

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 II

KODIAK NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE
VISITOR CENTER
Kodiak, Alaska
March 5, 2026

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Rebecca Skinner, Chair
- Patrick Holmes
- Natasha Hayden
- Daniel Smith
- Samuel Rohrer
- Brett Richardson
- Jeffrey Wasley

Regional Council Coordinator, Leigh Honig

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 - 3/05/2026)

(On record)

MS. HONIG: Pat Holmes.

MR. HOLMES: Here.

MS. HONIG: Sam Rohrer.

MR. ROHRER: Here.

MS. HONIG: Coral Chernoff.

MS. CHERNOFF: Here.

MS. HONIG: Rebecca Skinner.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Here.

MS. HONIG: Daniel Smith.

MR. SMITH: Here.

MS. HONIG: Natasha Hayden. Oh, I see her walking in. And Brett Richardson.

MR. RICHARDSON: Here.

MS. HONIG: No problem. All right. We have quorum. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank you. Okay. We'll now have an opportunity for public comment. This is Public and Tribal Comment on Non-Agenda Items. Is there anyone in the room who wishes to give public comment.

(No response)

Okay. I don't see anyone. Is there anyone joining us online or on the phone that wants to give public comment?

(No response)

Okay, we're not seeing anyone online. All right. So, this morning we are going to start with

0003

1 item -- agenda item 12, Fisheries Resource Monitoring
2 Program update. And first on that list is the Partners
3 for Fisheries Monitoring Program.

4
5 MS. SENEAL: Good morning, everyone.
6 Anna Senecal, OSM, Madam Chair, members of the Council.
7 So, I'm a Fisheries Biologist with OSM and am here to
8 provide you with a quick update on our Partners for
9 Fisheries Monitoring Program. Collectively known as
10 Partners Program. So, we posted a notice of funding
11 opportunity for the program during the spring of 2025
12 and this is a competitive grant. A competitive grant for
13 Alaska Native and rural non-profit organizations. So
14 those are the entities that are eligible to apply for
15 this funding source. And the intent is to strengthen
16 Alaska Native and rural involvement in the federal
17 subsistence management by providing salary funds to
18 organizations so they can hire professional biologists,
19 a social scientist, or an educator. So, these funds are
20 for capacity building. The grant also provides funds for
21 science and culture camps and paid student internships.
22 The period of performance is four years in total, so the
23 funding lasts for up to four years. And the Partners
24 Program Review Panel, made up of subject matter experts
25 across various DOI agencies, have reviewed the proposals
26 and the Office of Subsistence Management Regional
27 Director has approved funding for three new partners.
28 So, these include the Bristol Bay Native Association,
29 the Native Village of Eyak and the Ahtna Intertribal
30 Resources Commission. The next notice of funding
31 opportunity will be sometime in the spring of 2027. For
32 funding that would begin in 2028. And if you would like
33 to learn more about this program, you may contact Liz
34 Williams via email or phone, and her contact information
35 can be found at the partners web page at
36 www.doi.gov/subsistence/partners. Or if anyone here is
37 interested, please come see me at any time during the
38 meeting and I'd be happy to talk to you more about this
39 program. So, thank you, Madam Chair. This concludes my
40 updates on this program. Does the Council have any
41 questions?

42
43 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Are there any
44 questions?

45
46 (No response)

47
48 All right. I don't see any questions.
49 All right. Thank you. All right. We will roll right into
50 our next agenda item which is FRMP discussion. And my

1 understanding is we'll have a facilitated discussion,
2 and Anna is going to lead that. So go ahead.
3

4 MS. SENEAL: Okay. For the record, Anna
5 Senecal, Fisheries Biologist, OSM. Madam Chair, Council
6 Members, a brief update on the Fisheries Resource
7 Monitoring Program, and then we'll roll into the show.
8 So, we're currently in the final phase of the 2026
9 Monitoring Program funding cycle. The Federal
10 Subsistence Board met in early February and approved the
11 final Monitoring Program and funding plan or process.
12 This is the point in the cycle where we show up to the
13 RAC meetings, and we solicit volunteers to develop the
14 next suite of priority information needs or PINs to
15 direct the scope of future notice of funding
16 opportunities. So, these are the topics of research gaps
17 that the applicants need to address in order to be
18 eligible for this funding source. However, in looking
19 through previous annual reports and hearing from our
20 Council Coordinator, I understand that there's a
21 perennial discussion item regarding increased RAC and
22 tribal involvement in the FRMP process. And a an ask for
23 better lines of communication. So, to that end, I've
24 prepared a PowerPoint slide deck to step through some
25 brief background information and facilitate a discussion
26 around the Council's experience of the FRMP with the
27 intent not necessarily to identify action items. I want
28 to be very clear that I'm not promising anything here,
29 but to look for opportunities to do a better job of
30 addressing our highest priorities, subsistence
31 information gaps to understand respective experiences
32 and boundary constraints around this funding program
33 particularly during periods of flat or declining
34 budgets. So, and then at the end of that, we will need
35 to circle back and talk about PINs as the -- we can talk
36 about how to improve a process, but in the background,
37 the same process is still moving forward. So, if it
38 pleases the Council, I can shift over to that now.

39
40 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, I had a
41 question. Do we finalize our PINs at our fall meeting
42 or this meeting?
43

44 MS. SENEAL: Anna Senecal. So we -- I'm
45 asking for volunteers. The volunteers will meet like a
46 subcommittee via Teams during the summer, and then
47 they're finalized at the fall meeting.
48

49 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. So normally
50 what we do is we work in conjunction with Bristol Bay

1 RAC because we're in their same FRMP. So, we -- I'm
2 assuming we'd have the same working group with KARAC
3 members and Bristol. Okay. Thank you. Proceed.

4

5 MS. SENEAL: Okay.

6

7 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So, hold on. So
8 just for the people listening, I think we are perhaps
9 working out a technology issue. But Pat has a comment.
10 Go ahead, Pat.

11

12 MR. HOLMES: Oh, in the interim, I
13 thought this came to me that earlier conversations this
14 winter. In that very similar to the folks at King Cove
15 losing their fishing plant and because they relied not
16 -- almost exclusively on getting their red salmon from
17 the commercial fishery donations from family members and
18 friends. I -- it just dawned on me that with the shortly
19 -- not too long-ago Board of Fish actions on the Alaska
20 Peninsula, that their fishing time is going to be greatly
21 reduced, particularly in June when the chum salmon
22 either rotating off the Gulf of Alaska to Chignik or
23 from Kodiak or going up to Bristol Bay. That's
24 traditionally been a fishery there since before there
25 was even a commercial fishery in Bristol Bay. And so
26 those folks have been severely restricted in their
27 opportunities for commercial fishing. And then that's
28 probably one of the main sources for red salmon for
29 folks in Sand Point. So, I just wanted to bring that to
30 folks awareness that things are going to be tough out
31 west as well. Thank you.

32

33 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Pat. All
34 right. It looks like we are screen sharing and we have
35 the presentation up in the room. So go ahead, Anna.

36

37 MS. SENEAL: All right. For the record,
38 Anna Senecal, Fisheries Biologist, OSM. Madam Chair,
39 Members of the Council. I'm going to do my best to stay
40 within a parliamentary procedural boundaries and do this
41 facilitated discussion, and we'll just do our best.
42 Okay. So yeah, I gave the preamble already. Here we are.
43 Facilitated discussion. See if it will let me advance
44 my slides. It will not. Okay.

45

46 The why, why are we here? So, my goals
47 for today are to attempt to build shared understanding
48 around this process, both the technical elements and the
49 experiences, and identify specific topics for further
50 discussion. So, this is a -- you've been through this

1 process, you have a lot of knowledge of how it works.
2 You have come with specific ideas for technical
3 solutions to improve it, improve your experiences. And
4 what we have run into is that the sideboards, the legal
5 sideboards preclude us from pursuing some of these
6 options. So, with this group, I'd like to try to step
7 back and take more of a 10,000-foot level and think
8 about on a functional level, what are we trying to
9 address? And then maybe some ideas will surface. So
10 that's the rationale. How I hope that we're able to
11 engage, we've already agreed to these meeting
12 agreements. You know, to be respectful, we're going to
13 listen at that higher level, listen to understand. I
14 hope that we can work to call people in, instead of call
15 people out. Be curious. So, I'm hoping that we can all
16 be engaged, open, respectful and receptive to each
17 other's experiences.

18
19 So, the mission, this is paraphrasing,
20 the mission of the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program
21 is to identify and provide information needed to sustain
22 subsistence fisheries on federal public lands for rural
23 Alaskans by funding research and monitoring projects
24 that address the highest priority subsistence fishery
25 information needs. So that's what we read, what we say,
26 what you've seen. It's in reports. I'd like somebody to
27 tell me what stands out to them. What do you notice?
28 Yes. Chair Skinner.

29
30 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. I'll
31 start by throwing something out there. So, a lot of the
32 -- there's a lot of tension with access to salmon in
33 Western Alaska in the stream so, in-river. But I -- it
34 seems like there's a general consensus that what's --
35 well, it's unknown what's happening to the salmon, but
36 what's happening in the ocean is obviously a big factor.
37 So, when I read this, it specifies on federal public
38 lands and the like, rivers flowing over the lands. So,
39 from the perspective of a lot of what we're hearing now
40 with concerns with salmon, that is a characteristic of
41 this program that I -- that looks a little challenging.

42
43 MS. SENEAL: The -- so we are limited
44 geographically within the scope of this.....

45
46 (Simultaneous speech)

47
48 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: And are you going
49 to call on people or do you want me to call on people?

50

1 MS. SENEAL: If you would like, yeah.

2

3

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat, go ahead.

4

5 MR. HOLMES: Well, I think identifying
6 new things is important. And obviously some big changes
7 in the ocean, but myself, I would hate to see us lose
8 what have been the primary needs for our community since
9 this whole process has started and that's providing
10 funds to monitor the returning sockeye salmon. That's
11 the important thing -- most important thing for
12 subsistence that I can think of. And we have always
13 identified through the years the Buskin, Buskin Lake and
14 that run and then also the run into McLees Lake and
15 Unalaska. And there have been times in the past where
16 the bureaucracy has slipped up or made some
17 misassumptions as to who was doing what or who was going
18 to be paying for it, and then completely ignored our
19 requests. And so, we've had some times when there's been
20 two years or more, no funding for McLees. We've also had
21 funding for programs on the Buskin drop out and
22 fortunately the Fish and Game and then the local tribes
23 and folks have tried to find some way to work together
24 to compensate for some of that. But I don't think that
25 a new concept on what's happening in the ocean is going
26 to have anything to do with people being able to get
27 their traditional sockeye harvest from the Buskin and
28 from the McLees Lake. And I think in the last year
29 particularly on the Alaska Peninsula, we've talked about
30 the changes in the processing industry where King Cove,
31 their whole population has dropped from 1000 to less
32 than 300 people. And like I mentioned before, their
33 harvest comes from the commercial catch and the same for
34 the folks, Sand Point, False Pass.

35

36

MS. SENEAL: Council Member Holmes.

37

38

MR. HOLMES: I'm sorry.

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MS. SENEAL: I'm so sorry to interrupt,
if I may. We will -- we are going to get to a point in
this presentation where behind you on the board, there
are categories for talking about the strengths, the
weaknesses of this internal process and then the
opportunities and threats that present in the
environment, the container that holds. And I want to
capture all the information and I'm not able to capture
it right now. So, I'm going to continue to move forward.
This is a discussion to -- I just want you to -- what
we've done, we've read the mission, we're connecting to

1 the mission, we understand what the intent of the program
2 is. And there's always -- you know, there's tends to be
3 a gap between what we see on the landscape versus the
4 intent. And that is what I want to concentrate on. So,
5 I'm going to step out of presenter mode here and ask
6 this Council that if you could wave a magic wand. Would
7 you like.....

8

9 (Talking)

10

11 MS. SENEAL: Okay. Go back.

12

13 (Talking)

14

15 MS. SENEAL: Oh, it went away. Do I have
16 to be presenting for it to show up? I have to be
17 presenting for it to show. So, I can't type notes into
18 the PowerPoint and present it. All right. Member
19 Chernoff.

20

21 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah. Thank you. I just
22 wanted to note that what comes to my mind is that so
23 when it talks about monitoring projects that address the
24 highest priority subsistence fishery information needs.
25 Whose -- I just want to make a note like who's priority
26 subsistence fishery information needs are those because
27 we've addressed our high priorities at several meetings.
28 And we've also had discussions about why weren't our
29 priority needs that we identified addressed with the
30 projects that were awarded. And so, I guess what comes
31 to my mind is, you know, maybe to connect more to what
32 we are identifying as priority needs to those projects
33 that get awarded.

34

35 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Brett, go ahead.

36

37 MR. RICHARDSON: To take a stab at the
38 question you asked, what stands out? Alaska's massive.
39 Rural Alaska, many different areas with many different
40 priorities. So, you've probably got a ton of different
41 asks. Some of those priorities are probably going
42 against one another to some regard. Who gets their
43 priorities prioritized, you know, there's a lot of
44 complicated things involved here. So that's kind of what
45 stands out to me.

46

47 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. This
48 will be last call for comments on this.

49

50 (No comments)

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

All right. Thank you for backtracking on that, Anna. Go ahead.

MS. SENEAL: Yeah. Thank you all for your patience and trying something new. Okay. So here I was hopeful that I would be able to type into the screen in real time. I cannot and continue to present, so I'm going to type your responses here in the notes and then update the slide and show it back to you to confirm that I'm capturing what your intent is. So, this is -- we talked about the mission of the FRMP, the purpose of the FRMP as we have stated it. And I want you to imagine you could wave a magic wand. You have no constraints. In the future, you know that the FRMP is fulfilling its purpose. We're living up to our mission because I observe. What do you observe? So, there's a couple of sideboards here, five words or less. So, try to keep it short. And also, let's try to avoid the use of lack of. So, phrase it in the positive not -- I don't have a great example, but is that clear? Okay, so we are -- we're fulfilling our purpose because I observe.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Natasha.

MS. HAYDEN: Thanks, Madam Chair. Natasha Hayden. I'm just going to take a stab at this that I observe that OSM has permitting and reporting and tracking of fisheries activities, subsistence fisheries activities. I know that's more than five words reporting system -- a system for reporting -- permitting, reporting and tracking.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Brett. Go ahead.

MR. RICHARDSON: Communication and results.

MS. SENEAL: Can you be a little more specific? You have two more words.

MR. RICHARDSON: Effective communication and positive results.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: And you can add the word demonstrated if there's extra words there. Daniel.

MR. SMITH: Yeah. Thank you, Madam Chair. Tribal input and involvement.

