
37 you know, be safe. We know that you can reduce your risk
38 of PSP toxins by excluding these dark tissues. But
39 however, the results were not that clean. There were a
40 lot of variability, again, throughout the tissues. We
41 definitely saw seasonal changes in the congeners, which
42 really mattered. The cleaning methods helped, but they
43 didn't entirely eliminate risk. Exposure could be
44 reduced by removal of some tissues. Seasonality really
45 did make a difference. The effectiveness of the cleaning
46 strategies varied and, again, varied highly with
47 seasonality and with people's own perceptions and
48 cleaning techniques as to what you're defining as ugly
49 and gross to eat or okay to eat. And not everyone is
50 doing these practices as well, so -- and additionally,

1 in spite of removing the most toxic components of the
2 clam -- when the clams were very high, the -- very high
3 in toxicity overall, that toxicity toxin was inside the
4 edible tissues as well. So that simple manner of getting
5 rid of the dark tissues wasn't enough. So that clean
6 white meat that we want to eat can still retain those
7 toxins. So, it didn't entirely end our problems, but
8 we're making some steps to further our understanding
9 here. And there is a handout outside I brought, and I
10 provided in the packet. It kind of came up -- I did
11 share these results locally, but I think there's always
12 room to continue to share these results and to remind
13 people that the PSP is a complicated problem, but in my
14 work with the PSP, I know -- knowing that people do
15 harvest these clams, typically in the winter months,
16 that that already is reducing risk, and then cutting off
17 this dark tissue is also a potentially great reduction
18 of risk. We still advise to harvest and hold.

19
20 And I'm currently working on a new
21 project with KANA who -- KANA's role is to provide that
22 harvest hold capacity. So, we're still working towards
23 this issue. I encourage you to pick up the butter clam
24 cleaning publication that I put out and we're also
25 working to publish this data scientifically. And I want
26 to thank Coral and particularly Lloyd Ashouwak in Old
27 Harbor. He was the person who did most of this work. And
28 then -- and Glen, also in Old Harbor, and I don't know
29 if Glen's last name is Clow, but his wife's name is;
30 Phyllis, Phyllis Clow. A tremendous amount of work by
31 our communities to even collect this data and we're
32 anxious to share it, continue to share. I want to add
33 one more note before I stop, is that this study, we also
34 partnered from 2016 to 2020 with Western Alaska. Bruce
35 Wright was working with the Alutiiq or, I'm sorry, the
36 Aleutian Pribilof Islands Association and talking to
37 their harvesters. They did not practice this practice
38 of cutting that black siphon off. I've talked to Pat
39 Holmes before about this, of where this technique came
40 into play and why Kodiak harvesters used this, and I
41 honestly can't say that we know that. But the Western
42 tribes were not using this practice. So, I can end there.
43 And I just want to give everyone a big thank you who
44 helped with this project.

45
46 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Julie.
47 Are there questions? Coral, go ahead.

48
49 MS. CHERNOFF: Thank you for coming,
50 Julie. That was really interesting and I'm wondering now

1 if Daniel wants to pursue a second PhD, if all those
2 numbers and tables excited him. So, I had a question
3 about testing in the future. Are you using the same
4 methods, or do you have any plans to change the methods?
5 Perhaps, like, I think about how often we hold the clams
6 until their stomachs are cleaned out. That might be a
7 really interesting study is to hold the clams, change
8 their water every day for five days, and then test them.
9 And so, I'm just wondering about different methods.

10

11

MS. MATWEYOU: Yeah. And that presents a
12 different challenge is the changing the water. So, for
13 each time you take these clams out of the -- their
14 environment they're exposed to a certain body of water.
15 And once they're pulled out, they need to be treated as
16 a isolated sample. If you're going down to the ocean and
17 changing the water, you're introducing a potentially new
18 water that has PSP. So, a filtrated system -- there have
19 been thoughts about filtering or holding shellfish on
20 land. It runs into the -- it's tricky to continue to
21 feed the clam and keep it healthy while it's separating
22 the toxins. It will separate eventually, or most of the
23 clams will. But the problem, too, with the especially
24 better clam, is that there's varying times of
25 desperation. The butter clams can hold these toxins for
26 up to two years. So, it's not foolproof to clean that
27 gut out, but that's, I think, one of the practices that
28 is helping with people being able to harvest and eat
29 these shellfish that there are these practices that are
30 offering some level of security, and level of reduced
31 risk by harvesting the winter, cleaning the gut out,
32 perhaps cutting these tissues. I do want to say that
33 summertime in Kodiak, in Alaska in general, is extremely
34 risky to be harvesting shellfish because we don't know
35 when that phytoplankton bloom is going to skyrocket. I
36 could, at some other date, show you historical data, and
37 we have some of the highest toxicity in our State, and
38 the levels of toxicity can increase so quickly without
39 monitoring the toxin bloom. I have a current research
40 project out in Chiniak Bay. For the next five years
41 we'll be monitoring toxin plumes as well as shore side
42 sampling, trying to get a little bit better
43 understanding, but again, it's pretty tricky. Back to
44 your other question about testing, though. Through that
45 study I just shared, there's a new ELISA test. It's a
46 laboratory-based ELISA that we're implementing, that it
47 should be targeting 100% of the toxins, or almost all
48 of them. It was specifically designed off of the Kodiak
49 data that those GT toxins are -- will be picked up by
50 our test. So, we have some hopes over at the Near Islands

00087

1 facility that the next couple of years will be where
2 we're already ramped up to do this work, but we need to
3 vet that process.

4
5 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Further
6 questions? Pat, go ahead.

7
8 MR. HOLMES: And Julie, I'd like to
9 compliment you on where you've taken this program over
10 the last many years. I think that's just terrific, and
11 I know 30, 40 years ago when I was -- we used to have a
12 program with the State monitoring the Road System. But
13 they use rats, and that was not very precise. And it was
14 just really interesting that the first notice that I
15 wrote in the paper, I should have mentioned that at --
16 oh, my good friend had just passed away, the physician.
17 But I wrote a thing on Thursday -- on Wednesday to come
18 out on the Friday paper. And on Saturday, two people
19 went out to Chiniak and ate a bunch of mussels and
20 mussels, of course, pick it up more rapidly than any
21 other shellfish. And they ended up in the hospital here
22 with the physicians sitting there with them, pumping air
23 into them -- oxygen, trying to keep them from dying. And
24 so, it's common sense knowing the difference in the
25 clams, the time of the year, avoid the summer and
26 certainly -- even in the winter, if I go for clams or
27 something, I do the best to get rid of any of the siphon,
28 any of the tissue that stores oil, like the gonads and
29 the guts, and that's just life in the Gulf of Alaska.
30 And I think it's just such a cool program because like
31 when Kelly was at Shungnak, you know, they tell me when
32 they're going to go sampling and where they're going to
33 be, and if I really wanted to go get some clams, I could
34 go out there and get some, and at least it gives you a
35 little bit of encouragement. Better than giving it to
36 your neighbor's cat or your neighbor and seeing what
37 they do. Thank you.

38
39 MS. MATWEYOU: Yeah, and I do want to put
40 a plug in for KANA being able to currently field those
41 samples. So, they're harvested whole program is wide
42 open. You can come with clams and their data is churning
43 turning around faster, I think. It's not perfect, but
44 it's about five days, so the holding time is working a
45 lot better. And it's really nice to be able to say to
46 people that your clams are not toxic or they're below
47 the regulatory level. Interestingly, the last couple of
48 years, our -- we've lost some of this data, but we
49 haven't seen a lot of toxins in the sampling areas that
50 we're measuring right now. But it doesn't say anything,

1 and I think that's one of the challenges, too, is like,
2 people become complacent, and they start eating again.
3 And because the toxins aren't around and they're fine,
4 and then all of a sudden, they're super high again. So,
5 continuing to monitor, avoiding summer consumption, and
6 my new best theory is to test in the fall when we know
7 that phytoplankton is likely down. To test in October
8 or November, see what that baseline level looks like,
9 before you even start contemplating harvesting in the
10 winter, and I think that would give us a good baseline
11 and then still continue to harvest and hold. But too if
12 you see those toxins, especially in butter clams still
13 extremely high going into winter months, then we know
14 that we're not anywhere near clearing that. So, I'll end
15 it there. But thank you.

16
17 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: I had a question.
18 Do you have a, like, a visual breakout of -- so I was
19 really curious to see the huge range and the improvement,
20 the reduction in toxicity, the 9 to 89. That's like a
21 huge range. Do you have it broken out by cleaning
22 technique and time of harvest like to show, oh well in
23 December with cleaning technique number three, that was
24 89% reduction, but July was 9%.

25
26 MS. MATWEYOU: I'd have to go back in our
27 data right now. It wasn't super clean. There wasn't a
28 very great way to present that data. The method three
29 we have the most data from that method because Lloyd was
30 actually doing this on a monthly basis, and he was doing
31 all that work. And unfortunately, we stopped the well,
32 partly we were unfunded, but we stopped the program a
33 little bit prematurely, and I wish we had continued three
34 more months. We'd have so much more to say over those
35 winter months. But I could provide that to you at a
36 later date. We could -- yeah. And yeah, I thought of
37 that when I came over. I knew you were going to ask,
38 but.

39
40 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Are
41 there -- Go ahead, Daniel.

42
43 MR. SMITH: Yeah. Thank you, Madam Chair.
44 Hi, Julie. My question was pretty similar to Rebecca's
45 relating to, like, when the methods were tested. If they
46 were, like, in the winter months, summer months. So that
47 was kind of my first initial question. And then kind of
48 a comment/question was if like during periods of higher
49 levels of saxitoxin, during like summer months, did the
50 percentage of the effectiveness of the methods go down

1 or were they kind of similar across the board?

2

3 MS. MATWEYOU: Yeah, I think that they're
4 similar questions. In general, the amount of toxin
5 exposure that -- those higher numbers, 80%, 70 that
6 happened in the summer when toxins were extremely high
7 or went up and you were taking out that gut ball because
8 you were taking out a larger weight of mass, of tissue.
9 While the black tip can be extremely toxic overall, it's
10 just a little piece of meat. So that's why it's a little
11 bit difficult to show. Does that make sense? So, the
12 greater the -- there was greater reduction in the summer
13 months because the toxins were higher and because the
14 mass that we were removing was larger.

15

16 MR. SMITH: Yeah, that does make sense.
17 Thank you.

18

19 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Natasha.

20

21 MS. HAYDEN: Thanks, Madam Chair. So just
22 to sort of explore that a little bit more. What I think
23 what I'm hearing you say is that it is by mass, that
24 percentage versus by the percent of samples. So, for
25 example, if there was 100 samples that 89% of them would
26 not have had the toxin if they were treated that way,
27 versus there's however many samples, and 89% of the
28 masses of those samples.....

29

30 MS. MATWEYOU: The second. And I
31 apologize, I abbreviated the methodology and cut out a
32 lot of details like that, and I gleamed through that.
33 That's the percentage of mass for the -- from the
34 composite samples that we tested.