00010

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Meaningful tribal
2 input and involvement?

3
4 MR. SMITH: Meaningful. Yes. Thank you.
5

6 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Use every one of
7 the five words. Sam.

8
9 MR. ROHRER: I'm not going to count my
10 words, but I know that the FRMP is fulfilling its purpose
11 because I observe ADF&G every cycle reporting on the
12 different programs they're doing that are funded by the
13 program. So (indiscernible).....

14
15 (Simultaneous speech)

16
17 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: You blew your work
18 (indiscernible).

19
20 MR. ROHRER: I was restating the
21 question, which is important. When answering a question,
22 always restate the question because ADF&G reports on how
23 they're using the funding for their programs.

24
25 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat.

26
27 MR. HOLMES: I think it's effective
28 because of listening to comments from our Council and
29 also from the local Fish and Game Advisory committees,
30 as well as other user groups. Oh, and if I could put a
31 tab on that also is the -- it's also been effective,
32 particularly more in recent years because of
33 interactions between the Councils, i.e. the KARAC and
34 the Bristol Bay Peninsula RAC.

35
36 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, I think I'd
37 like to capture effective engagement from RACs. And I
38 know you said five words or less, but the context is
39 that the RAC members understand what the process is,
40 what we're being asked to provide, and we're fully
41 engaged in providing it. And we're also engaged because
42 we see the process working. So, we will not be putting
43 complaints in our annual meeting reports every year. All
44 right. Any other comments?

45
46 (No comments)

47
48 Okay. That looks like it.

49
50

00011

1 MS. SENEAL: Okay. Anna Senecal. That's
2 great. Let me see what I can do here. Okay.

3
4 (Pause)

5
6 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Jeff, go ahead.

7
8 MR. WASLEY: Since we're waiting here,
9 just real quickly, we're not really seeing anything in
10 Cold Bay, so I'm not commenting, so thanks.

11
12 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: And that could also
13 be a comment. Like -- something about, you know, adequate
14 funding and projects across all the region. Because
15 right now we tend to fund the expensive weir projects
16 because that's a priority. But then there's no more money
17 left. All right. So, our comments have been captured and
18 summarized on the screen.

19
20 MS. SENEAL: Does everybody agree with
21 what's up here? So, this is capturing a desired future
22 state. The SWOT is going to capture our current state.
23 And the in-between is the gap, right. That's the area
24 for potential. So, we're looking for accurate permitting
25 reporting and tracking of subsistence resources uses,
26 harvest, effective communication and demonstrated
27 positive results, meaningful tribal input and
28 involvement, communication not only between OSM and the
29 RACs, but the project recipients. The managers on the
30 ground coming back to this body. The RACs, the ACs and
31 user group comments are listened to. There's interaction
32 between RACs. We work together. Effective engagement
33 from RACs. So, the RACs are engaged in the process.
34 Members understand the process and the asks of them. And
35 we see the process working. And then in addition, there
36 is adequate funding and projects distributed throughout
37 the region. Does that sound like a pretty perfect desired
38 future state? Okay.

39
40 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, I think the
41 two -- the last two you listed that weren't written down
42 were the two things that seem to be missing. I'll note
43 that a lot of these -- the future state points that are
44 listed, I think, really get to the frustration that I've
45 heard from this RAC over the years. And it's more about
46 us feeling like we're being heard, our priorities are
47 being listened to, and funding is awarded along with
48 those, and that we understand what's going on, which is
49 all very important. But obviously there needs to be money
50 to fund these projects and having the data in order to

1 provide the subsistence opportunity. But I think you
2 captured those two things in your last two comments. So
3 yeah, I think in my opinion, this captures what was said
4 today and also what I've heard over the years from RAC
5 discussion.

6
7 MS. SENEAL: Okay, so what are we
8 working with? So, shifting back to reality, current
9 reality. There are some legislative sideboards, and we
10 have some information to go on, but really, it's not a
11 lot. There is very little actual -- actually in
12 regulation that dictates the form and the function of
13 this program. As I'm sure you're well aware, we are
14 mandated to undertake research on subsistence uses
15 within jurisdiction and make those data available.
16 That's pretty much the long and the short of it. So
17 that's the what. But the how -- or that's the why, I
18 guess the what and the how is not codified in
19 legislation. The other piece that we work with is the
20 Federal Advisory Committee Act, and that governs how
21 your Council and other Councils operate. And there are
22 some real sideboards there that were restricted. So, in
23 previous efforts to include tribal members or RAC
24 members on the technical -- what's the R stand for? TRC
25 Resource? Review? Technical Review Committee. Thank
26 you. Without going through some -- a lot of hoops that
27 my understanding it's difficult to create new Advisory
28 Councils sometimes that's not available. And then all
29 the procedural requirements of advertising the meeting
30 making it publicly available. Everybody has to be in the
31 same room at the same time. So, all of those things
32 would come part and parcel.

33
34 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat, go ahead.

35
36 MR. HOLMES: Item number two, just from
37 a historical perspective, when this whole process began,
38 we used to have, whenever they had a Technical Review
39 Committee evaluating the request for funding, there was
40 a member from each of the RACs that was involved in that
41 decision at the meeting. So, they could go and say,
42 well, gee, Becky, what do your people feel about the
43 Buskin? And that has not existed. That was thrown out
44 because there was an interpretation that those folks
45 have retired long ago, but that would create a conflict
46 of interest of other people knowing how the decisions
47 were made and that sort of contradictory to its goal.
48 And so it would be, in my mind, really good if you went
49 back to having that one person from each Council to go
50 ahead and support the information that they're asking

1 for, so they can answer questions as to how important
2 it is and why they aren't necessarily the ones making
3 the decision, but that would avoid the perception of
4 conflict of interest. But it would allow to get
5 information to where the decision is made.

6
7 MS. SENEAL: This is Anna Senecal. I
8 don't have all of the history. I do know that at certain
9 times, tribal members and RAC members have sat on the
10 TRC, and then our solicitor's advice has informed us of
11 potential risk associated with that. Because it was a
12 violation of FACA. And so, any of the decisions made by
13 that body could be reversed or contested. Serving on the
14 TRC versus being an (distortion) advisor in the room.
15 Is there somebody who is trying to comment? No? So, I
16 guess, so your comments are captured. I have heard this,
17 I have also heard that it's not possible, but maybe
18 there's another question that we should be asking. And
19 that's honestly why we're here today.

20
21 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Anna, if you want
22 to proceed, please.

23
24 MS. SENEAL: Okay. So, the way the
25 process looks right now is, we're familiar with it takes
26 about a year from cradle to grave to issue a notice of
27 funding opportunity. Go through the evaluation process
28 and have the project begin on the ground. So, it's a
29 long process. The asks are high of the applicant of the
30 Review Committee Panel of the -- of OSM staff and
31 administrative processes. It goes all the way up to the
32 director and it always hinges on the availability of
33 budgets and the funding of the federal funding cycle.
34 So, the places where the Councils have had the most
35 impact really have been in setting the priority
36 information needs. That's within the current process,
37 the confines of the current process that is the nexus
38 that we have -- that we have found that gives the
39 Councils access to directing how the funds are
40 prioritized and where they will go. It's at the very
41 beginning of the process. It doesn't touch the other
42 parts of it. Once the TRC ranks and evaluates all of the
43 proposals, they come back to you as you know, and you
44 make comments, but that bullet is not starred. You'll
45 see in this slide, as an important step. The comments
46 are captured and they are important, but where the
47 process is really shaped by this body is at that step
48 one. And so, what I'm hearing is an ask to understand -
49 - is there somewhere in here where we can do better?
50 Where is there opportunity for additional touch points?

00014

1 So, before I advance past this slide, does anybody have
2 a comment from the RAC?

3

4 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat. Do you have
5 something? Go ahead.

6

7 MR. HOLMES: I'm sorry, I just get
8 emotional about this, but when we lost the funding for
9 McLees for two years, and it's one thing about being a
10 geezer, you kind of know a lot of people that were
11 involved in this process. And from what I understand,
12 when that process was being discussed on funding McLees
13 and this is all rumor and gossip, but the decision was
14 made not to fund it because they assumed that Fish and
15 Game had plenty of money and that they were going to be
16 having money to fund that weir and that was completely
17 fallacious. They didn't check through their
18 coordinators, the state federal coordinator, the
19 federal, you know, the two groups, they've got one person
20 on each side. It's supposed to be doing that. And so,
21 they just made that assumption. But that was at a time
22 when there were massive cuts in the department and
23 funding and so, it was an erroneous assumption. And there
24 should be some way where they're checking if you're going
25 to drop funding because you assume one agency is going
26 to do it. They really ought to know for sure, rather
27 than it being 1 or 2 people's opinions on the committee.

28

29 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Sam, go ahead.

30

31 MR. ROHRER: Thank you. Through the
32 Chair, I noticed the notice of funding opportunity
33 closes in February. You have your proposal analysis
34 February through May, and then your Technical Review
35 Committee reviews proposals. So that period between
36 February and May is that entire time --- the TRC is
37 reviewing or is it a narrower time? Is there is a
38 proposal analysis that's mentioned on there, is that
39 done by the that's done by the TRC, correct? Or is that
40 a separate analysis? And then I have a follow up
41 question.

42

43 MS. SENEAL: This is Anna Senecal. So,
44 there is an initial screening process for eligibility.
45 You know it has to address PINs. It has to be under
46 certain funding caps or all the technical boxes that
47 need to be checked. So that happens first and then
48 there's the Technical Review Committee process. And I
49 don't know how long that takes, people in the room do
50 very well.

1

2 MR. AYERS: Yeah. Thank you Scott Ayers
3 for the record. As part of this conversation, which I'm
4 really enjoying, by the way, and I really appreciate the
5 Council's asking for something like this and then
6 willing to participate in kind of working through this
7 because it's helpful for us. And as I hope it's also
8 helpful for you, but once, as Anna stated once, that
9 request for proposals closes and we have all the
10 proposals in the hand -- in hand. It's OSM staff,
11 particularly our grants management specialist, who then
12 evaluates or -- all of the proposal materials. And
13 effectively, she's combing through all the files and
14 she's making sure that the budgets that are listed here
15 match up with the budgets that are listed there, and
16 that there's no extraneous items or things of that
17 nature. And then there are a group of folks within OSM
18 on the fisheries team and the anthropology team that are
19 cross trained as what we call project officers. And they
20 go through and also provide some initial review of the
21 materials to help the grants management specialist on
22 that front. And they create effectively a package of
23 materials that's not cleaned but evaluated that goes to
24 the Technical Review Committee. The Technical Review
25 Committee then has some period of time. We absolutely
26 always try to give them as much time as possible to
27 review those materials because it's -- they're
28 volunteers, they're state and federal employees and that
29 are subject matter experts, and they come together over
30 the course of several days to have a meeting. And during
31 that meeting is when those projects are scored and kind
32 of ranked. I don't know if that answers the question
33 clearly.

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. ROHRER: No. That does. Thank you.
So, I -- yeah, so it sounds like the initial reviews
happened, but then the TRC is over a period of time.
They rank them all over. So, you asked -- the question
was where else could we insert some participation? And
obviously that would be the spot, it would seem to me.
You clearly said that we can't -- that we can't have a
RAC member sitting on the TRC, but why can't we have --
why couldn't each RAC set a representative to have some
period during that review where they could be available
to answer questions, or they could have ten minutes to
speak about priority needs in their community.
Obviously, you see those things because we've already
had a meeting on it. We've put together, you know we've
-- we're able to put on paper, but -- what our priority
needs are, but not in person. And sometimes things are

1 lost in translation. So having a spot right with that
2 committee is reviewing for RAC representative to just
3 speak about their needs, our -- the region's needs.

4
5 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: This is Rebecca. I
6 am looking at the NOFO right now. So, I'm involved in
7 reviewing and developing different grant -- federal
8 grant programs. And I do understand that the ability for
9 the RAC to develop our priority information needs, that
10 goes into the notice of funding opportunity or the NOFO.
11 That is a really powerful thing that should shape who's
12 applying for the grants. Which applicants are most
13 competitive. It gives direction. I mean, implicitly our
14 priorities give direction to applicants about what's
15 important. I think that is a really powerful step,
16 looking at the NOFO and how that's actually taken into
17 account in the review process. And I understand you're
18 not asking us to weigh in on the NOFO, but I think the
19 NOFO could be improved to actually give more weight to
20 the PINs in the section where the PINs are being
21 basically graded and given points. There's a lot of other
22 stuff in that section that is not obvious to me. Well,
23 how does this relate to the PINs that the RAC came up
24 with? I'm sure it does, but from a RAC member
25 perspective, having listened to the frustration of this
26 RAC feeling like there's something missing from when we
27 prioritize what we need and then what's coming out at
28 the other end. The NOFO really controls a lot. It
29 controls again, it says, here's what's going to be
30 prioritized, here's what's going to be funded,
31 basically. And it tells the applicants what's important
32 to us because you respond to what you're being graded
33 on. And like I said, I think the section where you're
34 being graded on how well you're addressing the PINs, it
35 has a lot of extra stuff. So, I would suggest that may
36 be something we can weigh in on or the program needs to
37 look at, or if people have thoughts on it. Because that
38 seems like a really good opportunity to improve this.
39 Also, the response to the PINs is given 20% weight along
40 with -- there's five criteria. So, does that make sense
41 that meeting the PIN is only 20%? Should it be more. I
42 mean these are opportunities. Coral, you had something.

43
44 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah. I was thinking back
45 on meetings that we have when we talk about these
46 proposals in front of us and it's kind of almost I could
47 see if we turned that into a more formal process where
48 this Advisory Board basically has a more formal
49 scorecard for those where it addresses the needs. Like
50 it attaches the needs for information for subsistence

1 in our area in which we have a lot of knowledge about
2 like McLees Lake perhaps, and Buskin here, where --
3 because I guess, you know, our comments get captured,
4 but also if we're not specifically grading in certain
5 areas I just feel like that would be a better process
6 if we actually had like essentially a graded scorecard
7 from our subsistence that went along with it, rather
8 than just having an open forum for comments in which we
9 do have the opportunity to miss some things that perhaps
10 are graded further on, and then we've missed that
11 opportunity to comment on that.