35

36 MS. HAYDEN: So as a follow up, do you
37 know -- so for example, if 50% of the mass, because you
38 said it's kind of 50-50 for that method three, about 50%
39 of the animal would be removed in that method. Out of
40 the mass that was remaining is that -- again that -- it
41 would be like 89% of the remaining mass that would have,
42 and it's not associated with a, you know, a yes, no or
43 an animal, but just varying degrees of above that
44 threshold across the samples.

45

46 MS. MATWEYOU: Trying to see if I can get
47 there with you, and I apologize, I'm a little rusty on
48 this data. So, let's use an example of a June or July
49 sample. That sample's collected in the summer months.
50 We expected to see the toxin, and we did see the toxin.

1 A certain number of clams is always harvested for a
2 sample. And then let's just use Lloyd's example, he split
3 the tissues, right. So, we measured the toxicity in the
4 edible and the non-edible. We had the weight, so
5 everything was weight adjusted and, so that percentage
6 is from that sample, that composite weight adjusted
7 sample, let's say 80% was removed. However, in the summer
8 months, even though you removed a lot of -- a large
9 portion of the toxins, you still had the toxins in the
10 edible meat. And so there needs to be a better way to
11 graphically present that. And the data weren't very
12 clean to do that. And that's one of the reasons we
13 struggled with the messaging, and we didn't have, like,
14 perfect data to show that because there was a lot of
15 variability. There's a lot of variability within each
16 clam. There was variability -- we did we actually did
17 this in replicate, which was a lot of clams. So, the
18 replication was difficult to continue. Yeah. There's --
19 it wasn't -- yeah, and in retrospect I would love to
20 redo it. I'd do it better. But we did our best and,
21 like, even like, when Coral -- and Coral came and, like,
22 taught me how she harvested, you know. So, there were a
23 lot of differences in how people handled the clam meat,
24 too. And I like I said, I can't say that it's a universal
25 practice that people cut that off. So, there's a lot of
26 generalizations in this data.

27
28 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, and
29 Coral did mention she had clams on the half shell this
30 week, and she didn't die. So that was good. Pat, go
31 ahead.

32
33 MR. HOLMES: Oh, I just wanted to do a
34 footnote. There's a variability in the absorption of PSP
35 with species of clams. And like the littlenecks, the
36 ones that close up tight, and oh, what's the one with
37 all the crenulations in it? But anyway, they tend to
38 absorb less, and the theory used to be that they just
39 keep their shell shut because they can sense there's
40 something wrong and they don't seem to pick it up as
41 much. And so, I think in earlier studies where people
42 didn't separate out littlenecks from other clams, some
43 of that data was pretty messy. And anyway, I just once
44 again would like to salute you for your efforts, and to
45 do this because it's been something that's been needed
46 for a long time, and I think you'll be able to give
47 folks a lot better answers in the future.

48
49 MS. MATWEYOU: Thank you. We're trying
50 and that -- yeah, that data is still generated. We're -

00091

1 - yeah. I'll stop there. It's challenging because the
2 species and what you're monitoring changes with the
3 project -- with what your question is, so.

4
5 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Any
6 other questions? Go ahead, Karen.

7
8 MS. KALMAKOFF: I remember when I was
9 growing up, elders would tell us, don't eat clams in
10 months without an "R" so, have you noticed if the level's
11 been pretty high with PSP, with the ones that don't have
12 'R' in it?

13
14 MS MATWEYOU: Yeah. That's the general
15 rule that most of our harvesters use. Don't eat clams -
16 wait - with 'R'. No, without. Without. Yeah. Summer --
17 is basically summer months. So, September through April
18 have 'R', so that's a safer period to eat. Again, that's
19 winter months. That, you know, assumption is based
20 probably on PSP and on other contaminants in the water.
21 Everything gets a little bit hot; vibrio is more
22 pronounced in the summer months. So, there's more, you
23 know, potential for microorganisms. But yeah, in
24 general, that holds a little a little bit true. We're
25 seeing that breakdown with climate change and with
26 warming waters. And we've definitely even seen it here
27 in Kodiak, that rules breaking down particularly on the
28 edges. So, when we would typically think that May is --
29 would be one that phytoplankton bloom is ramping up,
30 we're starting to see toxins increasing in April and
31 extending into October. So that seasonality is
32 definitely breaking down, I'd say statewide. Talking to
33 southeast harvesters, it's the same. So that window of
34 harvest that used to be a -- the winter is pretty
35 consolidated now. And the harvesters that I've recently
36 -- what I -- that I speak to have shortened their window
37 of harvest for that reason too. So, everyone's being
38 more careful because of these warming waters. So, which
39 is good, and yeah. So that's why the combination of
40 being able to monitor for the toxin, and still test,
41 test, test. And the more we can improve the ability to
42 screen and test and we've got more tools in our hands
43 or in our pockets.

44
45 MS. KALMAKOFF: Yeah. And at home I seen
46 my cousin, she had butter clams in a roasting pan, and
47 they were baked in the oven, and they all sat down and
48 was eating them. And I seen her next day, and I said,
49 did you guys take those tips off of the butter clam? She
50 said, no. I said, you need to cause [sic] they carry

1 toxins. And she goes, we didn't know. And then another
2 question is. You know, I've always eaten cockles. Has
3 there been tests done with the cockle clams?
4

5 MS. MATWEYOU: I'm getting a little bit
6 to it. Pat was saying, for cockles do not typically
7 accumulate the toxins to the high level that the that
8 the butter clams do, and same with littlenecks. And I
9 don't know why people don't like cockles, but this seems
10 to be a non-preferred species. People do eat them.
11 There's -- I don't want to say less risk, but yeah, in
12 general, butter clams are going to be your riskiest.
13 Butter clams and blue mussels are your riskiest species.
14

15 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank
16 you, Julie. Thank you. All right. I think we're going
17 to take a shorter ten-minute break and come back at
18 3:15.
19

20 (Off record)
21

22 (On record)
23

24 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, it's 3:18. If
25 we could start gathering back to our seats, then we can
26 continue the meeting.
27

28 (Pause)
29

30 Okay. So, the next agenda item that we
31 are going to take up is 13E. This is Alaska Board of
32 Game statewide proposals for their meeting coming up
33 March 21st through 28 and the RAC can consider developing
34 and submitting comments. And the due date on that is
35 tomorrow. So, the proposals that we are definitely going
36 to talk about are 86 and 87, 123, 126 and 127, and 186.
37 And we'll probably take 186 alongside 86 and 87 cause I
38 think those are all kind of closely related. So again,
39 these proposals are not in the meeting materials. You
40 would have to look at the proposals online. Is it
41 possible that we can project onto this -- that we can
42 go to the Alaska Board of Game website and pull up the
43 proposal book so that we can at least have the language
44 on the screen? Okay. Okay, and then, Lisa, you weren't
45 listed on this one, so that's why I didn't go straight
46 to you. Do you have anything that you wanted to share?
47

48 MS. HUTCHINSON: No, I don't. I just
49 wanted to remind you that in your main meeting book at
50 the bear on front page, sorry, on page 34 there's kind

1 of just a summary of those kind of give an idea of what
2 you're looking at, and then Kendra will pull up the
3 proposals. And then I have a hard copy in the room as
4 well.

5
6 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. So, Kendra is
7 working on pulling up the Alaska Board of Game proposal
8 book and, for people online, if they want to pull that
9 up themselves. And this would, again, be for the upcoming
10 statewide meeting here in a couple of weeks. And we're
11 going to start with proposals 86 and 87 and then 186,
12 which I'm going to be honest, I couldn't figure out
13 where to find that online. So, 186 is listed -- it's in
14 a separate packet. It's in the ones that are outside the
15 Board of Games Authority. Go ahead, Jeff.

16
17 MR. WASLEY: Is that one worth discussing
18 since it's outside the Board of Games? Thanks.

19
20 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: My tendency would
21 be, since I assume staff has already decided that the
22 Board of -- it's outside the Board of Games Authority,
23 perhaps getting a stack of letters having to do with
24 that might not be helpful to the Board of Game.

25
26 (Pause)

27
28 Okay. So, is that being shared as well
29 online? Okay. If you could go down to proposals 86 and
30 87.

31
32 (Pause)

33
34 Okay. So, on the screen we have proposal
35 86 which is to require mandatory harvest reporting of
36 sea ducks, and in general -- and anyone can correct me
37 if I'm wrong. But in general, right now when you're
38 harvesting sea ducks, they're not reported at the time
39 of -- every sea duck harvest is not reported at the time
40 of harvest. It's done on a survey basis with extrapolated
41 data. So, my understanding is this proposal is asking
42 to collect actual numbers of sea ducks that are harvested
43 closer in time to when they're harvested, rather than
44 doing a survey a year later. That's very broad strokes.
45 What proposal 86 is, and then 87 is quite a bit
46 different. So, we'll take that one separately. So,
47 anybody who actually has more direct experience, would
48 anyone like to either correct what I said? Go ahead,
49 Jeff.

50

1 MR. WASLEY: Basically, there are no
2 report requirements other than emperor goose for any
3 waterfall in the State of Alaska and the general hunting.
4 Thank you.

5
6 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. So I think
7 to be efficient with this, what I would like to do is,
8 as we get to each of these, is to see if there's a motion
9 for the RAC to comment because if there's not going to
10 be enough support to discuss it, I don't want to take
11 40 minutes talking about something and then we don't end
12 up taking action. So, for proposal 86, does anyone want
13 to make a motion for KARAC to submit comments. Go ahead,
14 Jeff.

15
16 MR. WASLEY: I would make a motion to
17 support comments against it. Thank you.

18
19 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Is there
20 a second?

21
22 MR. RICHARDSON: Second.

23
24 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. We have
25 a motion and a second. Discussion. Jeff, did you want
26 to speak to your motion?

27
28 MR. WALSEY: Thank you. Basically, the
29 federal government is in charge of managing migratory
30 birds. I think this would create a unnecessary burden
31 for the State. And sea duck limits are extremely
32 restricted, and I don't think that this is necessary. I
33 think the State would be better suited doing other
34 things. Thank you.

35
36 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank
37 you. Further comments or questions for Jeff. Natasha and
38 then Pat.

39
40 MS. HAYDEN: Thanks, Madam Chair. Jeff,
41 how many animals roughly are -- would be in -- would
42 this include and the number of harvesters, would this
43 impact?

44
45 MR. WASLEY: I don't know exactly the
46 number of sea duck hunters in the State. I think the
47 state sells roughly 6000 duck stamps, so it's hard to -
48 - for me to answer that. Thanks.