12
13 MS. SENEAL: Anna Senecal here, all of
14 these are really great points and I'm capturing them in
15 my notes there. Of course, in the transcript too. It's
16 a great segue to the next slide. So, there's very little
17 on the thou shalt do side of the chart. And there's a
18 lot in interpretation and so, there's flex there. So,
19 we've come up the NOFO is a great example. We've come
20 up with regional allocations. These are practices, these
21 are policies. This is how we do the business of meeting
22 our obligations under the statute. So, we have these
23 funding regions. We have project evaluation criteria.
24 So those are the, you know, 5%, 20 or 5 elements, 20%
25 across the board. Even split is how we've done it. Do
26 we have to continue doing it that way? There is a project
27 selection process that we've talked about and some of
28 those points are fixed firm and some of them may or may
29 not be. We've talked at length about PINs. What are
30 they? How are they developed? And I'm sure there's more
31 here than NOFO was a point that came up. And of course,
32 within the NOFO, there are things under different
33 elements of the CFR for financial assistance that in
34 contracting that we can't change. But diving into that
35 is an interesting idea.

36
37 This topic of PINs is where we have
38 focused on where it's a control point that is familiar
39 and we've done a lot here. So, I don't obviously expect
40 you to be able to read this. This is a journey through
41 your PINs since the inception of this project -- or of
42 this program in the early days, we went to tribal
43 communities from what I -- from reading reports. You
44 know, I've been here for about three months. So, this
45 is all from reading reports and collected input from the
46 communities on what was important. And we -- and there
47 was a lot of information gleaned there, which is good
48 and may make it difficult to focus. In 2006, let's see,
49 there was a strategic planning effort. So outside
50 contractors or facilitators were contracted by the

1 government, worked with our program through a
2 hierarchical decision making framework and like very
3 quantitatively ranked all the different ideas throughout
4 all of the regions, the priorities and then came up with
5 a subset of those for both on the anthropological side
6 or the social science side and the fisheries side that
7 were quote unquote, the most important. And this process
8 was very detailed. It was quite expensive. It was also
9 a bit controversial from my read in that it's assigning
10 quantitative value to issues of importance across
11 different people, resources and regions. So, you know,
12 there's a story there as well, but you can see how that
13 really focused the efforts worked through all the NOFO
14 spoke to the systematic prioritization of those PINs
15 moving through the years as one was addressed. It was
16 taken off the list, and they moved down the list in that
17 way. Of course, there are the perennial needs for that
18 continue, you know, weirs for in-season management, for
19 example. But those -- that plan was outlived by 2016.
20 And the PIN generation went -- development, went back -
21 - went to the RACs. So, RACs started from my
22 understanding, doing the process we have today starting
23 in 2016. And you can see the lists beginning to balloon
24 again because everything is important and things rarely
25 come off the list.

26
27 And there is -- so there is an
28 opportunity to perhaps consider prioritization focused
29 effort to distill the PINs that you truly want to speak
30 to in a given funding year, particularly when budgets
31 are tight. So that is kind of an overview of where we're
32 at, how the process works, the control points that we've
33 exercised to date, and you've already identified some
34 other places to potentially explore. The next part is
35 the actual SWOT. So, it's stepping through, filling out
36 each one of these boxes, these categories, and we'll
37 write them on the back wall too to understand really the
38 strengths and the weaknesses of the current program as
39 it is. So that's the internal system and then the
40 opportunities and threats facing us. So, these could be
41 things like environmental change.

42
43 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: I'm sorry, Anna, I
44 think we have a question.

45
46 MS. HAYDEN: Sorry, I -- thanks, Madam
47 Chair, this is Natasha. I'm sorry to interrupt. I just
48 wanted to go back to the last slide and more of a comment
49 or an observation when clearly this shows like you said,
50 it started to balloon back up 2016, 2026. And for me,

1 this is an example of how these are being categorized
2 as monitoring. You know, it's a monitoring plan --
3 program, whereas like fishing -- river system weirs are
4 part of a management program, not a -- I mean, it's
5 monitoring is what it's being referred to, but those
6 programs are needed for management, and they should
7 never fall off the list. Like you have to have the weirs.
8 And so, you know, I agree with the observation that, you
9 know, things rarely fall off the list because all of
10 these are priorities, but they're priorities because
11 they're required components for management and for, you
12 know, the program at large. So that's kind of like for
13 me, you know, the -- this tension between okay, well,
14 we need a weir in McLees. We need a weir in Buskin. You
15 know, we need -- like, that's not something that should
16 be up for, you know reapproval every couple of years
17 because we're looking at long term sustainability. And
18 meeting the subsistence needs of subsistence users and
19 without them, it's not possible. So, I just wanted to
20 highlight that. Thanks.

21
22 MS. SENEAL: Thank you. And -- so Anna
23 Senecal, I'm hopeful that we'll definitely capture that
24 idea here as well. I've taken notes in the previous
25 slide. So, strengths and weaknesses of the existing
26 system. What do we do well? What does it not do so well
27 at? And then opportunities and threats. So that's
28 external to the system itself. So, you can -- thinking
29 about the external environment, thinking about the
30 federal -- political or funding environment, those are
31 examples of outside the box. So, inside the box is the
32 FRMP itself, how it functions, the current process
33 outside the box is everything else environmentally and
34 socially. Is that clear? Does anybody have questions on
35 the SWOT process?

36
37 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat, do you have a
38 question on the SWOT process?

39
40 MR. HOLMES: Not particularly. I'd like
41 to come back to where we were commenting before, but I
42 can do that at the end. I thought the last three comments
43 are related to this whole topic were spot on. And so
44 when we finish, if we could get that copy of the
45 transcripts, I'd love to read it again because I couldn't
46 absorb it all, but it was really, really important. Thank
47 you.

48
49 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Thank you.
50 Yeah, I think as we start into the SWOT process, if it's

00020

1 not completely clear, I think it'll help clarify things.

2

3 MS. SENEAL: Okay, great. So, we're
4 going to have Leigh with a marker at the back. So at
5 least if you are able to turn around, you can see your
6 comments in real time. And then I will do what I did
7 previously and taking notes and then updating the slides
8 and then showing them back to you. So, starting out with
9 the strengths. So, these are things that the program is
10 doing well, currently helpful to achieve the objectives.
11 So that would be the mission, and it is internal in
12 origin. So, within the current system. So, what are we
13 doing well? And similarly, if we could keep the responses
14 brief a few words and framed in the positive. So, no
15 lack of.

16

17 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. And I think
18 it's okay if you need to take more words to get the idea
19 out, we can figure out how to make it shorter. Jeff.

20

21 MR. WASLEY: I think one of the strengths
22 is that they are listening to the RACs at least. Even
23 if we can't do everything, they at least listen to us.
24 Thank you.

25

26 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Pat.

27

28 MR. HOLMES: I think that's a
29 particularly strong point. And I think the fact that you
30 are asking these questions is really darn important.
31 This is the first time this has happened since the whole
32 program started. And so that is splendid that you're
33 asking these questions now. How can we make it better?
34 It's wonderful.

35

36 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Natasha.

37

38 MS. HAYDEN: Thanks, Madam Chair.
39 Natasha. I think that a strength is the resources of the
40 individuals having the institutional knowledge and
41 understanding of the system that we -- I don't know how
42 to say that very shortly that very informed, educated
43 support.

44

45 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So, are you talking
46 about the agency side?

47

48 MS. HAYDEN: The agency side. Yeah. That
49 we continually are like, well, what about this? And
50 somebody comes to the mic, and they tell us exactly what

00021

1 about that? Or they say, okay, well, I may not know
2 about that, but I'm going to find out about that or that
3 actually doesn't exist or, you know, people who are very
4 knowledgeable about what it is that we're here to do to
5 support us. I think that is the strength.

6
7 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. And this may
8 be implied, but to me, the other side of that is the
9 listening to the RACs is the local knowledge. So, we
10 have the institutional knowledge on the agency side and
11 we have the local knowledge on the RAC side. Coral.

12
13 MS. CHERNOFF: And I think kind of to
14 respond on that too. It's like there seems to be the
15 support and response, where like OSM is responding where
16 they can and they're supporting us in what we want.

17
18 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: I think a strength
19 is the passion and personal commitment, and I would apply
20 that to both RACs and agencies. Natasha.

21
22 MS. HAYDEN: The awareness that the --
23 the importance of variety of communities, participation
24 in the RAC and RAC -- the meetings held in regional or
25 rural community, you know, the awareness that it is
26 critical to have rural participation and rural meeting
27 locations.

28
29 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Are
30 there any other comments? And then Anna does that -- do
31 you think that covers it or do you want us to keep going
32 on this one?

33
34 MS. SENEAL: Oh, this is your show. If
35 those are your strengths, those are our strengths. Looks
36 like remember Richards.

37
38 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Oh, Brett. Go
39 ahead.

40
41 MR. RICHARDSON: Brett Richardson just
42 focusing on the same goal. So, we're all goal oriented.
43 Everybody involved in the process is shooting towards
44 the single goal of providing opportunity for subsistence
45 users, and that's a good thing.

46
47 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. And then the
48 note on that, I guess, kind of what I heard was that the
49 FRMP program allows a bunch of different people to focus
50 on a goal. So, it's not that we all come to the table

00022

1 being goal oriented, but the program allows the
2 structure that focuses all of our passion and energy
3 toward a common goal. All right. Any final comments on
4 this one?

5

6

(No comments)

7

8

Okay. Not seeing any other comments.

9

10

11

MS. SENEAL: Okay, fantastic. So, moving
on to weaknesses. So, weaknesses of the current system.
And this is where it gets tougher to not use lack of.

12

13

14

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: I think
opportunities will come later.

MR. HOLMES: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So, let's keep this
on weaknesses. Coral, go ahead.

MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah, I would just like
to say Pat did mention follow-through. And so, I guess
I would like to add that.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: I guess, Pat, I did
have -- I didn't quite catch, did you -- is listening
to both sides the weakness or I don't -- what was the
connection between communication being a weakness and
listening to both sides?

MR. HOLMES: It's just not often.
Sometimes it seems like the points that we've raised
don't -- nobody answers it. They just ignore them. But
one of the things I wanted to say that would be a
supplement from weaknesses that has been lost that I've

1 noticed has been improved, is having some photographs
2 or some ways that up until just this last meeting, people
3 can understand and see what it looks like. Having some
4 photographs of the streams in Unalaska to see how small
5 they are. That is fantastic because then it shows what
6 we've been trying to communicate on things. And so that's
7 why we need to have a little more pictorial information
8 so people can see what the point is and what the
9 geographic problems are with the point that's being
10 discussed.

11
12 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So, we really can't
13 use the word lack of.

14
15 MR. HOLMES: A need for more
16 photographic or visual information about the topic and
17 the location.

18
19 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, sorry,
20 because I was going to say I think I'll use the word
21 lack. We can rephrase it, but the lack of understanding
22 of the areas where we live. So, we live in our areas,
23 we are familiar with them, we know what is there, what
24 the challenges are, what the conditions are. That
25 doesn't always translate to people who live in Anchorage
26 or Washington, D.C., they just -- they don't get it.
27 They're not familiar with it. You could use a paragraph
28 of words to try to describe it and until they go there
29 and see it, they're not going to get it. So, kind of
30 goes with the importance of the visual aids. It's --
31 we're in a unique environment. I mean, yesterday there
32 was a lot of discussion about people who had just
33 traveled to the Lower 48 and came back and had this
34 realization like, oh, wow, like, look what I have here.
35 So, it's that, I mean, if people haven't been to our
36 areas, they're not going to get it. Sam, I did see you,
37 but I wanted to put bureaucracy and disconnects as
38 weaknesses. Sam, go ahead. Disconnects.

39
40 MR. ROHRER: Thanks. It's easy to point
41 the finger at everyone else, so I'll point the finger back
42 at us. On the list of priorities up there, as you looked
43 back in 2002, we had 31 priorities. That -- a list of 31
44 priorities isn't priorities. That's just a wish list. In
45 '26 we had ten priorities. I would say ten priorities is
46 still not ten priorities. That's a wish list. So maybe we
47 need to do a better job of focusing down the -- these are
48 our three priorities. These are our four priorities. So,
49 the RAC could do a better job of coming up with a smaller
50 list. Core priorities for our region.

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, Natasha.

MS. HAYDEN: Thanks, Madam Chair. What I just want to circle back to what I was saying earlier about monitoring projects. Monitoring -- yeah, projects that are really management projects. So, weirs and those kinds of things. And you know, I just had a little light bulb that, while Sam was talking that if we have to focus, then we're only going to be asking for weirs for like we're not going to be asking for any other monitoring projects because those are the priorities, right. So that, and then the other one is, and I don't know if this is a weakness or a threat, but staff turnover within agencies, which is you know, you guys are really doing an amazing job, but I mean, we've got some significant -- and this is not just in this agency, but you know, across -- I think you could probably say Council turnover as well. When is -- we have Council members that leave or are on the Council long enough to just get up to speed and then they're not able to continue for whatever reason. So, I think that is also a weakness.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. And maybe the flip side is we got Anna who's new and we got this fabulous process. So, yay. Yeah, yeah. Jeff, go ahead and Pat, can you hit your mic button, please. Thank you.

MR. WASLEY: I just add to what you said just like bureaucracy, just the slow, kind of sluggish, long, long-term deal that just to get things going. And sometimes these resources react like now we have an emergency, and it just takes a while. So, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. Maybe like slow and not non-responsive, but yeah. Because the environmental conditions and the status of the stocks we're talking about are changing way, way faster than these -- whatever you want to call the FRMP funding process or management process or funding for management or research. All right. Are there any more weakness comments?

(No comments)

I guess -- and these are all internal weaknesses. Yes. I think I would put funding allocation on there. All right. I'm not seeing any more hands.

1 MS. SENEAL: Stepping forward. So now
2 we're looking outside, like off of our desk and around
3 the room. So, what is the environment we're working in
4 and what are the threats? And you've already identified
5 that there's some bleed-over from previous. So, we had
6 like staff turnover. Oh yeah. We're out of order. Staff
7 turnover was one. Probably bureaucracy and the funding
8 allocation and what else?

9
10 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: I think funding in
11 general. So, funding allocation to me is how it's divided
12 up. But external threat is just how much funding there
13 is to go into the program. Natasha.

14
15 MS. HAYDEN: The political climate.

16
17 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: And then actual
18 climate changes. Fast changing actual climate.

19
20 MS. SENEAL: This is Anna Senecal. I
21 heard previously from Member Holmes a comment on the
22 communication breakdown between external agencies. I
23 think that's something I'd like to capture.

24
25 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Natasha, go ahead.

26
27 MS. HAYDEN: I just got a question. Would
28 jurisdictional constraints be considered a threat like
29 Pat was talking earlier about what was happening in the
30 ocean is outside of the jurisdiction of what the waters
31 on the land. I don't know if that would be considered
32 that.

33
34 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Are
35 there any final comments on external threats to the
36 program?

37
38 (No comments)

39
40 All right. I'm not seeing any other
41 comments. Sorry, Natasha.

42
43 MS. HAYDEN: That's okay. I think a
44 general lack of understanding by just the community of
45 the system and why it is and what it does. I mean, I
46 think that there are not very many people who fully
47 understand the difference between the Federal
48 Subsistence Board, the RAC, the ADF&G, the Advisory
49 Committee, the North Pacific, you know, like, I mean,
50 there's all these different. And most people I talk to,

1 their eyes glaze over when I start to talk about it. So,
2 I think that it's just because it's so complicated that
3 most people don't really have a really good
4 understanding.

5
6 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Any last comment?
7 Last comments on external threats?

8
9 (No comments)

10
11 Okay. I'm not seeing any.

12
13 MS. SENEAL: Okay, and opportunities.

14
15 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Daniel.

16
17 MR. SMITH: Yeah. Thank you, Madam Chair.
18 This is Daniel Smith. I don't know how to condense this,
19 but it kind of goes off of what Coral was saying earlier.
20 In terms of, you know, the strengths are incorporating
21 local knowledge and institutional knowledge. And in the
22 review of the FRMPs when they come forward before the
23 Council you know, I think an opportunity would be to
24 incorporate more of that local knowledge by not having,
25 let's say the TRC or the Technical Review Committee
26 justification in front of the RAC. And then they could
27 incorporate their own edits and then the TRC could
28 include that justification, let's say, at a later date
29 or even at the same meeting. So that, you know, there
30 is a potential where that justification there could be,
31 you know some thoughts that could bring up that that's
32 more institutional knowledge based rather than local
33 knowledge. And so maybe another like step in the process
34 where the RACs could you know develop their own thoughts
35 without that TRC justification in front of them. And
36 then that later process, that justification can be in
37 front of them. And then their thoughts could also come
38 from that, I guess another opportunity to incorporate
39 local knowledge without the justification in front of
40 them.

41
42 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. So, I'll
43 throw more words on this particular point, and then maybe
44 we'll figure out what we're trying to say. The review
45 process that the RAC did for these proposals was very
46 awkward last meeting. I -- was not clear to me what we
47 were being asked to evaluate. Were we evaluating the
48 Technical Review Committee comments? Were we evaluating
49 proposals that we in fact had not read? We didn't know
50 how the proposals were ranked. It was very unclear. So,

1 if I had to phrase this as an opportunity, I do think
2 Daniel's point about is there a different place or an
3 additional place for RAC review of proposals, but also
4 it needs to be more clear if we are reviewing -- so, I
5 get we have a very strong role with PINs. But if we are
6 reviewing proposals later in the process, what are we
7 being asked to review? And if literally all we're being
8 asked to review is how well does this proposal fit with
9 our PINs but we cannot read the application, that again
10 seems very awkward and not very effective. So, I do
11 think -- based on my experience with this rack and the
12 frustration with FRMP, I do think some extra layer,
13 opportunity for RAC review would be helpful. Because the
14 way it has worked since I've been on this Council, it
15 is not effective and it generates frustration. It
16 generates confusion. And yeah, I did not at all like the
17 review process that we had last meeting. Yeah. So, I
18 think you've already put that. Yep. Sorry. Brett, go
19 ahead.

20

21 MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you. I'd say
22 there's an opportunity for public engagement and public
23 education.

24

25 MS. SENEAL: Can you say more about
26 that?

27

28 MR. RICHARDSON: So, soliciting feedback
29 from the public and right or wrong, educating the public
30 on the process we go through, successful or not. For
31 example, with the weir funding, supposedly, you know,
32 we put our PINs out there and then didn't receive any
33 information. Nobody in the public in Unalaska knew there
34 was not going to be a weir, just didn't show up. And
35 everybody was kind of looking around at each other. What
36 happened? Nobody knew anything. So, the opportunity for
37 better communication would lead to another opportunity
38 to engage the public and educate them on the process of
39 how this body works and the results that can come from
40 it in a positive way.

41

42 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat, go ahead.

43

44 MR. HOLMES: Well, I think this whole
45 process we're going through today, I would like to
46 personally thank the folks at OSM that decided to raise
47 this question. Outline this whole process and try to
48 find a way. How can we do better? I think that is
49 fantastic. I think the opportunity on communications, I
50 know myself, I fall down, I try to call different folks

1 I know in the villages and whatnot. But it's easy to
2 trip up and make a mistake. I think one thing that would
3 help a lot would -- we have, you know, sort of this, you
4 can call this number, and I forgot on some of my contacts
5 to have the sign in number. If we had a, you know, a set
6 process where we have identified all the tribes, the
7 communities that we're representing, I mean, each one
8 of us should be calling our acquaintances. And for me,
9 a lot of my older friends are dying off. But if we had
10 a way to get this information out to all of the places
11 that are involved in the process, just have a list of
12 Kodiak area Native, Shungnak, whatever the Q Tribe. But
13 have it down, o it's all part of the process so that
14 when this meetings are being announced, people can
15 access in a more reasonable way rather than to rely on
16 a stupid old geezer like me telling them. Each one of
17 us should have that in relation to our communities and
18 the folks who represent. So, this is an opportunity now,
19 once we have this put together of being able to
20 distribute the information in a much more accessible way
21 for everyone in our region, and I think that would help
22 a lot. It's just a great opportunity. I just have to
23 salute the folks that decided to bring us up and try to
24 answer our frustrations that we've had in the past. Thank
25 you.

26
27 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. And Anna
28 can smack me if I'm not supposed to say this, but so
29 this process right now is on FRMP. I've heard a couple
30 of comments that were, I mean, definitely were more
31 federal subsistence program, and I'm sure everyone in
32 the room is noting down all those comments. But this
33 process, again, the focus of it is the FRMP funding or
34 grant program. But yes, great points. Sam, go ahead.

35
36 MR. ROHRER: One of the opportunities I
37 see is with the move of the program from Fish and
38 Wildlife Service to the Secretary's Office. With that
39 move came a promise of more visibility for the program
40 better standing for the program. And I interpret that
41 as i.e. money. So, more funding for the program. That
42 might take some work on our part, but in theory, we
43 should have better standing within Department of
44 Interior to ask for more funding for these programs.

45
46 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Did you have more
47 or...? Because I have a question. Will you think about
48 your question? The section ANILCA you showed said
49 research for fisheries and wildlife is, why is there
50 only a Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program and not a

1 wildlife monitoring program? And could there be a
2 wildlife monitoring program? Or can we just write that
3 down? I'm not even going to ask. Please write down under
4 opportunities, wildlife monitoring program.

5

6 MR. ROHRER: I was going to ask when we
7 were going to have our WRPM discussion, so.

8

9 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat.

10

11 MR. HOLMES: I'm wondering you know
12 Natasha and Coral raised the points on you know, weirs
13 being a monitoring program. But also, part of this is
14 we are made aware of situations within some communities
15 within each of our region. But you need also to have
16 regular funding for the subsistence surveys so that
17 you're seeing, well, the factual background in relation
18 to the points that are concerned about. I'm sorry if I
19 can't phrase that right but that's -- use -- utilization,
20 those surveys that are done sometimes ten years between
21 them. And I don't know that -- I wouldn't like to see
22 that distract from keeping the weirs in or monitoring
23 the ones or counting whatever. But that should be
24 something, opportunity going off of Sam's thing. On
25 addressing how this program could be improved overall
26 would be to have the subsistence utilization as a regular
27 point of valuation or surveys or something. Sorry, I
28 can't phrase it correctly. Precisely.

29

30 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, I have one
31 and then I'll call on Natasha. But I just forgot my
32 point. Natasha.

33

34 MS. HAYDEN: Thank you. I do want to --
35 I'll just go back to where I had said that a weakness
36 was turnover and staff. And that is an opportunity when
37 we have new staff to bring in their strengths. But then
38 another opportunity is that the federal subsistence or
39 the rural subsistence preference presents an opportunity
40 for the development of fish and wildlife management
41 systems on federal lands and waters versus what it is
42 now and limited to restrictions in circumstances of
43 scarcity. So, opportunities for the development of
44 robust fish and wildlife management on federal lands and
45 waters.

46

47 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Mine was to
48 revise the NOFO to improve prioritization of local needs
49 in the process. All right. Do we have any more comments
50 on opportunities?

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 comments)

I guess this can go under opportunities. There is an opportunity to have statewide projects, but to my knowledge there hasn't ever been one. So, what happens is the way the funding is allocated, it gets allocated across all these regions. So, you end up with smaller and smaller pools of money. Whereas if we had a state -- if everyone agreed, which may be impossible on a statewide project, you could have a much bigger pool of funding to go toward a project that may be more impactful overall, as opposed to the kinds of stuff we can fund once you break it into the little buckets. All right. Are there any final comments on opportunities?

(No comments)

All right. I'm not seeing any.

MS. SENEAL: I just want to comment that your opportunities bucket is real big. And I think that's encouraging. Normally it's the weaknesses. People like to really hammer on the weaknesses. So that's just from kind of an outsider's viewpoint, it speaks to the optimism and the forward looking of this group. And that's cool. So, we are already a half an hour more, this was a rich conversation. That's great. So, I'm wondering if we would like to take a break. When we return, there's four sets of questions. Just to look at our SWOT and think about on four different levels. So, what do you see? What's your reaction to it? Are there interpretations and what do we want to do? So, this is up to you, Madam Chair, but maybe a little bio break chat amongst yourselves. Think about that framework and then we can come back and document all those things.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes, let's take a ten-minute break, come back at 10:40. And I will consult with Leigh about scheduling for the rest of the day. Thanks.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. We are ready to continue with this process. Oh, before we start, I forgot to give some announcements about the next couple of hours. We do have chili here in the room. Leigh

00031

1 brought chili and fixings. We -- the idea is we'll go
2 ahead and eat here. We have to be over at the aquarium
3 building at 12:15. So, vehicles will leave from
4 downstairs. Probably around two -- or 12:05-ish. So
5 that's a little over an hour to finish this process and
6 then eat something and then head over to the aquarium
7 building. All right. I think we're ready to resume.

8
9 MS. SENEAL: Okay. Thank you, Madam
10 Chair, Council Members. For the record, Anna Senecal,
11 Fisheries Biologist, OSM. So, for folks in the room,
12 we're referencing what I consider to be our data. So,
13 all the data on the current system, you talked about a
14 desired future state. So, hold on to that too. You can
15 see that in the room. Unfortunately for folks online you
16 don't have that to harken back to but follow along with
17 us. So, what we're doing right now is we're stepping
18 through a series of high-level questions to kind of
19 analyze the data. So, it's sort of the analysis piece.
20 So, without overthinking it too much kind of shooting
21 from the hip. Trust your gut looking at your SWOT. So
22 same thing I asked you about our mission statement. So,
23 what catches your attention? So just what -- describe
24 what you see. What is the situation? Summarize it. What
25 are we looking at? You can speak to the gap. You can
26 speak to the SWOT. Anything goes.

27
28 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: This is Rebecca.
29 I'll throw something out there. So just visually looking
30 at the whiteboard wall, which, by the way, I've been
31 waiting all week to use we have -- and you already spoke
32 to the fact that we list -- like when you typed up your
33 slide, there were more opportunities than threats. But
34 visually, we do have more written down in the strengths
35 column and the opportunities column as opposed to the
36 weaknesses and threats. And I -- that's noteworthy to
37 me because I do think it is easier sometimes to point
38 out what's wrong, what's not working, what's hard. And
39 the fact that we were able to identify a lot of strengths
40 that already exist within the system and then
41 opportunities that we see possible from where we are
42 now. So that -- a positive statement that jumps out to
43 me. Jeff, go ahead.

44
45 MR. WASLEY: Jeff Wasley. I think
46 overall, like we have a lot of knowledge, and I think
47 the big overall thing is lack of funding. So, speaking
48 to what Sam said is like, maybe we lean it down to our
49 most important things and push really hard for that and
50 at least try to do something. So just in a nutshell,

1 like I think there's a lot of resources within our RAC
2 and other folks helping us out. And if we can narrow our
3 focus and put all of our energy into the very most
4 important things, I think would be beneficial. Thank
5 you.

6

7

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat, go ahead.

8

9

10 MR. HOLMES: I think that this whole
11 process is fantastic, because it's the first time in 25
12 years that I know of that we've actually sat down and
13 addressed the difficulties we have as a advisory group.
14 And I think those are really fantastic. And my hat's off
15 to all the OSM folks that decided to do this, but what
16 it'll still come down to is the most important thing in
17 our region is salmon to eat. And how do you know if
18 there's enough salmon to go? So, monitoring the weirs
19 are still going to be, in my mind, are two priorities
20 for our organization to have. And I see that once we
21 have this summary done and look at the brief summary of
22 our meetings is this will allow us to communicate with
23 our folks that we're working for, folks in the villages,
24 people in town, tribal non-tribal on subsistence, and
25 how we're trying to assure that we can continue what
26 traditionally has been done in our community. So, this
27 exercise we've done today is fantastic.

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. And I
-- I mean, I think most of the credit goes to Anna. I
think my understanding is from what I heard, this was
her suggestion and her idea and she put it together. And
I mean, she did ask me, hey, would RAC be open to this?
And I was like, sounds great. Let's do it. But yeah, I
agree. I think this has been good and I think it's
something that's really necessary if the point of the
FRMP program is to meet the needs of the communities,
the subsistence communities, I think that processes like
these with the RACs is really an important component.
Coral, go ahead.

MS. CHERNOFF: I guess one thing that
does stand out to me is the FRMP, this process -- the
people who are applying for grants, I guess Rebecca had
kind of touched on it like before where we saw like a
summary of maybe some of the projects, but we didn't
have the full application. So I guess that brings to
mind here up here too, like, I don't know if we can go
back to this, but adding where we get a face to face,
you know, and the people who put in for grant money get
to come before the RACs wherever these are being reviewed

1 because we're reviewing something that's not -- that's
2 kind of disconnected, you know, it's the summary of OSM
3 brought to us, but we don't know what's in it. And so,
4 we're reviewing something that we're not even looking
5 at fully. But I guess what I want to say is, is there
6 any sort of review process for people -- the people who
7 are applying for this money? Like I think that might be
8 a good part of the opportunities, is for people to find
9 out how -- I don't know if there's an opportunity to
10 know how their information is reviewed. How it fits into
11 the program? Why they didn't get funded? You know, things
12 like that, how the RAC responded to it. So, I guess I
13 feel like what we haven't run over is actual contact
14 with the people who are applying for funding, and then
15 they're kind of disconnect with us.