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Would it -
2 - were you also asking which ones are sea ducks, or do
3 you already know which ones are sea ducks?
4

5 MS. HAYDEN: No, thanks, Madam Chair. My
6 question kind of came from Jeff's comment about it being
7 already just being very restricted. And if it's very
8 restricted, then how is it monitored? And, you know,
9 what is the scale of the impact?
10

11 MR. WASLEY: Thank you. So, for non-
12 residents, and I think this is what it's pointed towards,
13 you can only get 20 total sea ducks per season of which
14 only four of each species. So, it's all already very
15 restricted. Thanks.
16

17 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Pat.
18

19 MR. HOLMES: Madam Chair, having sat
20 through the -- this discussion there at the AC, I'm
21 inclined to agree with it because the transporters and
22 all the guides there thought that it was a good idea.
23 And recalling things that have come up with the State
24 and with our Council, and passed with sea duck
25 populations, the whole thing, it exists. And even if you
26 just change the reporting. The reporting goes back to -
27 - you'll still have to do it immediately after the bird
28 is taken in the field. And this makes it simpler for the
29 guides and the hunters and for the transporters because
30 you just do it at the end of the day, rather than having
31 to do it immediately. And I think that the gist of the
32 proposal was to try to make the regulation work smoother
33 because of the changes in population with time. Thank
34 you.
35

36 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Jeff.
37

38 MR. WASLEY: Currently we are not
39 required for any registration of any waterfowl. The only
40 people that need to do that were for emperor geese and
41 then, like, there's other stuff like commercial
42 outfitters on refuges have to do client use days. But
43 with the State, we are not required to do any reporting.
44 Thank you.
45

46 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Sam.
47

48 MR. ROHRER: Through the Chair. Thank
49 you. I think, Pat, what you might have been referring
50 to was the AC's amendment that they made. So, the

1 original proposal says you have to report, and the AC
2 made an amendment to that that said, you just had to
3 report by the end of the day, not immediately. So, I
4 think he was talking about a -- that was an amendment
5 that our local AC made. I sat through our AC comments
6 as well and listened to them. I'm not on the AC, but I
7 know our AC supported this proposal again as they amended
8 it. Normally I would -- I mean, I do put a lot of weight
9 on what our AC said, says and does. But it's interesting
10 when you read the State of Alaska's comments on this,
11 they're opposed to the proposal and their position is,
12 listen, this is going to take a lot of time. It's going
13 to take a lot of money, and we don't know that we can
14 really use the information anyways. We get this
15 information from the feds. The feds pay to collect it.
16 Granted, it wouldn't be as detailed as this is. But the
17 State's got concerns about how accurate the information
18 is with people self-reporting it, and the State says, I
19 mean, the state says we don't want the information. So,
20 I don't know. It's a little -- that makes me inclined
21 to oppose it anyways.

22

23 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Jeff.

24

25 MR. WASLEY: I think it also be kind of
26 a -- another way folks could slip up and be prosecuted
27 for something that, as Sam mentioned, is not really even
28 useful or wanted by the State. It's just another trap
29 for hunters that is just unnecessary in my opinion. Thank
30 you.

31

32 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Coral.

33

34 MS. CHERNOFF: Yes, I definitely am in
35 favor of this. I find it interesting that with ducks we
36 have very few surveys and we have very little to no
37 reporting. I don't know how that is a good management
38 system. I know we hail all the time the bear system,
39 which has very tight, you know, they're very adamant
40 about surveys. They're very adamant about registration
41 permits. They're very adamant about who gets to hunt.
42 And it's -- you know, we brag about that system that is
43 managed very well. I think not having any data, not
44 who's hunting, not who's reporting what they hunted and
45 not having surveys across much of the State of Alaska,
46 I don't think that's a good management system and I
47 think this is a good time to sort of move towards better
48 management of birds. Also looking at climate change in
49 the past, like if it kind of gives us a baseline of so
50 we can know where we've started. If there become -- if

00097

1 we see changes. We don't really have that right now. So,
2 I am in favor of this proposal.

3

4 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat, did you want
5 to...?

6

7 MR. HOLMES: I don't know. I'm flopping
8 around here. I thought that the way it was written was
9 that there already was a requirement for the report, and
10 I don't necessarily want to increase problems for the
11 outfitters and guides, or the hunters themselves. But
12 then again, Coral's points are really good. I'm just
13 going to be quiet for a bit. Thank you.

14

15 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Coral.

16

17 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah, and I did forget to
18 say we have reporting, I believe, in every other -- I'm
19 not going to say every other. I'm going to say most
20 other species that are hunted and trapped, we do have
21 reporting. And so, it's kind of interesting, I'll say
22 again, that we do not have much reporting in this area.

23

24 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Jeff.

25

26 MR. WALSEY: Again, migratory birds are
27 managed federally, not by the State. So that would kind
28 of be the reason why we don't have a lot of State
29 reporting on that. Thank you.

30

31 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Coral.

32

33 MS. CHERNOFF: I'm just going to go back
34 again. So, when we read in that -- so migratory birds
35 are not managed by the federal government. We do have a
36 AMBCC, they work together as partners, but for the fall
37 season, essentially the fall season is managed through
38 the State. The subsistence season in the spring is
39 managed through federal, and then we have
40 representatives that -- from the State, that are
41 members, the representatives for the Flyway Committee,
42 which is like 10 or 11 states on the West Coast to
43 Alaska, and one is U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and
44 the other is the Game. But this is why we see this
45 proposal in this booklet because it is managed by the
46 State.

47

48 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So, a question. I
49 think this was already said, but just to clarify, the
50 data that's collected on the harvest, whether it's

00098

1 through a survey, is that survey sent out by the State
2 or by the Fish and Wildlife Service? And, Jeff, if you
3 know, you can jump in.

4

5 MR. WASLEY: Just through the federal
6 government, Fish and Wildlife Service. Thank you.

7

8 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Natasha.

9

10 MS. HAYDEN: I have some questions about
11 the about the program. The proposal, so -- I mean, just
12 because I'm -- this is not really -- I'm not very
13 familiar with the way that the seabirds are managed,
14 which is a little embarrassing to admit, but you have
15 to have a hunting license. And if the two different
16 systems, there's the state season and then there's
17 federal subsistence season. So, I have gotten my
18 migratory bird subsistence harvesting permit that I have
19 to report my take on. And it does -- is there no
20 reporting? What you said is there's no reporting
21 requirements at all for anybody who participates in the
22 state managed bird harvest activity?

23

24 MR. WASLEY: So, when you get your duck
25 stamp, you fill out a hip survey and they ask you
26 questions and that's for the previous year. So that is
27 the federal format for getting a representative answer
28 throughout the whole flyway. And they do that in all
29 states. Thank you.

30

31 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. So, the
32 survey information is sent by the Fish and Wildlife
33 Service. My understanding is that it's a -- the wording
34 is in here. It's a -- on a -- I thought it was on a like
35 not -- so everybody gets a survey or just some people
36 get a survey?

37

38 MR. WALSEY: Everybody surveyed by the
39 staff.

40

41 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, and then I
42 lost my train of thought. But yeah, I think -- so part
43 of the comment about its managed by the federal
44 government, I guess I was thinking of that and
45 understanding it to mean the survey came out from the
46 federal government. But it is -- there is a federal
47 management component and a state management component.
48 But I think the survey part is definitely through the
49 Fish and Wildlife Service. Daniel, do you have your hand
50 up? Go ahead.

1

2

MR. SMITH: Yeah. Thank you, Madam Chair.

3

I might clarify something with you. Maybe, Natasha. So, I think what you're alluding to is the Kodiak Road System permit hunt. Is that correct? Okay. So that had been an ongoing thing for four years. But at the AMBCC meeting last year, our proposal had gotten accepted where permitting is not required anymore for the Kodiak Road hunt. And that's managed by the AMBCC, which is involved in Fish and Wildlife Service in the State. It's, you know, the Co-management Council. So, if that clarifies things a little bit. Okay.

10

11

12

13

14

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Further comments?

15

Sam.

16

17

MR. ROHRER: Through the Chair. Thank you. Yeah. So normally on this kind of stuff, I'm pro, yeah, let's get more information. Like Coral said, let's watch these numbers closely. Let's track this stuff that's helpful for making management decisions down the road. But the fact that the State doesn't want the information, they're saying, no, we don't want it. It's kind of -- I mean, my -- I suspect the Board won't pass this because the department's going to be sitting in the room telling them we don't want it. So, the Board's probably not going to pass it anyways, would be my assumption. Normally, how the Board works and so I -- it's hard to require people to turn in something -- to report to record something, report something, when the people you're reporting it for don't actually want the information. Seems kind of a waste of time and effort.

32

33

34

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So, I'll make a comment. In the Kodiak community and I guess I'm thinking particularly at the at the Fish and Game Advisory Committee meetings, and this is across several meetings over the last few years. A common theme that comes up is the need to better understand the impact of harvest. And honestly, it usually comes up in relation to the impact of harvest by people that don't live in the Kodiak area. And one of the challenges, or one of the barriers that comes up to having an understanding, is that sometimes the data isn't there, the data isn't available. And so, we don't have a baseline. So, baseline data that we can compare over time to see changes, we don't have any of that. In that regard, I think -- so I appreciate the department has said we don't want this data. We don't -- we're not going to do anything with it. We don't know what we're going to do with it. I --

50

000100

1 I'm not disputing that. But I also think there can be
2 value in people from the communities that are impacted
3 in sending a message that we think the data is important.
4 And, sure, it may be the case that the data is not
5 collected right now, it doesn't mean that there's not
6 value. So, I'm a little torn on this one because in a
7 way it's -- this problem of there's multiple management
8 systems, or you've got a federal component and a state
9 component, and they may not be aligning completely, and
10 you have needs that are being articulated in a community
11 that aren't being met by the current management
12 structure. So, do I think this will pass at the Board
13 of Game? Probably not. Does that mean that we shouldn't
14 support telling them that we think this is important?
15 Yeah. I don't think it means that either. So, Natasha,
16 go ahead.

17
18 MS. HAYDEN: Thanks, Madam Chair. I - it
19 -- so, I mean, I'm assuming that the information in this
20 proposal is accurate, and you know, it talks about the
21 decline of populations of 30%. And I am there -- in my
22 mind when I consider this proposal that I -- there's
23 parallels for some of the other resources that we have
24 had that were plentiful. We had bountiful resources 40
25 years ago, you know, 30 years ago, 50 years ago, that
26 have been severely depleted. The example that comes to
27 my mind is, we were chatting about this earlier, is
28 halibut. So, people have created, you know, business
29 models that are based on being able to take people
30 fishing, you know, their client base is to, you know,
31 bring you know -- people get out on the water and go
32 fishing. And so, with the restrictions in halibut
33 there's been shifts to, you know, other species,
34 rockfish, you know, other types of -- other species that
35 are available. And similarly, and I don't know if this
36 was part of the discussion at the AC or not, but I --
37 you know, I've heard that -- and I do know I've seen
38 advertisements for transporters that are advertising
39 deer hunting and duck hunting. We can, you know, give
40 you the full meal deal, the full suite of opportunities,
41 and without there being information that collected on
42 what those activities are, I am concerned that, you know,
43 5 or 10 years from now -- I mean, if we have one more
44 bird die off like we had, and I can't remember if it was
45 in the material or if it was a headline, but it was
46 something like, you know, 40 million birds died off in
47 2015 or whatever year that was with the heat wave, you
48 know, and we're sort of -- we're still on the side of
49 things being, you know, healthy and fairly balanced. But
50 I don't think that it would take too many, you know,

000101

1 catastrophic events or, you know, a couple of years of
2 unreported, you know, over -- you know, overharvesting
3 than what the system can maintain. And so, I'm -- I
4 wouldn't -- I'm not supportive of the motion. I'm
5 supportive of getting more information. Because I am
6 concerned about, you know, there's exploitation that is
7 happening in different ways that didn't occur, you know,
8 20 years ago, 30 years ago. And it's not going -- the
9 trend is not going to go the other direction as far as,
10 you know, fewer -- lower rates of exploitation. There's
11 going to continue to be more and more pressure. So, I'm
12 not supportive of the motion.