16
17 MS. SENEAL: Anna Senecal. So, Leigh is
18 adding that information to the opportunities portion of
19 the SWOT. So, we're trying to capture all this, all
20 these data points. Is the group ready -- so this first
21 set of questions is really about -- just a structured
22 way to connect with the data on the board. So just
23 looking at it, actively thinking about it, engaging with
24 it. The next set of questions, if we're ready to advance,
25 is more experiential. So how do you -- I know this is
26 touchy feely. How do you feel? How does looking at this
27 Board make you feel? What is your reaction to this? Are
28 you surprised by something? We are like the inclination
29 is to go straight to action. But I'm trying to slow us
30 down a little bit, so let's look at it first. Let's
31 think about how we feel in our bodies. What's weird,
32 what's cool, what's challenging about this board?

33
34 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Brett, go ahead.

35
36 MR. RICHARDSON: Brett Richardson. I
37 think it's the kind of opposite of touchy feely. It's
38 actually quantifying the information that we kind of
39 asked for. Throwing it back on ourselves. We have
40 expressed frustration and one of the best ways to resolve
41 that would be to point by point, go over the issues,
42 opportunities, the SWOT process. It's a good first step,
43 I think.

44
45 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, this is
46 Rebecca. I yeah, I guess I do feel a little surprised
47 and very proud. I mean this wasn't a process that the
48 RAC specifically discussed and said, yes, let's do a
49 SWOT analysis of the FRMP program. So, this kind of got
50 sprung on the group without a lot of preparation or buy-

00034

1 in to what was going to happen just because, I mean,
2 this came up in the last couple weeks. So given that I
3 am really like impressed and proud that we have engaged
4 so well in this process, and I think produced a lot of
5 good data that's up on the wall. And I think it's
6 productive data and the discussion has been productive
7 and that people have been very thoughtful in their
8 comments. That's it. Coral, go ahead.
9

10 MS. CHERNOFF: I guess when I look at
11 this, what -- I think of the challenge of where do we
12 go from here? You know, I've been through quite a few
13 of these sorts of things that turn up no action. And I
14 think although we haven't -- we've gone through this; I
15 would like to see the next step go, okay, on the
16 opportunities. And looking at the strengths and
17 weaknesses have our priority, like come up with
18 actionable items that we can improve on. But I think I'm
19 feeling like we've come up with this and then again,
20 this goes away and then someone else perhaps decides
21 what changes get made or what changes don't get made. I
22 guess, yeah, yhat's my thoughts. Really the challenges,
23 what comes after this? Or did we just spend an hour or
24 two just coming up with these lists?
25

26 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Any
27 other comments? Pat, go ahead.
28

29 MR. HOLMES: Well, I think having done
30 this, this identifies the things. And I think that we
31 will see because majority of the staff has only been on
32 a few years now. We've got a new dynamic fish person
33 that raised this whole concept of how do we improve
34 communications. So obviously, that's going to go back
35 to the OSM headquarters or wherever it is. I don't know
36 what agencies, but at least we have identified things
37 for them and saying, well, hey, here's what we need to
38 have happen. And so, I think that will greatly enhance
39 our communications with the decision makers. And I think
40 this is something that I wish we had done 20 or 30 years
41 ago, but I think this is answering the questions and our
42 frustrations and the letters that Becky has put together
43 summarizing our thoughts. And so, I think that this is
44 a really, really, really good step forward. And so, I
45 think that in our minutes that we should note the really
46 positive aspects of doing this and thank the OSM staff
47 that facilitated it for us.
48

49 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, and building
50 on that, I guess this is not a surprise or a challenge,

1 but I'm looking at the wall where all of this data is
2 written down, and it's also being typed up and reflecting
3 that in the kind of process we are in, if it's not
4 documented, then it's almost like it didn't happen and
5 nobody looks at it and you can't come back later to look
6 at it or see if there was action from something that was
7 documented. So just the value and importance of going
8 through this process, getting the data out, documenting
9 it on the wall, documenting it on the meeting record is
10 really important. The other thing I will note is the
11 value and importance of doing this with all of the RAC
12 members. So, I have the strategic planning document
13 open. I think it was 2006. I'm not going to try to switch
14 pages, but I'm looking at the list of participants. And
15 out of 15 participants, there were only 3 RAC members
16 that participated. So, you think you have the strategic
17 planning process on the FRMP. Only 3 RAC members out of
18 15 total people who were participating. That's a -- my
19 reaction to that is that's a pretty poor percentage. So,
20 I think this process today that really focuses on RAC
21 member input and feedback and engagement is really
22 valuable, and I realize it's not really what the question
23 was. So, all right. Are there any other responses to the
24 questions that are up on the screen right now? Natasha,
25 go ahead.

26
27 MS. HAYDEN: Thank you. I -- similar to
28 your comments, I think that it has been really positive
29 to have all of the participation in the process from
30 around the table that people are not, you know, just
31 sitting and holding back and not engaging. And I think
32 that that is very valuable and it wouldn't be as strong
33 if people decided to do that. So, I think that that's
34 quite remarkable.

35
36 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Any
37 final comments? Pat, go ahead.

38
39 MR. HOLMES: I think that, you know, this
40 -- our summary of our meeting and minutes will be going
41 uphill with OSM, but I think also it'll be important
42 that the state agencies also understand this. And I think
43 it also behooves us as individuals at various political
44 levels to mention this to people that are responsible
45 for getting funding to OSM or wherever it's going to let
46 them know how this is going to be a positive improvement
47 for our rural folks in a big way.

48
49 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. I'm not
50 seeing any more hands. We want to move on to the next

1 question.

2

3 MS. SENEAL: And we are in action-
4 oriented group. I promise we'll get there, I promise. I
5 know I'm slowing you down. Okay. Here is before -- one
6 more step before we get to actions. What seemed to be
7 the key issues? What are we compelled to consider? So,
8 we've -- you've already gone to some interpretation
9 around communication, working together, process, adding
10 review steps. So those are all kind of this interpretive
11 level analysis. Does anybody want to speak further to
12 that?

13

14 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Natasha.

15

16 MS. HAYDEN: Thank you. I think one of
17 the key issues is that inability because of the FACA for
18 RAC members to be on that. Is it the TRC? That seems to
19 be a key issue And I -- what I heard earlier was, you
20 know, maybe we could have one of our -- one RAC member
21 from each region do -- have like an unofficial
22 opportunity to read the applications or read to --
23 anyways, that is a key -- I think that's a key issue.

24

25 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat.

26

27 MR. HOLMES: To continue doing what is
28 positive and are having our pre FRMP meeting with Bristol
29 Bay RAC. I think those communications are really
30 important to continue. And so, I think that will be
31 good. And I think the improved communications with the
32 various bureaucracies is going to be a real positive
33 spin off from this.

34

35 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Any other
36 comments?

37

38 (No comments)

39

40 Okay. Yep. Go ahead, Pat.

41

42 MR. HOLMES: This was on spinning off of
43 Natasha's thing of having a presence of a Council person
44 when they're doing this evaluation. I don't think --
45 maybe originally the objections of the bureaucracy were
46 that it would be a conflict of interest of having a RAC
47 member vote. I don't think that that's an important thing
48 of voting presence. It's just a informational or
49 communication things where, as Natasha was saying, where
50 whoever went could answer some questions. Hold up a

00037

1 photograph of McLees Lake or wherever and just to provide
2 enhancement for the positions that we're trying to make.
3 And so that could be the role of having that
4 representative there, not necessarily being a voting
5 member, but just having a presence from our Council
6 during the process.

7

8 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Any
9 final comments?

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 Okay.

14

15 MS. SENEAL: All right. You made it.
16 Here we are. So, what are we -- again, I made no
17 promises. But are there things we're interested in
18 following up on? What could that look like? Is there
19 something you want other RACs to know, or you want to
20 know from them? What are -- so, assume that none of us
21 OSM folks were in the room like, what are the big rocks?
22 What are the high points you want us to take away from
23 this time?

24

25 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: This is Rebecca. I
26 am very interested in -- I'm going to go home and print
27 out the NOFO and get my red pen out and make notes on
28 it. Because like I said, the notice of funding
29 opportunity is key to any grant program because it tells
30 you what your projects are supposed to be about. It
31 tells you how your applications will be graded,
32 evaluated, reviewed and scored. It tells you what is
33 important to the grant program. And like I said, I do
34 see opportunities, and I think there is a lot that can
35 be changed in the NOFO, because it's not a federal law
36 that you can't change. But I think there's a lot of
37 opportunity there to get at some of what's up on the
38 wall right now. Pat, go ahead.

39

40 MR. HOLMES: I think what we want other
41 folks to know is once we have this table down, it's to
42 simply share that with the other RACs. Here's what we
43 went through in our discussions. Does this relate to
44 you? And I think it probably does. And just taking we
45 have up on the wall and sending it to the other Councils,
46 particularly to the Bristol Bay folks up there, because
47 knowing there are several of their Chairman, I think
48 they would be quite excited to see what we've discussed
49 and identified. And I think that would be a really,
50 really good way to spread the thought process.

1
2 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Additional
3 comments. Natasha.

4
5 MS. HAYDEN: Thank you. Follow up on
6 wildlife monitoring program that doesn't exist right
7 now.

8
9 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Any additional
10 comments?

11
12 (No comments)

13
14 So, one thing that I'll note is there
15 something you want other RACs to know or want to hear
16 from other RACs on? I think the concept of having a
17 statewide FRMP project would require all of the RACs to
18 agree that that was a priority, and then priority to do
19 that type of a project and then decide what the PIN for
20 that project should be. And I would be interested in the
21 other RACs considering that, considering the value of
22 that. So basically, you know, do we want to pool
23 resources to try to have a, I guess a potentially bigger
24 impact by having pooled their resources? Pat.

25
26 MR. HOLMES: I think that's a good
27 philosophical thing to raise. But on the practical
28 level, would we want to have a statewide FRMP process
29 and view of how OSM was totally restructured, and nobody
30 even asked us. I could see that the questions about
31 declining chinook stocks and chum stocks could overwhelm
32 the whole question of us getting funding for our two
33 funky little weirs. And so, I think that having a
34 statewide FRMP should only be done where there would be
35 new money available and Auntie Em and Uncle Dan would
36 say, okay, here's some money. God knows where it would
37 come from. Have that as a new item rather than something
38 statewide, because politically, I think we'd be cutting
39 our throats.

40
41 MS. SENEAL: Anna Senecal, OSM. Just
42 point of information. I guess there is a multi-regional
43 category within the current funding opportunity for
44 regions to work together on work that crosses
45 boundaries. And it's not -- I think it has been utilized
46 in the past, but it's not often utilized. So, it could
47 be an opportunity. But it's -- you're right. It's all
48 the same pot of money.

49
50 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Any final comments?

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 comments)

All right.

MS. SENEAL: Okay. So, interest in diving into the NOFO. Desire to send summaries of the discussion to other RACs. Follow up on wildlife monitoring program. Coordinate -- potentially coordinate on multi-regional projects and think about the value of pooling resources are the kind of the potential action items that came out of this things to chew on. I am surprised that I didn't see a -- like a process evaluation, an FRMP process evaluation in here, looking at more touch points for communication or different ways to approach that. Because that was -- that did come out -- was a theme previously. So, I am wondering whether to document that here or, or not.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: I mean, it makes sense to me. I think we're also, you know, coming up on lunch and this has been an intense process. So, you may be dealing with a bit of brain drain. But Sam, did you have a comment?

MR. ROHRER: Well, yeah, I would just say that the touch point I heard was the final step having RAC input during the TRC review process. So, I would think of -- that's an additional touch point we're asking for. Is that -- if that's what you meant?

MS. SENEAL: Sure. Yeah. That's great. I'll just -- I'll put it in here. I know the brain drain is a lot because it's work of the head and it's work of the heart. And it's, it's a big ask. So, I really do thank you and do want to acknowledge all of the engagement from the group and the calling people in and the, you know, affirmations and feeling proud because you did, you did a lot of work today. And there is that fear that it's going to be a lot of work for nothing. And so, it's up to us and it's up to you. And it's up to all of us to make sure that that doesn't happen. So, I think it's good to put this down for now. Step back from it, think about it and then reconnect. And one of the points of reconnection is identifying folks to work with Bristol Bay RAC and OSM staff on the PINs. And that's something that that we need to follow up on.

MS. CHERNOFF: I guess with that comment too. And like, what I would really love to see is a more

00040

1 meaningful, like where we are actually -- instead of
2 asking to review or look at or have discussion about
3 things like where we actually have work on like a report
4 card on how, you know, instead of saying, oh, what are
5 our priorities, but actually have a process where we are
6 grading these applications.

7
8 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. So, I just
9 following up on Anna's comment, and then what's on the
10 screen So, we have a lot of stuff on the Board. I'm
11 interpreting this question right now is of everything
12 on the board, what would you go up and put a star next
13 to? So, I think Anna's comment or her surprise that we
14 hadn't highlighted the communication gaps, I'll
15 paraphrase what she said. Because that did come up a
16 lot. So, I'll just give the council members a last chance
17 as she's documenting what are we interested in following
18 up on. So again, this would be, to me, this would be if
19 I had to go star one thing, what one thing would that
20 be? So, for me, it's the NOFO. That's why I spoke to
21 that. Is there anything else on the board that Council
22 --that hasn't been identified as we want follow up or
23 we want other RACs to know, or we want to know what
24 other RACs think, or we really want OSM to take note of
25 that hasn't been said yet of what we covered because
26 there is a lot on the board. So, if you know, OSM and
27 us has to prioritize, we're not going to have time to
28 do everything. We can only do, say 2 or 3 things, which
29 2 or 3 things would those be? Daniel.

30
31 MR. SMITH: Yeah. Thank you, Madam Chair,
32 this is Daniel Smith. The one thing for me would be kind
33 of going off of what Coral was saying about an additional
34 place for RAC review for proposals without seeing the
35 TRC justification. So, like similar report card that the
36 RAC could fill out and then they could see the TRC
37 justification of the proposal later on.

38
39 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Brett.

40
41 MR. RICHARDSON: Brett Richardson. Once,
42 I guess the process has begun and you know, the FOMO and
43 the task review at some point. Communicating with the
44 public, the decisions that have been made. So that's
45 the, maybe the communication and then the public
46 engagement aspect of that, prior to our next meeting
47 where we have at some point some more information about
48 this looks like it's going forward, this is not, are
49 there additional opportunities elsewhere if it's not
50 going forward, that kind of thing? Thanks.