13

14 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Jeff.

15

16 MR. WALSEY: Thank you. Just a final
17 words on this. So, the State doesn't want this and the
18 reason they don't want this is they don't think it's
19 useful. And they have a set number of staff, and they
20 have a set budget. And if they're forced to do this,
21 they're going to not be able to do the more important
22 things in their professional opinion of what they should
23 do. So, I just don't see why we need to go through this.
24 And secondly, like this proposal is not accurate. It's
25 just put in by a private individual. This isn't something
26 from the State. So, these numbers are not, you know,
27 they haven't gone through the scientific method of being
28 proven. It's just cherry-picked stuff. So again, I don't
29 think it's going to help anything and it's going to be
30 an undue burden on the State, and they clearly don't
31 want it. Thank you.

32

33 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Are there
34 further comments?

35

36 (No response)

37

38 Okay. I think we are ready to take a
39 vote. Again, the motion is to -- for the KARAC to submit
40 a letter opposing proposal 86. And we'll do roll call.

41

42 MS. HUTCHINSON: And do we have a second
43 on that? I didn't record that. Brett. Okay.

44

45 MR. SMITH: Could you restate the -- what
46 we're voting on exactly.

47

48 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes. The motion is
49 for KARAC to submit a comment letter opposing proposal
50 86. Yeah, so if you vote yes, that means that you are

000102

1 supporting -- you are not supporting the proposal. You
2 are voting yes to support the motion, and the motion is
3 to write a letter opposing the proposal.

4
5 MS. HUTCHINSON: Okay. Is everybody clear
6 on that? Yes. Sometimes it's better just to submit the
7 motion in in positive and then it makes a little bit
8 more clear [sic]. But as long as everybody understands
9 what we're voting to submit a letter to oppose proposal
10 86, and if you vote yes, you are supporting to oppose
11 it. And. No -- okay. We will start with Jeff Wasley.

12
13 MR. WASLEY: Yes.

14
15 MS. HUTCHINSON: Patrick Holmes.

16
17 MR. HOLMES: No.

18
19 MS. HUTCHINSON: Daniel Smith.

20
21 MR. SMITH: Yes.

22
23 MS. HUTCHINSON: Samuel Rohrer.

24
25 MR. ROHRER: No. Sorry.

26
27 MS. HUTCHINSON: No with hesitation.
28 Christopher Price.

29
30 MR. PRICE: No.

31
32 MS. HUTCHINSON: Coral Chernoff.

33
34 MS. CHERNOFF: No.

35
36 MS. HUTCHINSON: Karen Kalmakoff.

37
38 MS. KALMAKOFF: Yes.

39
40 MS. HUTCHINSON: Natasha Hayden.

41
42 MS. HAYDEN: No.

43
44 MS. HUTCHINSON: Brett Richardson.

45
46 MR. RICHARDSON: Yes.

47
48 MS. HUTCHINSON: Rebecca Skinner.

49
50 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes.

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. HUTCHINSON: Okay. Again, we have five for and five against, so the motion fails.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Okay, so I'm having some computer charger issues here. So, moving on to proposal 87. This has to do with restricting use of a boat when hunting waterfowl. I personally found this proposal to be confusing, but my understanding of what they're trying to say, I think, is that you can use a boat, but it has to be stationary throughout the duration of the hunt. But then I'm confused as to whether you can use the boat to actually go get the bird that you've shot. Like if you're still in the duration of the hunt. So, I'm going to be honest, I am confused by how this proposal is written. Jeff, if you'd like to say more, go ahead.

MR. WASLEY: Yes. Jeff. I'm completely against this and it is -- again, this isn't through the State. This is one individual who is clearly an anti-hunter making it basically impossible to hunt ducks. There's plenty of places where we would hunt, where anchoring your boat would severely endanger the hunters where we need to drift in heavy seas. If you had to have your boat within a hundred yards of where you're hunting, you know the ducks will see your boat and not come to the hunters. It's untenable. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Coral, go ahead.

MS. CHERNOFF: I'd like to make a motion for our Council to write a letter to oppose proposal 87.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Is there a second?

MR. ROHRER: I'll second that.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Sam. Further discussion or questions? Coral, go ahead.

MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah, I just think it's totally unreasonable to hunt ducks without a boat, especially sea ducks. And I think the danger in this, too, I look at it in a subsistence perspective that if it passes statewide, that might feed over to subsistence. And even those people hunt during sport, a lot of times it's their subsistence, too. And so, to make it so difficult to obtain ducks, I think is not good.

1
2 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Further comments?
3 Okay. I'm -- Coral, go ahead.

4
5 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah, I have a question.
6 If anyone in the room -- I know nothing about the rifle,
7 pistol, shotgun, gauges, is that -- and even at the AC,
8 I think nobody really talked about that. Is that
9 reasonable or unreasonable? Also, if anyone could speak
10 to that.

11
12 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: My understanding
13 is that's in the current regulation. So, the only part
14 they're changing is the underlined, bolded in number
15 three. Okay. I'm going to try this. Is there objection
16 to sending a letter that the KARAC oppose proposal --
17 this proposal, proposal 87?

18
19 (No response)

20
21 Okay. Seeing none, that passes
22 unanimously. Okay. The next proposal -- all right. I
23 think I had said we were going to talk about proposal
24 186, but that request has been withdrawn. If we could
25 go to proposal 123.

26
27 (Pause)

28
29 123, yes.

30
31 (Pause)

32
33 Okay. So, proposal 123 is up on the
34 screen. Generally, this proposal is seeking to remove
35 the restriction that a person can't give or receive
36 remuneration to obtain, grant or influence the granting
37 of a proxy authorization. So, it's asking that in
38 relation to having somebody do your hunt by proxy would
39 allow you to give that person money or would allow them
40 to give you money, if this language were removed, and
41 if you could scroll down to the next page. The -- so the
42 reasons given I guess I just wanted to comment. Well,
43 one of this -- one of these says illegal on state lands
44 but allowed on federal lands. I was assuming that that
45 was referring to the designated hunter, and we had asked
46 for clarification as to whether a designated hunter was
47 allowed remuneration or not. And I think the answer was
48 no. So, I just wanted to clarify that that's -- it's not
49 allowed under the federal system, which has a designated
50 hunter instead of a proxy hunter and the qualifications

1 are a little different. So, is there a motion in relation
2 to proposal 123? Maybe from Coral who requested to have
3 that? Did you want to make a motion? Oh, you did. Okay.
4 Did you want to make a motion or just for discussion?

5

6 MS. ROHRER: I will make a motion that
7 we oppose proposal 123.

8

9 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Is there a
10 second? Okay. Thank you. Jeff, go ahead. All right. Sam,
11 did you want to speak to it?

12

13 MR. ROHRER: Sure. I'll speak to it. It's
14 not allowed under our federal subsistence rules. As is
15 stated in the proposal. So, as that's already been noted,
16 but our AC was completely opposed to it, which I
17 appreciate. One of the things that I think is important
18 to note is not only would it allow you to -- it would
19 allow you to pay someone to go shoot a deer for you or
20 to, you know, go shoot any, you know, go harvest any
21 animal for you that's legal. It would also allow a person
22 to offer you money so that they could go shoot your
23 animal, just, you know, because they want to go get more
24 animals. So, which seems phony. So anyways, the money
25 can go both ways. And you know what? If there's people
26 in our community that need food, there's always people
27 willing to go, generally people willing to go help. And
28 so, I think it should -- proxy hunting and designated
29 hunting should continue without remuneration. Thank you.

30

31 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Further
32 comments or questions.? Natasha.

33

34 MS. HAYDEN: Thanks, Madam Chair. I just
35 want to say I agree with that and support the motion.

36

37 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. So, I'll just
38 comment that I think, I could foresee it being very
39 problematic allowing money to change hands to either,
40 you know, purchase the right to be someone's proxy or
41 somebody offering money to someone to be their proxy
42 hunter. I think in some cases that it could be fine, but
43 it really seems like a slippery slope with -- that could
44 lead to some hugely problematic consequences. Any
45 further comments? Okay, I'll try this. Is there any
46 objection to the motion which is the RAC will send a
47 letter opposing proposal 123. Any objection?

48

49 (No response)

50

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

Okay. Hearing and seeing none, that motion passes unanimously. The next two proposals that were requested to be discussed are proposal 126 and 127. And I think you could go to either one because they're pretty much the same.

So generally, these proposals are -- so these are proposed statewide. So, they would take effect across all Units and areas across the State. And they're asking to allow the use of electronically enhanced night vision and forward-looking infrared devices for taking furbearers statewide. And it is -- so this would include shooting furbearers. So, we're not just talking about trapping, it's shooting. And it's not just limited to using these devices at night. So, you could go out in the day with infrared devices and see animals hiding in the bush and whatnot. Is there does someone want to put a motion forward? Coral.

MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah. I will make a motion to -- for this Council to oppose proposal 126 and 127.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Is there a second?

MR. HOLMES: Second.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Pat. Discussion, or Coral do you want to speak more to your motion? Explain why you think we should oppose it.

MS. CHERNOFF: I guess I can't exactly articulate why. Like, it just feels wrong to give an animal no chance during the day or night. We also heard at our AC meeting that -- well, I know several years ago, I think the use of the use of drones for spotting animals is disallowed. I know for transporters, you can't even glass the side with binoculars and pick out people, but yet we want to introduce this super enhanced animal finding devices. I just -- it just feels not right. There's no -- maybe it's just the culture of our hunting around here. It just doesn't feel right to give that -- you know, we limit means of hunting and fishing. We have limits on daytime sometimes and nighttime hunting and I realized that this just refers right now to furbearers. Thank you. But I think, you know, could it pass for furbearers, it could pass for everything. We did have Fish and Game speak to using these devices and they said, in looking for animals to -- for collaring, and they said they are extremely efficient

1 at finding animals. So, I guess that's all I have to say
2 about it.