1

2 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. And I think
3 that that highlights maybe a little bit of difference
4 between the FRMP grant program and I'll just speak for
5 myself, other grant programs I work with, other federal
6 grant programs which are generally run out of
7 Washington, D.C. Grants I review. I've never met any of
8 the people applying for them. Well, because you want to
9 avoid bias. So that's also a reason. But the things I'm
10 looking at, I'm never going to probably meet any of
11 these people. With these FRMP projects, we are -- we,
12 the RAC members are being asked to come up with
13 priorities in our communities. These are places we live.
14 They're fairly small. These are people we know. We
15 understand what the needs are because those are -- we
16 share those needs as well. This is a very intimate and
17 personal kind of a process. And so, to Brett's point
18 about the communication to the community, I can
19 understand from other grant program perspectives, like
20 through that lens, you're not going to communicate with
21 the community about what grants got awarded. That's
22 crazy, but that's because they're very far removed from
23 the community and there's not that same connection that
24 there is here. So, I just wanted to emphasize Brett's
25 point about communicating with the community. I do think
26 that's a necessary step that's probably unique, maybe
27 more unique to the FRMP program. Pat, did you have your
28 hand up?

29

30 MR. HOLMES: I would disagree. I think
31 that the FRMP is important, but I think the
32 communications of what our Council does and what we're
33 trying to do is really, really important. And if you
34 wanted to sign up a committee of folks to work on that,
35 I think we could sit down and develop an outline where
36 we were working with, Leigh, once we have a basic
37 summary of our meeting. Just a pre meeting
38 communications, I think is really important because, you
39 know, I'm old and befuddled and I screw up when I'm
40 trying to get people to call in. But if we had something
41 where we identified those contacts with the tribes, with
42 the corporations, with the local community Councils.
43 Karluk has a whole different kind of way of
44 communicating. Even though there's only 25 people living
45 there and whatever. Some way we're letting people know,
46 okay, here, we're having our meeting. Here's what topics
47 were discussed. This is where we're going in the future.
48 And then when we're setting up to have a meeting, whether
49 it's a discussion on FRMPs or on our whole total
50 structure, identifying problems in our community or

1 solutions that we have a way that we just go, okay,
2 coordinator, please send a note. And we got just
3 identified a contact list of people and then as
4 individuals, we can also go through there and I can say,
5 oh, I'll call Stanley Mack at Sand Point, or I'll track
6 down Della even though she's retired and she could get
7 us connected to what's going on at King Cove. But I
8 think that that would be establishing our communications
9 with OSM and taking that and applying it to all the
10 communities we represent is really, really important.

11
12 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. So again, the
13 purpose of this, this is focused on FRMP. It is not
14 general RAC meetings. And also, I just want to stress
15 communicating about grant funding is not going to come
16 from the RAC. It's going to come from the granting
17 agency. So that's the appropriate flow. It should never
18 first come from RAC members. Okay. So, I think I'm not
19 seeing any more hands I think. Is there another step?
20 This is it.

21
22 MS. SENEAL: Yep. Madam Chair. Anna
23 Senecal, for the record, this is it. You guys made it,
24 and I will let you get to your chili. But before I do,
25 I still need volunteers for PINs. So, are there 1 or 2
26 members that -- look at that raising hands.

27
28 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. So,
29 we'll have Pat, Brett and Rebecca. Does anyone else want
30 to participate? Do we need a motion for that or...? I
31 can't remember what we usually do.

32
33 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Can I have a
34 motion for -- Coral, do you have a -- can I have a
35 motion? This would be to identify the KARAC members who
36 will be working with Bristol Bay to identify our joint
37 set of PINs.

38
39 MR. ROHRER: I'll make that motion for
40 Pat, Brett and Rebecca to be on that joint committee.

41
42 MR. RICHARDSON: Second.

43
44 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right.
45 Discussion. Coral.

46
47 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah. I'm just wondering
48 what kind of a time commitment is that.

49
50

00043

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: It's usually one,
2 maybe two phone calls a few hours.

3
4 MR. RICHARDSON: Didn't we do this last
5 year? Yeah. And it was. Yeah, one meeting, some emails.

6
7 MR. HOLMES: And we did that in the
8 previous year. And then a couple of years before that
9 we did it and we got our knuckles wrapped. But then it
10 was accepted as a process that was valid. And so, I
11 think we should go for it.

12
13 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Additional
14 discussion. Sam, go ahead.

15
16 MR. ROHRER: Thanks. Yeah. Sam, for the
17 record, I would just say that's a good makeup. Brett,
18 obviously you know, someone from down the chain who
19 understands what's going on out there. Pat brings such
20 a historic perspective. It's great. Rebecca, with you
21 being the Chair, that makes a ton of sense. My
22 encouragement I think would be, I haven't been part of
23 the PIN process before. Other than just as a rack as a
24 whole, but I think my recommendation would be maybe we
25 should work on trying to whittle down our ten priorities
26 to -- maybe ten priorities is fine, but let's, let's
27 rank our really top of our ten. Try to get that maybe a
28 little bit of a tighter group might be helpful and that's
29 all.

30
31 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thanks.
32 Any further discussion? Is there any objection to the
33 motion?

34
35 (No response)

36
37 All right. Seeing no objection, that
38 motion passes. Okay. It is -- does this conclude the
39 FRMP agenda item?

40
41 MS. SENEAL: Madam Chair, this concludes
42 the agenda item. I will commit to turning this into some
43 kind of report deliverable for you.

44
45 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat, go ahead.

46
47 MR. HOLMES: I was wondering where you
48 concluded this process, I kind of hinted around at it
49 earlier, but I would like to maybe work with you or
50 somebody and add a girl for having this happen. A letter

1 to OSM just praising what has happened here and what a
2 big step forward it would be and for Anna and Leigh and
3 helping facilitate it and whoever else. But they'd
4 be.....

5
6 (Simultaneous speech)

7
8 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Is there a
9 second to that motion?

10
11 MR. SMITH: I'll second that.

12
13 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank
14 you. Daniel, is there any additional discussion? So, the
15 motion is for the RAC to send a basically a letter of
16 appreciation and acknowledgement to OSM thanking them
17 for this process and acknowledging I guess Anna for
18 taking the lead and putting this together for us and
19 that we found it a very valuable process. Any additional
20 discussion?

21
22 (No response)

23
24 Right. Is there any objection?

25
26 (No response)

27
28 All right. Seeing none, that motion
29 passes. Okay. So, it's almost 11:30. I'm inclined to
30 break now for lunch. We do have food in the room, and
31 we'll be getting into the vehicles about five after 12.
32 So however many minutes that is. Is that 40 minutes? I
33 don't know. Looking at the agenda, I'm not seeing -- I
34 think we'll be good on time this afternoon. So, we'll
35 go ahead and break for lunch now. We'll reconvene
36 probably about quarter after one. We'll reconvene at
37 1:15. Thank you.

38
39 (Off record)

40
41 (On record)

42
43 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. We'll go
44 ahead and call the meeting back to order. So, on the
45 agenda we are on item 13, Reports. And there is a report,
46 we don't have a person to speak to it, but it's the
47 North Pacific Fishery Management Council report. It's
48 listed as being in the supplement book. I think it did
49 not make it into the supplement book. It's available
50 here as a handout and I assume it's also posted on the

1 -- on our web page under meeting materials. So, I will
2 note here that Council staff for the North Pacific
3 Fishery Management Council were requested to attend our
4 meeting to be able to present the report and then answer
5 questions, and they declined to participate. All right.
6 So that was d. We heard from Fish and Wildlife Service
7 yesterday which was item e. That takes us up to item f
8 National Park Service. Do we have anyone for that?

9

(No response)

10

11

12

13

Okay. Seeing none there, Bureau of Land
Management.

14

15

(Talking)

16

17

18

19

20

I'm sorry. I was going off of an old
agenda. We actually have under Fish and Wildlife
Service; we also have Jon Gurkin in the room. Did not
mean to skip over you.

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

MR. GERKEN: No problem, Madam Chair. Jon
Gerken, Fish and Wildlife Service. I'm the Federal In-
Season Manager for Alaska Peninsula, Bristol Bay and
Aleutian Islands, and I'm just hoping to give sort of a
staff report from the perspective of our fisheries
branch. We haven't done it here before. But I think
appropriate just given sort of the topics that we were
-- we've been covered in the last few days. And then
just sort of let you know, kind of the things that we
sort of run into the assessment projects that we
anticipate to run. Some of the management forecasts for
the areas that we have. So, it'll be generally brief. I
do have copies that I can hand out. I didn't make it
into the staff reports and online, but I'll hand it out
at the end of this so.

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

So, our office is located in Anchorage.
It's -- we have a satellite office in Soldotna. Our
fisheries branch used to be located in King Salmon. It
was moved back into Anchorage in 2006. So that's why a
guy from Anchorage has delegated authority in Bristol
Bay, Aleutians and Alaska Peninsula that used to be part
of the King Salmon office delegated authority. We
combined offices, Soldotna office and Anchorage office
roughly in 2016 and so that also gave our office
delegated authority for Upper Cook Inlet. And so, within
our office, we have five biologists. We conduct
assessment surveys. We also do the in-season management
in those four areas. We have technical expertise that

1 we provide to all of the refuges in that area. That's
2 Maritime, Kenai, Kodiak, Alaska Peninsula, Izembek and
3 Togiak. So, we do what we can to get around. And the way
4 that we typically function is we get requests from,
5 primarily the refuge requests from Fish and Game,
6 requests from NGOs, tribal entities for technical
7 expertise. And then if they fit within our sort of our
8 guide, our -- I guess, our mandates primarily under in-
9 season management or assessment and monitoring as it
10 fits into the refuge. That's typically how we make our
11 decisions with respect to projects. And so, most of the
12 conversation and most of what I have in here is specific
13 to management. And I'll just talk a little bit briefly
14 at the end about the assessment projects we're hoping
15 to operate in 2026 and 2027.

16
17 One thing that I didn't talk too
18 directly to, but we do have responsibilities on, as we
19 do a lot of Sikes Act work through the Department of
20 Defense. And so, our office does get brought into most
21 recently try to understand forage fish stuff on Ship
22 Creek as it relates to cooking the beluga whale, which
23 is listed. And so, DOD has a responsibility to monitor
24 their species within the, I guess, the DOD confines or
25 their lands as part of their natural resources
26 interests. And so typically what they do is they hand
27 that to the Fish and Wildlife Service to do that level
28 of monitoring. And so, we provide some guidance to them
29 under this act called the Sikes Act, which directs the
30 Fish and Wildlife Service on behalf of the Department
31 of Defense to do these type of monitoring. So that's
32 another part that we do work with. And then we have been
33 or have picked up a number of responsibilities in the
34 aquatic invasive species world. Less so in the area that
35 you guys are in. But in the Mat-Su, it's typically pike
36 and or the Mat-Su and the Kenai River or Kenai Peninsula,
37 excuse me.

38
39 So, in 2025 and 2026, we've conducted a
40 number of preseason management coordination efforts and
41 again, this is not just to your area, but other RACs.
42 So, we attend the Federal Subsistence Board meeting in
43 February. We have a member that -- or a part of our
44 fisheries team that sits on the Technical Review
45 Committee. We attend all of the Board officials for all
46 of these different areas, the Bristol Bay RAC, the
47 Kodiak/Aleutians RAC, the Southcentral RAC. Kenai is its
48 own beast. We offer -- or we issue a lot of permits in
49 the Kenai Peninsula to all of the federally qualified
50 cities. So typically, that's 600 to 700 permits in the

1 Peninsula. And then we try to make visits to Chignik Bay
2 every year where we issue permits. Typically, that's
3 about a week to ten-day trip where we start in the lake.
4 Go to the lagoon, go to the bay and issue permits there.
5 As things change, we try to make additional public
6 meetings. We've done a couple in Cold Bay in the past.
7 We will likely be going to Unalaska hopefully in the
8 future. Some of the regulatory changes in (In Native),
9 Alaska would be nice to also get out there and do some
10 public meetings. So as time permits, we try to get out
11 there. We would definitely notify everybody here on if
12 we were going to go to either Cold Bay or Unalaska here
13 in the near future.

14
15 And then I'll just give a quick couple
16 sentences on some of the forecasts for our area. The
17 majority of my time for in-season management has
18 typically been focused on Chignik. Most of the areas in
19 the Aleutian Islands on the North Peninsula are not
20 really on federal waters. Same thing on the South
21 Peninsula. So, you know, our delegated authority is only
22 on federal lands. So, we have less of an opportunity to
23 really, you know, affect management unless it's in the
24 freshwater. So Chignik is definitely the biggest area
25 in the Peninsula for that. So Chignik got a number of
26 stock of concerns both early and late run, and chinook
27 made the escapement goal for the first time in ten years
28 last year by 91 fish. So that's a positive. In order to
29 do that, there were some pretty drastic conservation
30 measures put in effect by the state both in state
31 subsistence state sportfish and state commercial, and
32 then a collaborative effort with federal subsistence to
33 really well, actually close it to all users for chinook.

34
35 Bristol Bay is forecast to be good, 43
36 million fish there this year. We typically never get any
37 requests for federal assistance or federal permits from
38 Bristol Bay and well, they just have a lot of fish.
39 There's typically not many requests for federal
40 assistance. The Alaska Peninsula is, I guess, set to
41 have kind of an average year. Like I mentioned earlier,
42 we typically don't get many requests for federal permits
43 in any of those areas. And then most all of the
44 information that we typically use is provided by the
45 ADF&G, all -- you know, nearly all of our assessment
46 information. And so specific to Aleutian Islands, you
47 know, all of those fisheries are forecast to meet
48 escapement goals and provide harvest opportunity.

49
50

1 Specific to assessment projects. 2e hope
2 to -- well, I guess we have one ongoing project. It's a
3 weir operation and it's occurring in Platinum. The river
4 is called the Salmon River. Platinum is undergoing
5 decades of mining. And so, the top priority for the
6 Togiak Refuge was to install a video weir to see if --
7 what number -- just basically enumerate the number of
8 salmon species going up the Salmon River in and around
9 this mine. The mine is inactive, but there are a number
10 of mining claims that could at any time become active.
11 So, it was a high priority for the Togiak Refuge, that
12 project in its third year. It's collaborative with the
13 City of Platinum and the -- we have a lot of local hires,
14 tribal local hires there, including one from Goodnews
15 Bay. We work with the Refuge, BLM and most recently
16 Trout Unlimited has come interested or has some interest
17 in the Platinum mine. We operate another video weir on
18 the Funny River on the Kenai Peninsula. We are moving
19 up on year 24, I believe. It's the only specifically
20 chinook salmon assessment project on the Kenai River.
21 The department does have a lot of other things, but
22 that's the only weir that actually enumerates spawning
23 chinook stock.

24
25 We maintain a real time water
26 temperature sensor network on the Kenai and the Mat-Su
27 chinook salmon streams. In total, there's 22 different
28 locations. It's a real time temperature, so you can log
29 onto the internet and see what type of water temperature
30 it is. It's been a pretty good outreach perspective. We
31 get a lot of anglers that want to use that -- those data
32 to plan their fishing. And that was all basically
33 conducted under the National Fish Habitat Partnerships,
34 which is a big push for the Fish and Wildlife Service
35 in the Mat-Su and Kenai area.

36
37 During the last FRMP cycle, we had a
38 project in Chignik. It's a Chignik River in-season
39 subsistence harvest surveys. We are just finishing up
40 the last report. That project had three objectives. One
41 was to extend weir operations for ADF&G at the Chignik
42 River weir through the month of August. The second was
43 to enumerate through video footage, all chinook passing
44 the weir between -- roughly late June through end of
45 July to compare those estimates with their ten-minute
46 count, which is how they have traditionally operated
47 their weir in Chignik. And then the third part was to
48 conduct subsistence surveys in Chignik River, Chignik
49 Lake, Chignik Lagoon and Chignik Bay. That proposal has
50 gone into this next round of FRMP projects, and we will

1 await its fate here in the near future.

2

3 And then the last one is some one that
4 has been on your priority information needs for a while,
5 not in your area, but in your combined area with Bristol
6 Bay RAC and that is Big Creek. So, we are hoping to
7 begin or hoping to evaluate kind of in a pilot year
8 video weir on Big Creek as part -- in partnership with
9 BBNA and Alaska Peninsula Becharof National Wildlife
10 Refuge. So, we got a lot of equipment on the ground.
11 Hopefully we'll get majority of that up to the camp. Get
12 a base rail in for the weir and then operation would
13 hopefully be a five-year cycle. So, I would expect a
14 proposal coming to FRMP, not this year, but next year
15 for that Big Creek project, so. And that's all I've got.
16 Thank you.

17

18 MR. HOLMES: I'm sorry, I'm deaf. What
19 was your last project at?

20

21 MR. GERKEN: The last -- through the
22 Chair. The last project was a video weir in Big Creek
23 off the Naknek River near King Salmon.

24

25 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Are
26 there any other questions from council members? Pat, go
27 ahead.

28

29 MR. HOLMES: Briefly on the ten-minute
30 video partial counts. Have you folks done a ground truth
31 during the daytime, or 24 hours or two days, where you
32 compare the ten-minute video and expanding it to 24 hours
33 versus looking at actual counts for 24 hours, because
34 those chinook -- some of the places I've been out there
35 if they're side by side, you're going to have to be
36 really sharp on picking them out on a video basis. And
37 it's tough even standing right over them. So, I'm just
38 wondering if you've done a ground truth or if that's
39 part of your plan?

40

41 MR. GERKEN: Yeah. Through the Chair.
42 Yep. That project is primarily operated by ADF&G.
43 However, we have three years of information comparing
44 the 24 count -- and this is only for chinook, not for
45 sockeye, to the ten-minute count that they would usually
46 use, and then a portion overall to their daily
47 escapement. And as I understand, those are -- they're
48 not exact, but they're within like 20% difference for
49 24 hours versus a ten-minute count. So, I think right
50 now, I think everybody's pretty confident that the ten-

1 minute is working. But obviously there's always better
2 -- more improvements we're looking at. So, but so far
3 we've been pretty happy with those data coming from the
4 department for the weir counts.

5
6 MR. HOLMES: Oh, that's swell because I
7 know years ago there used to be quite a bit of debate
8 on the county reds, even actual counts versus what figure
9 -- people figure were going to Black Lake or not. And,
10 you know, if it didn't equate to having the openings
11 when some of the seiners in the lagoon wanted to fish
12 and they would stop at the weir and raise holy heck. And
13 so that's a sensitive issue out there for sure.

14
15 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Any additional
16 questions?

17
18 (No response)

19
20 Not seeing any questions. Thank you. All
21 right. Well, I don't think we had any one from National
22 Park Service, BLM or other organizations. So, we're up
23 to OSM.

24
25 MR. AYERS: Thank you, Madam Chair,
26 Members of the Council, Scott Ayers, OSM. So, this is a
27 summarized report kind of the activities that have taken
28 place mostly since the fall cycle ended, and then kind
29 of a bit of a preview of upcoming events. So, this is
30 our way of keeping the Council abreast of kind of the
31 happenings within OSM and the Federal Subsistence
32 Management Program. I've got six items roughly to cover
33 with you, so I'll try to get through it relatively
34 quickly and just let me know if anyone has questions.
35 So, the first topic is the wildlife regulatory cycle.
36 All ten Councils were able to hold their fall meetings.
37 Obviously, there were some that were rescheduled due to
38 the government shutdown. That's really compressed a lot
39 of meetings together in a short period of time since we
40 met effectively in December and January and now February
41 and March. But everyone has pulled together and we're
42 happy with the results of that. But the outcome on that
43 related to this topic is that we were able to get
44 recommendations on the wildlife proposals for almost all
45 of those proposals and closure reviews during the fall
46 cycle meetings. There were a few that bled over into
47 these winter meetings, but they should all be wrapped
48 up in time for the Board meeting. There are tribal and
49 ANCSA Corporation consultations on these proposals and
50 closure reviews that were held February 17th and 18th.

1 And the Federal Subsistence Board is going to be meeting
2 on April 20th through 24th in Anchorage as part of taking
3 up all of these proposals and closure reviews and taking
4 action on them. Public testimony is option to be provided
5 during the meeting. There's always opportunity during
6 those Board meetings for public comments on non-agenda
7 items at the start of every day. And then there's also
8 opportunity for the public to comment during the process
9 when the regulatory proposals are coming up. There's
10 also an opportunity for tribal consultation that will
11 take place immediately preceding that Board meeting. So,
12 there's another chance there for folks to get input in
13 on this process and the proposals and closures under
14 considerations.

15
16 Second item is the Secretarial Review.
17 So, the public comment on the secretarial review of the
18 Federal Subsistence Management Program opened December
19 15th of last year. All ten Councils took up this topic
20 and submitted letters, and I believe the letters are
21 included in your books. So, there's an opportunity for
22 you to see what the other Councils had to say as well.
23 There was a public listening session held on February
24 3rd in Anchorage. It was a long day. We had over 76
25 people provide oral comments either in person or over
26 the phone. The meeting was scheduled to take place from
27 3 to 7. Folks started showing up at 1:45 in the afternoon
28 before anyone of us was ready for it and we ended after
29 9:30. And that was even after the decision was made by
30 the Secretary's Office to limit comments to three
31 minutes. And I know you all discussed that a little bit
32 earlier in the frustrations with that. I think there was
33 frustrations kind of across the board on the way that
34 that turned out. But ultimately everyone that came to
35 talk was provided an opportunity to talk. So, we were
36 pretty happy with that outcome.

37
38 Shortly thereafter, the period for
39 public written comments was extended by 45 days after a
40 lot of commentary related to the comment period being
41 so short, it now closes March 30th. There will be
42 statewide tribal and ANCSA consultations on the review
43 held March 10th and 17th as I mentioned earlier, and in
44 addition to that, any tribe can request a separate
45 consultation on this topic at any point in time. One
46 last note on this. Kara Moriarty, the Senior Advisor to
47 the Secretary of the interior for Alaska Affairs, has
48 noted that all comments will be reviewed and no decisions
49 have been made on whether or not the review will result
50 in any program changes.

1

2 The third topic is the Federal
3 Subsistence Board Winter Work Session. The Board met in
4 Anchorage on February 5th for its work session. They
5 took care of a handful of administrative items during
6 that meeting, including accepting the 2026 Fisheries
7 Resource Monitoring Plan as presented. Naturally, we did
8 not have a budget by that point in time, so there was
9 not a discussion on which projects would likely be
10 funded. So, we're still waiting on that, but we
11 anticipate having that information very soon. It
12 approved the Regional Advisory Council transmittal
13 letters to the Secretaries pertaining to Council
14 concerns on the ANCSA 17(d)(1) lands on cross,
15 jurisdictional and conservation related fisheries
16 concerns, and then also on Regional Advisory Council
17 membership -- or member compensation. The Board also
18 received an update on request for reconsideration for
19 RFR25-01, asking the Board to reconsider its 2025
20 decision on designating Ketchikan as a rural community
21 under the Federal subsistence regulations. This is
22 currently undergoing something called a threshold
23 analysis, and the Board will hear kind of the results
24 of that during its April regulatory meeting. And if any
25 claims are found to hold merit through that threshold
26 process by the Board at that point in time, then that
27 will spring into a full analysis of those particular
28 claims, but they'll be more on that later.

29

30 The Board also received an update on the
31 online portion of the federal subsistence permit
32 database that's still being developed and it also
33 received an update from the Senior Advisor to the
34 Secretary of the Interior on Alaska Affairs regarding
35 the Secretarial Review. There will be another Federal
36 Subsistence Board work session during the summer. That
37 will be August 4th and 5th. We're hoping to make this
38 an opportunity for Council Chairs to meet with the Board
39 and have face-to-face discussions with the Board on
40 topics of concern that are included in the Council's
41 fiscal year 2025 annual reports. So, we're looking to
42 make that a little bit more of a back-and-forth
43 conversation instead of the Board just taking in
44 information as summarized by OSM and then responding
45 back to the Council's.

46

47

48 Fourth topic is the fisheries proposed
49 rule. So, the Fish and shellfish proposed rule published
50 on February 12th of this year, opening the current call
for fish and shellfish proposals and for rural and non-

1 rural determination communities or areas. That comment
2 period for submitting proposals ends on April 3rd. And
3 obviously you all have been well involved in that earlier
4 in this meeting yesterday. So, I appreciate that. But
5 the closing date for that for anyone to submit proposals
6 is April 3rd. You all will make, and the other Councils
7 will make recommendations on any proposals that are
8 submitted during the fall meetings. And then the Board
9 will take those up next year in February. The meeting
10 is set for February 1st through 5th.

11
12 Council appointments. The 2025
13 application submitting during last year's recruitment
14 cycle are still under consideration at the Secretaries
15 of the Interior's Office. However, we expect those to
16 be announced later this month, finally. And then lastly,
17 the call for Council applications and nominations. The
18 current call opened on February 13th of this year. The
19 forms are available on the public table here and on the
20 program's website. And Leigh can provide any additional
21 information on that front. The deadline for submitting
22 those applications is April 2nd. So that concludes the
23 information I have. Again, very much appreciate all the
24 work that you all do and that you come here twice a year
25 and spend way more time than that going through all this
26 stuff. So, thank you very much.

27
28 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, Scott. I
29 think I missed item number four. I had wildlife
30 regulatory cycle, program secretarial review, federal
31 Subsistence Board winter work session. And then my four
32 was proposed regulations for fish. Was there something
33 before that one?

34
35 MR. AYERS: No. Madam Chair, number four
36 was the fish proposed rule as you stated, five was
37 Council appointments and six was the call for
38 applications.

39
40 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank
41 you. Oh, okay. Pat. Do you have a -- go ahead?

42
43 MR. HOLMES: I just wanted to say I find
44 it heartening in the report that it looks like the Board,
45 as well as the whole process, not just our being an
46 angst on communications, but that they're trying to
47 improve the whole ball game and make it more responsible.
48 So, I think that's -- really deserves some applause or
49 acclamation that finally things are being looked at in
50 a broader perspective and listening to people.

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: Are there any questions or other comments?

(No comments)

All right. Seeing none. Thank you. All right. We are up to agenda item 14, Other Business, a. is correspondence update and I think Leigh will give that.

MS. HONIG: Thanks, Madam Chair. Leigh Honig for the record. I just have a brief presentation on that. So, I've included the current Council correspondence from the fall meeting, and that begins on page 155 of your main meeting book. And that begins with the Council's request to extend the Federal Subsistence Management Program review process, which as Scott just said, that it was announced it would be extended until March 30th. I have also included the other Council's comments on the review if you're interested in reading those. I've also provided Northwest Arctic, Western Interior and Eastern Interior in your supplemental materials. If you're interested, Southcentral and Yukon-Kuskokwim, they were sent out right before this meeting and they are available on our website. You can go to the Regions tab, and we have a correspondence tile where that will be listed if you're interested in reading those. Additionally, the Council also submitted a letter to Fish and Game regarding the Buskin River. We have not received an official response yet, but yesterday they kind of briefly did touch on that on their presentation. And that one is on page 181. And so, as I noticed or said before that the scoping process has been extended to March 30th. So, if any individuals would like to supply comments on that, they may do so through our website. There's more information there as well. That is all I have for that agenda item, Madam Chair. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Are there any questions or comments on the correspondence update? Pat, go ahead.

MR. HOLMES: Good job, Becky, on composing these things. I think you really hit things very precisely on these communications with other areas. And this one for Doug Vincent-Lange as a good flag. Thank you.

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Any other
2 questions or comments.

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 All right. Seeing none. Next item is
7 Council Discussion on Native Corporation Lands and
8 Allotments on Federal Maps, Board request for input.

9
10 MS. HONIG: Thanks again, Madam Chair.
11 Leigh Honig, for the record. So, this discussion
12 revolves around the request from the Eastern Interior
13 RAC. They had made a request to the Board through their
14 annual report. I did include their annual report, which
15 is found on page 183. They had requested incorporating
16 Native corporation lands and allotments on the maps that
17 are used in federal regulation books to reduce trespass
18 issues. At the moment, these maps only reference federal
19 landownership. Through the report, the Council stated
20 that trespassing primarily by hunters is a big issue in
21 the region, that they are actively working to address
22 through increased outreach and hunter ethics
23 initiatives. The Council also stated that these efforts
24 will not be successful if the public cannot easily
25 reference land status on regulatory maps and therefore
26 requested the Board to also display corporation land in
27 Native allotments. In their reply to the Eastern
28 Interior Council, the Board requested feedback from
29 other Councils about whether this is something you would
30 also like to see on regulation book maps in your region.
31 The Board and the Eastern Interior Council would greatly
32 appreciate a brief discussion with your thoughts about
33 the request. It's not an action item, so I'll just gather
34 any comments and submit those to the Eastern Interior.
35 I also do have an example of what a map would look like
36 with those lands. It's in the northern unit, so we can
37 definitely have one made up for this area if you are
38 interested. Thank you, Madam Chair. That's all I have
39 for that one.

40
41 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Maybe we
42 could take a minute to look at the map, and then we'll
43 see if people have comments.

44
45 (Pause)

46
47 I guess for clarification. Okay. So,
48 this map does show the -- this is what they want to see
49 with Native corporation lands and allotments. If it
50 wasn't depicted on this map, am I correct in assuming

1 that what would be in color would be federal lands and
2 everything in private ownership would just kind of be
3 grayed out so it would be clear it's not federal lands?
4 So, all private land would be grayed out.