3
4 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Yeah, I was
5 going to say that in the Kodiak AC meeting there was, I
6 think, a high level of concern expressed about potential
7 impacts on foxes on the beach at night. Well, from a
8 boat that people could -- it could allow you to really
9 easily harvest foxes. So, there were specific species
10 for our area that were mentioned as being species of
11 concern in regard to this proposal. And I think in the
12 discussion, it was also posited that this is really
13 focused on wolves and coyotes. And so, it's more of a -
14 - so this is proposed statewide, but really, it's for
15 species we don't have under conditions that we don't
16 have because we don't have the same -- the super, super
17 short or non-existent days that they have farther up
18 north, where this might make sense. We have different
19 terrain, we have a fair amount of hunting that occurs,
20 you know, with a boat and a beach, and I think if
21 anything, it really points out that some of these
22 proposals that are in the statewide book probably should
23 not have been addressed at a statewide level because
24 conditions in different areas are just different, and
25 the species of concern are just different. Are there
26 further comments? Sam, go ahead.

27
28 MR. ROHRER: Thank you. Through the
29 Chair. Yeah, 100% what you said. This is -- these
30 proposals are coming from guys that are more in the
31 interior. They're wanting to get wolves and coyotes, and
32 that's where this is focused. And they're not really
33 coastal folks with a coastal perspective. I said this
34 at the AC meeting, but I really think our most effective
35 way to oppose this would be to just speak specifically
36 to exempting -- well, be 8 and 10, I guess. But
37 specifically speak to the fact that, you know, the fox
38 and otters and beavers are just really susceptible in a
39 marine environment to boats and nighttime hunting and
40 whatnot. I just think that's something that people who
41 propose this probably aren't thinking about, but I think
42 it's really important to say -- even say, you know,
43 we're not we're not talking on a statewide level. We're
44 strictly talking about the area we know in a coastal
45 environment you're going to decimate these critters.
46 Thank you.

47
48 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Pat are
49 you -- go ahead.

50

1 MR. HOLMES: I was just about to call for
2 a question, unless you'll go on to debate it more.

3
4 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, Coral. Go
5 ahead.

6
7 MS. CHERNOFF: I would just like to say
8 that I guess before we vote, to just -- to make note
9 that there is no language about just wolves or just
10 coyotes or anything, these do not separate those out.
11 These are fully for every furbearer that there is. And
12 so just to be aware of that, that information is not in
13 these proposals.

14
15 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, and then
16 insofar as -- if this does pass drafting the letter that
17 would be part of what we're commenting on, is that this
18 is statewide, and it applies to all furbearers and that
19 this -- it's -- this one size fits all approach is not
20 it's not going to work for us. All right. I'll try this.
21 Is there any objection? So, the motion is for KARAC to
22 write a letter opposing proposals 126 and 127. Is there
23 any objection to that?

24
25 (No response)

26
27 Okay. Seeing and hearing none that
28 passes unanimously. Those were all of the proposals that
29 were noted by Council members for action or discussion
30 for the Alaska Board of Game. So, I just want to make
31 sure -- go ahead, Sam.

32
33 MR. ROHRER: That should have included
34 proposal 128. I'm not sure why we missed that yesterday,
35 but I know in the AC comments it lists 126, 127, 128. I
36 just looked in Coral's book and it is.

37
38 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, so noted. If
39 I guess is that okay with everyone? They're pretty much
40 the same. They're all asking for the same thing. So, it
41 would be 126, 127 and 128. Okay. Is there anything else
42 on the Alaska Board of Game statewide proposal agenda
43 item? And so, I guess just to recap this, the RAC will
44 be generating comment letters for proposal 123 and
45 proposals 126, -27 and -28. So two letters out of this.
46 Okay. All right. Moving on to the next agenda item. This
47 is Alaska Board of Game call for proposals including
48 Unit 8. Is there any desire from Council members to try
49 to generate a proposal to the Alaska Board of Game?

1 (No response)

2
3 And then just making sure, Lisa, did you
4 have any additional context you wanted to share on this?
5 You're not noted as affiliated with this agenda item,
6 but okay. Okay. Well, I'm not seeing that anybody wants
7 to try to generate a proposal, so we are also done with
8 13F. Okay, moving on to 13G. Alaska Board of Fish,
9 including Alaska Peninsula, Aleutian Islands, Chignik,
10 finfish areas and statewide finfish call for proposals.
11 We do have at least one request for KARAC to either
12 generate a proposal or -- I guess it would be generating
13 a proposal at this point. This was the one with Brett's
14 wording, and we did receive copies of that. Was that
15 electronically and paper? Okay. All right. So, we do
16 have those in paper. Go ahead, Robbin.

17
18 MS. LA VINE: Madam Chair, is this the
19 time to hear about the federal proposals?

20
21 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes. I think I did
22 say this was the time where Dr. Roberts -- sorry, that's
23 what it says on the agenda, will come and remind us the
24 actions that the Federal Subsistence Board took on
25 fisheries' proposals at their last meeting.

26
27 DR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Madam Chair,
28 members of the Council. I'm Jason Roberts,
29 anthropologist at OSM. Just Chair Skinner kind of stole
30 my thunder earlier, but so just to update you on the
31 outcome of the federal proposals that were just decided
32 on that deal with your region. So, all five proposals
33 that were submitted for the Kodiak/Aleutians region
34 ended up making the consensus agenda, which means there
35 was consensus, or at least no specific disagreement
36 between the recommendations of the Council, the
37 interagency staff Committee, and the State. So as a
38 result, the Board voted on these proposals in deference
39 to the Council's recommendation, without taking them up
40 for a full deliberation. So, just to remind you, proposal
41 FP 25-04 dealt with Buskin River salmon harvest limits.
42 And the Board opposed this proposal in deference to the
43 Council. This sought to establish salmon harvest limits
44 specific to the Buskin River to match the Women's Bay
45 rod and reel only area Federal salmon harvest limits,
46 which currently match state sport fishing limits.

47
48 FP 25-05 dealt with the Afognak Bay and
49 salmon harvest limits or methods there. The Board
50 supported this proposal, which requested limiting the

000110

1 allowable gear type to rod and reel in the previously
2 closed waters of Afognak Bay. FP 25-06 dealt with Kodiak
3 Road zone salmon harvest permit limits, and the Board
4 opposed this proposal in line with the Council, which
5 requested to remove the per permit harvest limit for
6 salmon and the road accessible zone of Kodiak Island.
7 FP 25-07 Russell and Trout Creek harvest limits and
8 harvest methods. The Board adopted this proposal with
9 the OSM modification in deference to the Council. So,
10 the OSM modification implemented current state sport
11 fishing harvest limits in these newly opened areas and
12 opposed requiring a federal permit because it would be
13 for -- pretty difficult for subsistence users to get
14 that permit under current conditions and retained
15 regulations permitting the use of certain low impact
16 harvest methods. And then the last one was similar
17 proposal FP 25-08 for Adak and Kagalaska Islands
18 freshwater harvest limits and methods. The Board adopted
19 this proposal with the OSM modification, and that
20 implemented pretty similar modifications as FP dash --
21 FP 25-07. So prohibited the use of nets in the fresh
22 waters of Adak and Kagalaska but opposed changing the
23 harvest limits in the Unalaska and Adak districts. And
24 opposed requiring a federal permit in the Aleutian
25 Islands area for similar reasons. And I can answer any
26 questions if you need me to.

27
28 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Great. Thank you
29 for that reminder. Coral, go ahead.

30
31 MS. CHERNOFF: Jason. Thank you. When are
32 those published and when do they go into effect?

33
34 DR. ROBERTS: That's a good question. So,
35 we expect that these will be published hopefully soon.

36
37 MS. LA VINE: Madam Chair, for the
38 record, this is Robbin La Vine. We have no news yet of
39 when these will be published. They -- there is hope they
40 will be published in time for April, but given all the
41 changes it often takes longer for approvals to occur at
42 the D.C. level. Thank you, Madam Chair.

43
44 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Any
45 other questions?

46
47 (No response)

48
49 All right. Thank you. Okay. So, let's
50 go ahead and I guess, Brett, can I turn it over to you

000111

1 to speak to your Board of Fish proposal?

2

3 MR. RICHARDSON: Yes. Thank you. Do you
4 want a motion or just discussion?

5

6 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes. You can do a
7 motion. Thanks.

8

9 MR. RICHARDSON: Okay. I move to propose
10 a change to regulation 5 AAC 01.360.

11

12 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Can you state --
13 and then what is the change that you're proposing?

14

15 MR. RICHARDSON: So, the regulation
16 currently reads, fishing seasons in the Unalaska
17 district, salmon may be taken for subsistence purposes
18 from sunrise until -- sorry, that's the change -- from
19 subsistence purposes from 6 a.m. until 9 p.m. from
20 January 1st through December 31st. I'd like to revise
21 to -- from sunrise until sunset.

22

23 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. So, I'll just
24 restate the motion is to revise 5 AAC 01.360 changing
25 the harvest times from 6 a.m. to 9 p.m. changing that
26 to sunrise to sunset. Is there a second?

27

28 MS. HAYDEN: Second. This is Natasha.

29

30 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank
31 you. Brett, did you want to speak any more or give
32 additional context to why you're proposing this?

33

34 MR. RICHARDSON: Yes. Thank you. So, I
35 spoke with people that I fish with, people that have
36 nets out on a regular basis during the summertime.
37 Regular summertime, sunset is after 11 p.m., sometimes
38 midnight. And we all work all summer. So, getting out
39 after work, hitting the net in the boat, if it's not
40 already in there, gassing up, getting out to the spot,
41 it could be seven, eight o'clock, put the net in. You
42 basically have to pull it very quickly to be done by 9
43 pm, which is -- it's pretty hard given our weather that
44 we have out there. It would be great if every Sunday
45 were blue skies and calm seas, but it's not how it is.
46 So, we have to go whenever we can. And it would be, you
47 know, fortunate if we had more time to do so. Thank you.

48

49 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, Brett. Are
50 there any questions for Brett about his proposal? Okay.

000112

1 And then -- oh, Sam, go ahead.

2

3 MR. ROHRER: Through the Chair. Thank
4 you. Brett, just curious, do you guys have a good -- I
5 mean, is there a published sunrise and sunset in Unalaska
6 that's readily available that -- just to make sure
7 everyone's like using the same that a trooper would be
8 using the same and that you would all be using because
9 it's not -- I mean, it's not when the sun drops below
10 your horizon, it's I mean, it's like -- it's a specific
11 time and it changes wherever you are. So, do you know
12 how you're going to figure that?

13

14 MR. RICHARDSON: Through the Chair.
15 Likely the NOAA website published sunrise/sunset data.

16

17 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Go ahead, Coral.

18

19 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah. Thank you. Brett, I
20 had this question. Through the Chair, I -- let's see.
21 So, you're proposing a revision in the area. It says
22 salmon may be taken from January 1st through December
23 31st. So that would -- is that your current dates?

24

25 MR. RICHARDSON: Yes. That says it's
26 currently.....

27

28 (Simultaneous speech)

29

30 MS. CHERNOFF: Open for summer? And I
31 definitely am in support of having expanded availability
32 for people to subsistence because, like you said we have
33 weather, you have weather, a lot of times you might be
34 able to get out two times in a season. And so, I think
35 it increases opportunity when we increase those times.
36 So, thank you.

37

38 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Natasha.

39

40 MS. HAYDEN: Thanks, Madam Chair. Is this
41 something that has been talked around? And is there a
42 local advisory committee that would be taking this up
43 for consideration? A Fish and Game Advisory Committee
44 as well. I mean, is that something that you've already
45 done, or is this the first time that it's been introduced
46 in for proposed changes?

47

48 MR. RICHARDSON: Through the Chair. I
49 spoke to a representative of ADF&G, and they said that
50 sometime in the past it was sunrise to sunset. I'm not

1 sure what the change was. As far as Advisory Council, I
2 haven't spoken to anybody else. But everybody I've
3 spoken to kind of boots on the ground has supported what
4 we've talked about.

5

6

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat.

7

8 MR. HOLMES: I believe the proposal went
9 in many years ago as a protection device, but there's
10 no enforcement out there. They won't even go down to the
11 bridge and look and see if somebody's gillnetting out
12 of the bridge between Unalaska and out to the beach. And
13 anyway, it's rather silly. They did have something
14 similar with the commercial rigs when they used to have
15 pretty serious salmon fishery out there for pinks and
16 reds, but that's faded away decades ago. And so, I'd be
17 inclined to go with my colleague on this.

18

19

20

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Further
discussion? Natasha.

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: Brett, do you have
a response you'd like to share?

1 MR. RICHARDSON: Yes. Thank you. Through
2 the Chair. So, I don't know that we have stiff
3 competition as, as you described. It may, you know, I
4 question why the 9 pm stoppage, could be due to people
5 overfishing on front beach. You know, there's a lot of
6 proxy fishing going on. You kind of see the same people
7 out setting the net over and over and over again. But
8 there isn't, you know, elbow to elbow or anything like
9 that. And I haven't spoken to any official in Advisory
10 Council other than just locals.

11
12 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Coral.
13

14 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah, I guess I said
15 before, like I am you know, I understand the weather and
16 stuff, but now I guess I would be hesitant. Well, it
17 makes me hesitant to comment on this when it has not
18 gone through the local -- I feel like the appropriate
19 place would be for it to go through the local Fish and
20 Game Advisory Committee, and I guess because I don't
21 live there and I don't know how the community feels
22 about it, I don't know that I, or we as a Subsistence
23 Board, should necessarily weigh in on a Board of
24 Fisheries proposal that hasn't been run through the
25 local Advisory Committee to get the feel of what the
26 committee is feeling like. So, I guess I'm really leaning
27 towards not supporting us to write a letter in support
28 of this or adopting this through this separate system.
29 So, thank you. Okay. I'm not opposed to the idea though.

30
31 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. And just to
32 be clear, we would actually be proposing to change the
33 regulations. So, the proposal would be generated by the
34 Kodiak/Aleutians RAC. This section of regulation is --
35 it's a subsistence regulation and it's specific to
36 Unalaska, at a very small regional level. Any further
37 comments? Yeah. It's State Subsistence. Sam, go ahead.

38
39 MR. ROHRER: Thank you. To the Chair.
40 Carol, I kind of -- my mind. I've been going, kind of
41 going back and forth on this in my mind, and my mind
42 kind of wandered down what you said about, well, it
43 should -- you know, I wouldn't like it if someone wrote
44 something like this for Kodiak. But the flip side of
45 that is, is Brett's here representing the wishes of that
46 community. So, from that aspect then I'm like, oh yeah,
47 okay. No, it does make sense for us to write that. So,
48 I -- when's a proposal have to be in by to hit the sport
49 fish cycle, or the fish.

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: It's April 10th.

2

3 MR. ROHRER: I just was wondering if the
4 AC out there was going to be meeting anytime if we said,
5 hey, we want to do a joint proposal with you guys and
6 put both of our names, that'd be an option. But at the
7 end of the day, I mean, Brett, if you're saying your
8 community is for it, then I'll support it. It would be
9 neat to do it from the AC and us together, but it's
10 probably not enough time to make that happen.

11

12 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. So, for
13 myself, I don't have a problem with the RAC putting in
14 a proposal that relates to a community within our region.
15 And this is a -- it is a subsistence-related proposal.
16 And I think that -- the daylight hours it's a real issue
17 for us. If it's light until 11, I -- to me, it makes
18 sense that the fishery should be open, especially if you
19 have to transit, and it takes time to transit to the
20 fishery after work. So, I'll be voting in support of
21 this. I mean, I think I would feel differently if we
22 were attempting to propose something for Fairbanks or
23 Southeast, but we're not. This is -- we're it's a
24 proposal that impacts one of the communities in our
25 region, and it's a subsistence related proposal. So, I
26 feel like it's fair game for us to put a proposal forward
27 that really supports subsistence activity, even if it's
28 not federal subsistence activity. Go ahead, Jeff.

29

30 MS. WASLEY: Chris, I kind of want to put
31 you on the spot like you're from there. Can we hear from
32 you on this, please?

33

34 MR. PRICE: Sure. No, I think it's good
35 to throw it out there to see how people respond. I think,
36 I'd like to know why they came up with this originally,
37 the 6 am to 9, and the only thing I think is maybe
38 there's a safety reason why if he got out at late, at
39 sundown, if you're at least getting back in the dark,
40 it might be concern for maybe public safety or something
41 like that, but I don't see -- I think it's good to give
42 it a shot and see what people say.

43

44 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Would you
45 like to come forward?

46

47 MS. KEATING: Thank you, Madam Chair. For
48 the record, Jackie Keating, Division of Subsistence with
49 Fish and Game. Just wanted to add something to the
50 discussion, for the record, that regardless of what

1 action you all choose to take today, if this Council
2 chooses to submit a proposal, the Unalaska AC will have
3 time to comment on that proposal. Vice-versa; if you
4 choose not to, and the AC or someone else does submit
5 that proposal, this Council will have time the way the
6 cycle works in the fall to comment and provide support
7 for it if you choose to do so. Thank you.

8
9 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. All
10 right. Is there any further -- Natasha, go ahead.

11
12 MS. HAYDEN: I -- just a procedural
13 question. Would it be appropriate or possible for us to
14 include that we had the discussion about the Unalaska
15 Fishing Game Advisory Committee and wanting to be
16 inclusive of their needs as well? Not that we're just
17 trying to direct what happens.

18
19 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. So, I have
20 been prompted to ask if there's anybody from Fish and
21 Game online that can speak to the question of when the
22 harvest times changed to the 6 am to 9 pm. So, is there
23 anyone from Fish and Game online who would be willing
24 and able to speak to that?

25
26 (No response)

27
28 Okay. Well, I'm not seeing or hearing
29 anyone. Pat, do you want to go ahead?

30
31 MR. HOLMES: What was the question you
32 were asking Fish and Game?

33
34 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Lisa, what was the
35 question I was asking Fish and game?

36
37 MS. HUTCHINSON: Well, it seemed like
38 there was some questions that were wondering when the
39 initially there was a sunrise to sunset. At least, I
40 think Pat indicated that, out there and then it did
41 change to a certain specific time. And so, I think we
42 wanted to know when that changed or why it changed. So,
43 if there was any Fish and Game staff online that could
44 answer that. That'd be helpful, or unless Jackie knows.

45
46 MR. HOLMES: Well, I can't speak for the
47 department, but I was the Aleutians salmon biologist. I
48 think when that came about, I was up here. But -- or no,
49 just before I went out there. But that went in as a
50 matter of same question of enforcement as I mentioned

000117

1 before. And people at the AC thought it would be a good
2 idea to have it so that people wouldn't be out there
3 cheating, getting the better set. But it's obviously --
4 there's no enforcement anymore. And so, I just -- I
5 agree with doing this and, because there wasn't any real
6 hard, panicky thing, it was just trying to do at that
7 time what folks were thinking. And so, it's obviously
8 not needed if you can't enforce it.

9
10 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Jackie, did you
11 want to add something?

12
13 MS. KEATING: Thank you, Madam Chair. I
14 wanted to add that, first of all, I believe the person
15 that would have the answer is in a boat training right
16 now. Second of all, if the Council does choose to submit
17 this proposal, I would recommend that you work with this
18 person and let them know we have a pretty collaborative
19 process. And I'd be happy to make that connection so
20 that they could review the proposal and weigh in on it
21 with background information.

22
23 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Is that
24 something that would not otherwise occur or...?

25
26 MS. KEATING: Thank you. We -- the
27 department would review the proposal otherwise. But
28 proposals that are really successful generally have some
29 line of communication before submitting it so that the
30 area biologists can talk through what some of the issues
31 might be and just sort of be aware of the issues at
32 hand.

33
34 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. So, we're not
35 going to be able to do that if we vote on this today.
36 But yeah, I mean having the line of communication
37 absolutely makes sense. All right, is there any further
38 comments or questions? Okay. Can we do, Lisa, a voice
39 vote on this one?

40
41 MS. HUTCHINSON: Okay. Council, we are
42 voting on the proposal that Brett Richardson is
43 suggested, which is to -- he's proposing -- the fishing
44 seasons in the Unalaska district, and it currently the
45 is taken from 6 am to 9 pm, and he would like to change
46 that from sunrise to sunset from January 1st through
47 December 31st. So, we're voting to support that; a
48 proposal to write that. Correct?

49
50

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Well, that's what
2 I was going to ask. Are we voting to support his proposal
3 or are we voting to generate a proposal? So, I was
4 approaching this as though we were generating the
5 proposal based on the conversation that we might be able
6 to substitute that out.

7
8 MS. HUTCHINSON: Okay. I didn't know he
9 had already written a proposal. I just thought this was
10 his suggested proposal, and that's what we were going
11 to vote on it, but.....

12
13 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. But -- right.
14 But we're not supporting we're -- we are proposing it.
15 We are generating a proposal into the Board of Fish.

16
17 MS. HUTCHINGSON: Yes.

18
19 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay.

20
21 MS. HUTCHINSON: Thank you. Thank you.
22 Okay. Is everybody clear? Except for me. Okay. We'll
23 start with Christopher Price.

24
25 MR. PRICE: Yes.

26
27 MS. HUTCHINSON: Brett Richardson.

28
29 MR. RICHARDSON: Yes.

30
31 MS. HUTCHINSON: Karen Kalmakoff.

32
33 MS. KALMAKOFF: Yes.

34
35 MS. HUTCHINSON: Jeff Wasley.

36
37 MR. WASLEY: Yes.

38
39 MS. HUTCHINSON: Patrick Holmes.

40
41 MR. HOLMES: Yes.

42
43 MS. HUTCHINSON: Daniel Smith.

44
45 MR. SMITH: Yes.

46
47 MS. HUTCHINSON: Sam Rohrer.

48
49 MR. ROHRER: Yes.

000119

1 MS. HUTCHINSON: Coral Chernoff.

2

3 MS. CHERNOFF: Yes.

4

5 MS. HUTCHINSON: Natasha Hayden.

6

7 MS. HAYDEN: Yes.

8

9 MS. HUTCHINSON: Rebecca Skinner.

10

11 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes.

12

13 MS. HUTCHINSON: It passed unanimously.

14 Ten for. Thank you.

15

16 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank
17 you, Lisa. Does anyone want to bring forward any other
18 proposals for the Alaska Board of Fish upcoming cycle?

19

20 (No response)

21

22 Okay. I'm not seeing any -- that
23 concludes agenda item 13G. Our next agenda item is 13H.
24 Future meeting dates. So, this will be tab 7, 8 and 9
25 in the big proposal book.

26

27 (Pause)

28

29 Okay. So, the first thing is to confirm
30 the fall 2025 meeting date and location, and we are
31 currently -- what we have right now is September 17th
32 and 18th, a Wednesday and a Thursday in Cold Bay. So, I
33 think I just need to ask, does that still make sense to
34 everyone? And then does this require an actual vote to
35 confirm? Okay. All right. So, we're going to need a
36 motion to confirm those as the meeting dates and
37 location. Go ahead, Jeff.

38

39 MR. WALSEY: I'll make the motion to
40 confirm them.

41

42 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Is there
43 a second?

44

45 MS. CHERNOFF: Second.

46

47 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Is there
48 any discussion?

49

50 (No response)

1
2 Okay. Is there any objection to the
3 motion that our fall 2025 meeting be September 17th and
4 18th in Cold Bay?

5
6 (No response)

7
8 Okay. Seeing and hearing none. That
9 motion passes unanimously. The next one is choosing
10 winter 2026 meeting date and location. So, if you go to
11 the next page in the meeting date, you can see which
12 RACs have already chosen dates.

13
14 MS. HUTCHINSON: So, Madam Chair.

15
16 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes.

17
18 MS. HUTCHINSON: Council. I wanted to add
19 just one because of -- the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta just
20 met earlier this week and theirs is not on there. So,
21 for that, their meeting is scheduled for March 17th,
22 18th and 19th. And for those of you who aren't aware,
23 we can only have no more than two meetings during a
24 week. So, if -- you just keep that in mind. Looks like
25 it's not an issue at this point or you want to schedule
26 it, but.....

27
28 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Thank you.
29 Oh, Sam. Go ahead.

30
31 MR. ROHRER: I would move for the same
32 week next year, so that'd be like the -- anytime 2nd,
33 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, but probably towards like 5th and
34 6th -- 4th or 5th, or 5th and 6th of March of next year.

35
36 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Thank you.
37 So, the week of March 2nd, but looking at the end of
38 that week, maybe March 5th and 6th, is there a second?

39
40 MS. CHERNOFF: Second.

41
42 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Okay.
43 So, I'm going to check my calendar. I don't know if
44 other people want to take a minute to check their
45 calendars and then we'll have discussion.

46
47 (Pause)

48
49 Okay. How does that week -- and I guess
50 if we can go the specific days, that would be helpful.

000121

1 Do people prefer a Wednesday, Thursday or a Thursday,
2 Friday?

3

4 MR. WALSEY: Wednesday, Thursday.

5

6 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Wednesday,
7 Thursday. Okay. We have a suggestion for a Wednesday.
8 Thursday, that would be March 4th and 5th. Daniel.

9

10 MR. SMITH: Yeah, I would like that.
11 Wednesday, Thursday.

12

13 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Is there any
14 objection to -- well, sorry. We also need a location.
15 So generally, in the winter we have been meeting in
16 Kodiak. I'm not -- is that kind of a given or should we
17 even talk about other locations or...? Looking at Lisa.
18 Looking at Robbin. Coral, do you want to jump in?

19

20 MS. CHERNOFF: My suggestion would be
21 meet in Kodiak.

22

23 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, so the -- can
24 we amend -- can we friendly amend Sam's motion? So, the
25 motion is going to be meeting in Kodiak March 4th and
26 5th in 2026. Is there.....

27

28 MR. ROHRER: I'll accept that friendly
29 amendment.

30

31 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Awesome. All
32 right. Is there further discussion?

33

34 MR. ROHRER: Just one thing. So, I -- the
35 Board of Game is, my understanding, is they're going to
36 be in Kodiak for their March meeting next year, but I
37 don't know the dates of that. And that would be the only
38 thing. I don't think they're posted yet, but they might
39 be. Oh, are they? Okay. I don't know if it'd be neat to
40 try to do something that -- maybe doesn't even make
41 sense, because that's like but there would be a bunch
42 of people in town to tag on something on one end of it
43 or the other. It would be a lot, but I've just at least
44 so we know if Council members that that is an option,
45 maybe a bad option, but it is an option.

46

47 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Well,
48 I'm pretty sure we have Sam's motion on the floor. All
49 right. Well, I'm not seeing any more -- is -- sorry.
50 Hand hands are waving around. Okay. So, the motion is

000122

1 to meet in Kodiak, March 4th and 5th, 2026. Is there any
2 objection?

3

4 (No response)

5

6 Okay. Seeing and hearing none, we have
7 our March 2026 meeting dates. The next is to select fall
8 2026 meeting date and location. And we don't even have
9 a calendar for that. Oh, we do. Okay. Right in front of
10 me. Are there any updates to the calendar?

11

12 MS. HUTCHINSON: Yes. So, YK Delta should
13 be added and that's October 27th, 28th and 29th. So that
14 last week would be out, and I think there was just one
15 thing that had come up that sometimes it's difficult for
16 both Jeff and Sam to attend the fall meeting because
17 that's their key hunting season or guiding season. So,
18 I don't know if that's something that you guys want to
19 discuss of making -- picking the date where they might
20 be able to attend more regularly, but that's just
21 something that I have heard. Thank you.

22

23 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, I wouldn't
24 mind getting some feedback. I think what Sam has said
25 in the past is kind of like all the times are bad, so
26 pick a date and he'll make it, if he can. Jeff, go ahead.

27

28 MR. WASLEY: If it's in Cold Bay, I can
29 do it regardless of dates. If it's not, I can't. I mean,
30 I might be able to try one day remotely, but that's all
31 I have. Thanks.

32

33 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank
34 you.

35

36 MR. ROHRER: Through the Chair. I would
37 just say later is better for me in September, but.....

38

39 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, and I would
40 ask that we not overlap with the North Pacific Council,
41 which is October 5th through October 14th. So basically,
42 that's a two-week period in October.

43

44 MS. HAYDEN: Madam Chair.

45

46 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Go ahead, Natasha.

47

48 MS. HAYDEN: This is Natasha. I'm just
49 going to make a proposal, or a motion, to hold the
50 meeting the week of September 28th. Whichever days are

000123

1 preferable. Let's see. Maybe September 30th and October
2 1st.

3

4 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Would you like to
5 add a location?

6

7 MS. HAYDEN: Can I just feel like this
8 is Wheel of Fortune. Sand Point or we were in Unalaska
9 last fall. Where else? Because we're constrained to hub
10 communities. Is that correct?

11

12 MS. HUTCHINSON: Well, there are -- where
13 -- the hub is -- the hub community discussion again. So
14 currently the approved hub communities for your region
15 are Unalaska, Cold Bay and Kodiak. You could -- we have
16 had another areas like when we met in King Cove. It just
17 requires approval from our director and then I have to
18 do a budget comparison and all that, which, you know,
19 is just part of it. But like, King Cove is actually the
20 same cost as going to Cold Bay. So, it wasn't like it
21 was a great addition. But Sand Point has been met in the
22 past and I just count the Council at that point didn't
23 really recommend going to Cold Bay, but that was
24 something when we get back into the hub communities it
25 could be incredible. I mean, you could -- if the Council
26 wants to meet there, we can put it down and they just
27 have to get approval. But you might want to have a backup
28 plan for one of the hub communities. If that makes sense,
29 so.

30

31 MS. HAYDEN: Okay. So, my motion -- I'm
32 just going to make the motion on the dates. And if --
33 I'm -- after a second, if somebody wants to make an
34 amendment to include a location.

35

36 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Then yeah, because
37 I'm hesitant to vote on dates unless we also have a
38 location. But yeah. So, we'll go with Natasha's motion
39 for the week of September 28th. And is there a second?

40

41 MS. CHERNOFF: Second.

42

43 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thanks.
44 Thanks, Coral. Pat, you're trying to jump in. Go ahead.

45

46 MR. HOLMES: Oh, no. I was going to
47 second, but I would suggest Cold Bay, and the reason why
48 is because you're probably going to be a whole lot more
49 restrictions on meetings coming out at Washington, D.C.,
50 as to where or when. And I think, if it could be arranged

1 for us to stay at the Fish and Wildlife Service
2 headquarters, like we did when we got caught getting
3 back from King Cove. I mean, those were incredibly great
4 place to stay. It isn't going to cost the government
5 much, and it would be a place where we could get
6 together. And it also is reasonably accessible for folks
7 to Sand Point. As much as I'd like to go to Sand Point,
8 I think it could be done cheaper at Cold Bay. And I
9 agree with Natasha's suggestion of those dates towards
10 the end of September. Lord knows what the weather does,
11 but usually the second or third week of September and,
12 my colleague could probably correct me, but that always
13 seemed like there'd be a big snorting rip 50, 60 mile
14 an hour storms hitting about the middle of September and
15 towards the end, it's not quite as nasty, but that's
16 just my own recollections.

17

18 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, so Pat has
19 made a motion for Cold Bay. Is there a second?

20

21 MR. PRICE: Second.

22

23 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. We'll take
24 Chris on that. So, we have an amended motion on the
25 floor to meet in Cold Bay the week of September 28th.
26 If we can narrow down dates, do people prefer the
27 beginning of the week, the middle of the week, or the
28 end of the week? Jeff, go ahead.

29

30 MR. WASLEY: We could do like October 1st
31 and 2nd. It'd be easier for me having the Friday. Thanks.

32

33 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. So, we have
34 a suggestion for October 1st and 2nd, which is a Thursday
35 and a Friday. Is that okay? Is there any comments?

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 Okay. Well, I'm not seeing any
40 additional suggestions. So, let's go ahead and take a
41 vote on October 1st and 2nd, which is Thursday and a
42 Friday, and that would be in Cold Bay. And this we're
43 talking about 2026. So, is there any objection?

44

45 (No response)

46

47 Okay. Seeing and hearing none that
48 passes unanimously. So, we have our fall 2026 meeting
49 dates and locations. Go ahead, Coral.

50

1 MS. CHERNOFF: I guess we just passed
2 through this, but my thought was just that the -- that
3 wildlife proposal that I wanted to put forward is
4 concerned with Kodiak. So are we going to be in Kodiak
5 when we review that, and if not like I'd like to be.

6
7 MS. HOLMAN: So, Madam Chair, through the
8 through the Chair. This is Kendra Holman for the record.
9 So that would be this coming fall, which I believe was
10 the Cold Bay location for this coming fall. So, it would
11 not be in Kodiak as of right now.

12
13 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Coral, go ahead.

14
15 MS. CHERNOFF: So, I don't know. I'd like
16 to propose to change the meeting place for that. I feel
17 like if we're going to talk about Kodiak and customary
18 and traditional use, and that I think that the
19 opportunity for Kodiak to weigh in on that, I think, is
20 very important. So, I don't know if anyone else is
21 willing to talk about changing that place, for this fall
22 to Kodiak.

23
24 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So, yeah, I will
25 say that I -- I'm not going to support that because that
26 would result in three meetings in a row in Kodiak. And
27 also -- so I do appreciate what you're saying about
28 having -- if it's a big -- a proposal that impacts the
29 community, it's nice if it can be in the community. I
30 do think for people in Kodiak, we are -- we have pretty
31 good connectivity, and we're pretty good at
32 participating virtually and we have time to do outreach.
33 So, while maybe not ideal, that's -- that would be how
34 I would prefer to go forward. But yeah, I just think
35 it's problematic to have three Kodiak meetings right in
36 a row. Go ahead, Coral.

37
38 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah. So, I guess the
39 issue with -- oh, yeah. I'm not sure what your first
40 point was again. But I don't know. I would like to just,
41 you know, just hear what anybody else has to say. I do
42 think, you know, we like to provide opportunity for
43 people. I think it's also a lot of -- it's snowing! I
44 haven't seen snow in so long. So, I think that the
45 opportunity for people to weigh in is different in person
46 than on the phone. So anyway, I would just like to
47 advocate to have that meeting in Kodiak.

48
49 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Further comments,
50 discussion and dialogue? Coral has expressed interest

1 in hearing from other Council members what they think
2 about her suggestion to move the fall meeting. So that
3 would be the upcoming September meeting instead of in
4 Cold Bay, it would be in Kodiak. So further -- do Council
5 members have thoughts or reactions to that?

6

7 MR. HOLMES: Madam Chair, I think we
8 should vote. I'll stay with Cold Bay.

9

10 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Well, we
11 don't have a motion on the floor yet. I think Coral was
12 wanting to hear what people's reaction was. So, we're
13 still in the reaction phase. Jeff, go ahead.

14

15 MR. WASLEY: Yeah, I agree with you,
16 Rebecca. Three meetings in a row in Kodiak. And also,
17 there's six members on the Board here from Kodiak. I
18 feel you guys are fairly represented. Thank you.

19

20 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Brett, go ahead.

21

22 MR. RICHARDSON: I believe we did just
23 vote, didn't we? On holding Cold Bay?

24

25 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: We did. So, we
26 voted on each location, Coral is now bringing up -- so
27 I guess I could say no, we voted on that. Let's move on.
28 But I was allowing some discussion on this issue of
29 potentially revisiting that motion to move -- so instead
30 of meeting in Cold Bay, we'd meet in Kodiak in the fall.
31 The next meeting. Natasha, go ahead.

32

33 MS. HAYDEN: Thanks, Madam Chair. I'm not
34 interested in exploring changes in the location of the
35 meeting, but I am interested in exploring if there's
36 anything we can do to facilitate community participation
37 or community education, you know, through -- outside of
38 what we normally do, not putting any more undue burden
39 on OSM, but for us to be able to have really good
40 communication with when the proposal goes, when it's
41 going to go, you know, exactly what it's going to say?
42 And then what are the on-ramps for participation in that
43 fall meeting for discussion. You know, I think it's a
44 good point about, you know, making sure that the people
45 in the area that are going to potentially be impacted
46 by that proposal have got as much information or and --
47 or and that that's part of our role is educating the
48 community. So, I'm interested in you know, figuring that
49 out tomorrow.

50

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. I was
2 actually going to ask if maybe we could form -- not a
3 committee, because it seems like there's always pushback
4 on committees, but an outreach working group is that --
5 can we just -- can we do that? What's that?

6
7 MS. HUTCHINSON: When would you like to
8 meet?

9
10 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Well, the working
11 group would decide when it was going to meet. So, we
12 would just like today we would decide who would be on
13 it and then it would need to -- it would be kind of like
14 with the when we had all the closure reviews, we had a
15 group of people that got together to talk about, you
16 know, outreach and that kind of thing. That's how I
17 envision it. And it seemed like a working group had more
18 flexibility than doing a committee.

19
20 MS. HUTCHINSON: Yeah, you could
21 definitely -- you could form a working group. Just
22 whatever you come up with, you have to meet back with
23 the Council and have them vote on it. So, you could
24 either have a working group tonight and come back with
25 a Council tomorrow, or if otherwise, it's going to be
26 after that. You can have to wait until the fall to
27 discuss it and have the Council vote on it.

28
29 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So, the point of
30 the working group would be -- and maybe this can just
31 be done outside of the RAC, would be to talk about
32 outreach, and making sure that the community is informed
33 and that there's good information going out to the
34 community about how they can participate in the fall
35 meeting. So, there wouldn't be action today, and there
36 probably wouldn't be action in the fall, because that's
37 in fact when we'd be taking up the issue. But it's
38 getting a group of people, if there's people at the
39 table right now that want to work on it. I just want to
40 provide an opportunity for them to identify themselves.
41 They're always free to do that on their own. But it
42 seemed like the working group we had for the fishery
43 closures worked fairly well. So, I'm just envisioning
44 something like that process, and we didn't set those
45 meetings ahead of time. We didn't set them at the RAC
46 meeting, so it seemed like we didn't need to do that.

47
48 MS. HUTCHINSON: Okay. Yeah. If it's just
49 sort of to figure out how to increase your outreach. I
50 think that'd be fine.

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: Okay.

MS. HUTCHINSON: So, we just need some volunteers then.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Sam, go ahead.

MR. ROHRER: Thank you. Through the Chair. Well, I have good news to address Coral's concerns, the Federal Subsistence Board won't be meeting until April of 2026 to hear our proposal anyways, if we come up with a proposal. So, we'll have a full year cycle. If we come up with a proposal tomorrow, it'll go to them, they'll look at it, they'll review it. We'll have an opportunity in the fall to comment. But I mean, am I wrong? We'll have next year's meeting if we want to make further comments and to hear from the public.

MS. HOLMAN: So, through the Chair. So, no. So, the way it kind of goes through the process is you know, we'll have the public comments on the proposals June-ish, give or take. It'll come before the RAC again in the fall for your motions. From that point in time until we're getting ready for the Board, we have other reviews that will be happening on them. And then prepping for the Board. So, when you're winter meetings are happening again in that March time frame of next year there -- it's going to be too late and all the documentation and everything. So, as we go through the system there's time frames on public notice and things like that have to happen. And they -- those would not have the time for review.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Go ahead, Robbin.

MS. LA VINE: Madam Chair, I'm definitely a shades of gray kind of person. Ideally, you develop your recommendations on the analyses during the fall cycle. When you do, it gets into all of the meeting materials and is more accessible to the public. It also helps in developing the consensus and non-consensus agenda items. But there have been Councils that have withheld their proposals for various different -- or their recommendations, for various different reasons. And frequently, they wait until they hear from others. More people or there's more discussion. And so, what that would do if you decided to withhold your recommendation on that proposal in the fall meeting in favor of hearing from the public during your winter

1 meeting, the outcome of that would be the proposal would
2 not have a chance to go on the consensus, non-consensus
3 agenda. It would be taken up by the Board, but your
4 recommendation would have the benefit of being held, you
5 know, or developed here in the public, if you felt -- I
6 mean, here in Kodiak, if you felt it necessary. So, you
7 could, you could go through a bit of an outreach, you
8 could hear from a number of people during your fall
9 meeting and feel content. But if you feel like you needed
10 more input and that your Council would benefit from
11 greater input, you can withhold your recommendation for
12 the winter. Thank you, Madam Chair.

13
14 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. So, I will
15 say my preference is to stick to the normal course of
16 schedule in that, we would be reviewing the proposal in
17 the fall. I don't recommend delaying it for a variety
18 of reasons. So if we are going to hear it in the fall
19 and the fall meeting is in Cold Bay, not in Kodiak, my
20 suggestion, just to put some kind of structure around
21 it, is to have a working group comprising, however many
22 members want to be on the working group that would work
23 -- that would get together to talk about outreach. So,
24 you're not talking about the proposal, you're talking
25 about how do we outreach to the community most
26 effectively, and also make sure that we have good
27 ramps. So, like, maybe the tribe could organize a --
28 like a Zoom call in room. So, if people wanted to testify
29 and comment on the proposal, they could show up to the
30 tribe, and all kind of gather in one place so that they
31 know they have a good connection and there's other people
32 there. Things like that. That's what I'm thinking. We
33 don't have to do that, but I think it's a good exercise
34 to go through because it makes us really think about how
35 are we engaging with our communities and I see Pat was
36 trying to jump in. Pat, go ahead.

37
38 MR. HOLMES: Okay. I'm sorry I missed
39 Coral. What proposal were you talking about that we
40 needed more input here, and then B if you'd like, Madam
41 Chair, I can go over the points that I made earlier on
42 outreach for this meeting. Those are two separate
43 things. But Coral?

44
45 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So, she's talking
46 about the -- it's a Federal Wildlife proposal. It's one
47 that she handed out on paper. I was going to say
48 yesterday, that would be today, and it has to do with
49 the customary and traditional usage for brown bear --
50 subsistence brown bear for Kodiak and then also having

1 a number -- a certain number of harvest permits
2 available. And so that's the -- we're going to be talking
3 about that tomorrow morning.

4

5 MR. HOLMES: Thank you. I'm going to have
6 the outreach discussion. I suggest that we do it when
7 you close this meeting, or I can give you a review as
8 to what I usually do and what I did do this time.

9

10 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. I think at
11 this point, let's go ahead and deal with the -- if we
12 do want to have an outreach working group, we'll deal
13 with that tomorrow when we deal with the proposal. I'm
14 looking around. I think people, it kind of looks like
15 we're at the end of the day. So, I'm inclined to end the
16 meeting for the day and then tomorrow will start at 9
17 am, and I think we will just go ahead and start with the
18 -- go back to the Call for Federal Wildlife Proposal
19 Item. So, first thing in the morning, we'll start with
20 the brown bear proposal, and then if we want to talk
21 about outreach working group, we can. That's not
22 required. And once we get that done, that will have
23 taken care of all of the action items and then -- so
24 right after that, we'd be moving down into reports. We'd
25 be hearing from Jackie Keating. So, any -- is there any
26 Council comments for the good of the order, anything
27 anybody wants to bring up before we break for the day?
28 Go ahead, Lisa

29

30 MS. HUTCHINSON: Just wanted to get --
31 confirm on the on the last meeting they did for October,
32 for the fall meeting of 2026. So, it was October 1st and
33 2nd in Cold Bay? Okay. So, thank you.

34

35 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes, that is
36 correct. Okay. We'll go ahead and break for the day and
37 reconvene here at 9 am tomorrow.

38

39 (Off record)

40

41 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 1 through 130 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the KODIA/ALEUTIANS SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME I recorded on the 6th day of March;

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 21st day of March 2025.

Rafael Morel
Chief Project Manager