5

6 MS. HONIG: I don't know if it would
7 necessarily be grayed out, but yes, you are correct that
8 it would just show the federal public lands and then
9 maybe white or something for the other private lands.

10

11 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Sam, go ahead.

12

13 MR. ROHRER: Yeah, through the Chair. I'm
14 just -- as we're talking, I pulled up what's currently
15 in the regs, in the federal subsistence hunting
16 regulations and the map. It just has all the state land
17 and all the private land as white. So, it's a little
18 hard to see it on my screen. But federal public lands
19 in pink and then everything else in white. I don't know,
20 there's -- I mean, I feel like there's a lot of resources
21 around that give us a breakdown of that. But also, it
22 wouldn't be very hard to mark what's the private land.
23 I think on the -- I should have looked. Let me look in
24 our -- in the state one. Oh, I flipped right to it. The
25 -- yeah. The state -- I think when you look at the state
26 map, it's real similar. And on that one, they have
27 federal lands, state lands, and then all of the private
28 land is in white. But they do have the state difference.
29 So, I don't know if it matters that much, but it probably
30 wouldn't be that hard of a deal to at least differentiate
31 between what state land and what's corporate or tribal
32 lands.

33

34 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, I guess I'm
35 -- I want to give consideration to -- if in this region
36 asking for it, it's important I don't want -- I mean,
37 it's important to them. I'm a little confused why we
38 would only show one segment of private land. I feel like
39 the map is supposed to show federal public land and if
40 you're going to start breaking out different types of
41 private land to show that kind of confuses me. Not
42 confuses, but I mean, because there's obviously
43 resources that have to go into producing this. Sam, go
44 ahead.

45

46 MR. ROHRER: Well, just to say you
47 certainly, you couldn't -- you could show all private
48 land. I mean, you're going to get down into little
49 parcels, so you'd have to have some acreage, you know.
50 And anything I mean, I think I think the point would be

1 you wouldn't show any, any private lot -- like private
2 land, like individual private land. But to show to mark
3 what state land and what's corporate land.

4

5 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Natasha.

6

7 MS. HAYDEN: Thanks. Madam Chair, this
8 is Natasha. I agree that it would be more appropriate
9 to have the federal land designations and then state
10 land, you know, public land designations, state land,
11 and then private land. And, and I think that I -- in my
12 brain, I think what you, Madam Chair and Council Member
13 Rohrer is describing is kind of the same thing. Like
14 it's you're not going to put the parcel -- like the name
15 of the person who owns the parcel on every little parcel.
16 And then at the scale of a map of Alaska, like you're
17 not even going to be able to see anything that's going
18 to be smaller than a couple hundred acres at a minimum.
19 And then -- but I don't see -- I also wouldn't see the
20 point of differentiating between any, you know, like a
21 Native allotment and some other piece of private
22 property that isn't designated as an Alaskan Native
23 parcel. It's just private property and so that's what I
24 would think would be appropriate. And I and another sort
25 of question, and I don't know if this is -- has any
26 relevancy or not, but this is coming from the RAC, which
27 may or may not be comprised of leadership from the Alaska
28 Native corporations within that region. And I would
29 think that the leadership within the corporations would
30 have a say in that as well. Like if you're going to make
31 -- designate all private land as just being private land
32 is different than saying, this land over here is owned
33 by this corporation. This land over here is owned by --
34 - it's an Alaska Native allotment. And make those
35 differentiations and showing those boundaries because
36 you know, they may not think that's appropriate as the
37 landowners.

38

39 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. Another --
40 like I think I understand where this is coming from, but
41 another complication or consideration is that ownership
42 changes. So, the specific example I'm thinking of is
43 them land exchange with the King Cove/Cold Bay. That
44 land exchange just went through. So, ownership of the
45 land has changed. I mean, you do regulation books every
46 year, I guess not a big deal. You update it. But if the
47 point is to make sure people understand whether they can
48 go on a piece of land or not, and if it's trespassing.
49 I guess I'm not sure. I feel like the regulation book
50 would be the best place for that. Also, I think from a,

1 like a hunting perspective, I and guide and whatnot I
2 keep hearing about is it onX or the cool app you can
3 carry into the field, and it tells you when you step
4 across the border onto private land. I feel like my
5 sense is a lot of people use that. So again, I guess I
6 don't -- I feel bad that I'm kind of being negative
7 toward this concept, but it, I -- my sense is there is
8 a problem. I just don't know that this is the best way
9 to fix it. But if the question is, do we want this for
10 our region? Was that the question?

11
12 MS. HONIG: Right. It would be -- well
13 it would be statewide. So, it would affect your region.

14
15 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Other -
16 - Sam, go ahead.

17
18 MR. ROHRER: Well, I'll just say one more
19 thing. So, I pulled up the existing Unit 26 map from the
20 regs that they're currently using and comparing it to
21 this draft one. And I mean, at the end of the day,
22 Rebecca, you, you hit the nail on the head. You can't
23 use this map -- you can't take this map to go hunting
24 to decide where it's legal for you to be or not. There's
25 just not enough detail. Those resources are already out
26 there. This is just meant to be a generic guideline of
27 where federal public lands are. I mean, if it doesn't
28 cost that much more for OSM to add in the private lands,
29 then fine. But if there's a lot of expense to it, it
30 just doesn't seem like it's worth it. There's other
31 resources out there. BLM or DNR has a phenomenal mapping
32 program online that has everything. And yeah, it doesn't
33 seem like it really accomplishes that much.

34
35 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Oops. Natasha.

36
37 MS. HAYDEN: Thanks, Madam Chair. This
38 is Natasha. So, if it -- I would think that we would
39 want to solicit input from leaderships of the
40 corporations, those private ANCSA corporations first for
41 us to make an informed recommendation. That's one thing.
42 And then I think another thing like what Sam is saying
43 is that there's a problem not knowing if this is how to
44 fix it is that, you know, really they could just put
45 like big, bold watermarks that says no trespassing on
46 private land in the reg book. And, you know, because
47 it's -- there's like a lot of fine print in the beginning
48 of the book that the hunter is responsible for knowing
49 where they are. And then there's a lack of monitoring
50 and enforcement and so then therefore, the burden is on

1 the landowner to conduct monitoring. And you know,
2 identifying when there's trespass, when you know, more
3 caution of like, hey -- you know, private land ownership
4 in Alaska is a big deal. Like no trespassing. Make sure
5 you know where you are. And, you know, this is a
6 caricature of land boundaries, ownership boundaries in
7 Alaska, not something that is, you know, legally kind
8 of going to hold up in court if you say, okay, but I'm
9 on this side of that line, you know.

10
11 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat, go ahead.
12

13 MR. HOLMES: I can understand where
14 you're coming from completely, Natasha. And I think that
15 Native corporate folks should have some input in this
16 for sure. I myself don't think that. I mean, this is not
17 going to be anything legal. But where you have something
18 like, you know, the one for Kodiak Island, this is pretty
19 crude, but it would be good for the agencies whoever is
20 trying to show roughly who is and what is where, you
21 probably should have a footnote on here, blah, blah,
22 blah, please contact for some more precise information.
23 But I've seen people get off the bloody ferry here from
24 Anchorage to go, quote, bear hunting on the road system.
25 And they probably don't even think about the fact that
26 Leisnoi owns most of it, you know. So, you should have
27 some kind of footnote, regardless of the definition
28 that's shown, at least so that somebody would look and
29 say okay, well, this is -- this doesn't show much, but
30 I probably should check up and call Leisnoi. And because
31 I want to go out on the road system and then get Leisnoi
32 map so that they have a way of knowing they might be
33 in trouble or just flat knowing where they're at. And
34 then that acknowledges the landowner as well.

35
36 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Additional
37 thoughts and comments? Brett, go ahead. And Pat, can you
38 hit your microphone button? Thank you.
39

40 MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you. I guess
41 generally I would tentatively support this because they
42 see it as a need for whatever that reason specifically
43 is, I'm not exactly sure, but with additional
44 information I would be asking about, you know, potential
45 cost. And more specifics, maybe before sending some kind
46 of formal I don't know, approval, acceptance, that kind
47 of thing.
48

49 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Scott is
50 approaching the microphone. Go ahead.

1

2 MR. AYERS: Thanks, Madam Chair. Council
3 members, I just wanted to note that the cost has come
4 up a couple of times, and OSM does have a cartographer
5 on staff who works on all of our maps. And I believe
6 much of the information that we're discussing here comes
7 from GIS layers that she has direct access to as part
8 of the map production process. So, I don't know that it
9 will add really anything cost-wise to this process. And
10 I just kind of wanted to put that out there for you that
11 I don't think that's part of the concern on our end at
12 this point in time. As you noted, we do make new wildlife
13 books every two years and new fish books every two years.
14 So, this would just be a process of updating those maps.
15 But I think you all have raised a lot of really great
16 other comments related to this. So, thank you.

17

18 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Any additional
19 comments?

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 Okay. Leigh, do you feel like that was
24 enough feedback? Okay.

25

26 MS. HONIG: Great. Yes. Thank you.

27

28 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Before we get
29 to Council Member Closing Comments, I wanted to check
30 back. Yesterday, Jon Gerken raised the issue of
31 potentially a regulatory proposal to match the Federal
32 Subsistence Board hours of operation to the state, so
33 the state removed any restriction. Subsistence is
34 basically open 365 days a year, 24 hours a day. On the
35 federal subsistence side there are time restrictions in
36 the day. I said we'd revisit this and I'm mostly looking
37 at Brett because this was your area. Did you have any
38 interest in trying to bring forward such a proposal, or
39 are you good with status quo?

40

41 MR. RICHARDSON: Brett Richardson. Yes,
42 I would like to propose to change the time frame on
43 federal subsistence permits in Unalaska area. Do you
44 need a motion specific to that?

45

46 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes, if you could
47 -- so we're -- just for the -- everyone, we're kind of
48 reverting back to the section where we're talking about
49 proposing changes to fisheries regulation. So yeah, if
50 you want to make the motion and then we'll get a second

00061

1 and have discussion.

2

3 MR. RICHARDSON: Move to revise the
4 federal time frame on the subsistence permits in
5 Unalaska.

6

7 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: And in what way
8 would you revise them?

9

10 MR. RICHARDSON: To remove the specific
11 time.

12

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

15

16 MS. HAYDEN: Second. This is Natasha.

17

18 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, Natasha.
19 Would you like to speak more to your motion?

20

21 MR. RICHARDSON: Yes. Thank you. So, in
22 order to streamline the proposals we already put
23 forward, I think this would be a good move to open the
24 waters that apply. Fresh waters to match the state
25 guidelines that were recently revised to remove 6 a.m.
26 to 9 p.m. time frame and to be open from January 1st to
27 December 31st, 24 hours a day.

28

29 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank
30 you. Additional either questions or comments? Natasha,
31 go ahead.

32

33 MS. HAYDEN: Thanks, Madam Chair. This
34 is Natasha. I'm supportive of the motion. I just was
35 wanting to -- just to go back to how you recalled that
36 when we talked about this that we talked about it during
37 daylight hours and that was my recollection as well. And
38 so, but it sounded like that the Board of Fish felt like
39 that was too onerous for management purposes. And so
40 that was the rationale behind just not having any
41 restrictions for nighttime fishing. And so -- and your
42 proposal is to also avoid any sort of onerous or unwieldy
43 management that would might come from saying it's from
44 sunrise to sunset as well. Is that correct?

45

46 MR. RICHARDSON: Yes. Through the Chair.
47 That's correct. I think to avoid confusion to
48 subsistence users who may be subsisting in different
49 areas, more state regulated versus federal regulated,
50 it might become confusing. And it might be confusing to

1 any, you know, in-season managers who are looking at
2 anything or to other organizations that might be working
3 in these areas. So, I think this would simplify a lot.

4

5 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Coral.

6

7 MS. CHERNOFF: So, I guess I have a
8 question, and this references something that Pat got me
9 thinking about. Do you think you, in your area with
10 Federal Subsistence Board, are you prepared to have
11 somebody put their nets out and then leave them out for
12 3 or 4 days because there is no then cut off time.
13 Whereas if you have a 6 a.m. to 9 p.m., those nets have
14 to come out of the water. So, I just wanted to bring
15 that up.

16

17 MR. RICHARDSON: Coral. Through the
18 Chair. Thank you for that point. At this point, since
19 there is no federal permit in the area, everybody has
20 to have a state permit that is going to be allowable.
21 Maybe unfortunately though I think that anybody who
22 leaves their net out for three days is asking for just
23 a world of hurt. There's not going to be any fish in
24 there. It's going to be chewed to heck and back. Even
25 when you're standing out there, the seals and the otters
26 are going at you, right. So, anybody who leaves their
27 net out overnight is not a good subsistence user and,
28 you know, may not get a permit in the future.

29

30 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: I see Scott has
31 approached the microphone and then I'll go to Sam. Scott.

32

33 MR. AYERS: So sorry to interrupt, Madam
34 Chair and Council Members. I just wanted to note that
35 in the regulations, the federal subsistence regulations
36 for the Unalaska district, if you fish with a net, you
37 must be physically present at the net at all times when
38 the net is being used. Thank you, Madam Chair.

39

40 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Scott.
41 Sam.

42

43 MR. ROHRER: Through the Chair. Sam,
44 here. Also, aren't we submitting a proposal to say it's
45 rod and reel only? So, the net shouldn't be an issue?

46

47 MR. RICHARDSON: Yeah, through the Chair.
48 If you -- for the proposals. Yes, rod and reel only in
49 the freshwater systems. For your state permit in
50 saltwater areas where nets are allowed now 24 hours a

1 day with the caveat that you have to be sitting there
2 with them. That would be that distinction. Does that
3 make sense?

4
5 MR. ROHRER: Yeah, that makes sense. But
6 that's already allowed under the state regulation that
7 just got passed. So, I think the federal subsistence
8 permit is only for in-river rod and reel, freshwater rod
9 and reel. So, there's no -- as far as I understand,
10 there's no nets involved on the under the federal permit.
11 Assuming that the Board passes our proposal.

12
13 MR. RICHARDSON: Through the Chair. That
14 is correct. So, you would -- with the proposals, you
15 would be able to fish in the dark with the rod and reel
16 only. That's it.

17
18 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. And just
19 reminding everyone that if we generate this proposal,
20 there will be analysis. So, we'll be taking final action
21 on this in the fall and will have the benefit of analysis
22 that can tease out some of these issues. Just for the
23 record, I would also note that the in-season manager for
24 the area we're talking about recommended making this
25 change. I -- to me, it makes sense that federal
26 assistance would not be more restrictive than state
27 subsistence. And since now state subsistence has removed
28 any timing restrictions, it makes sense to me to do that
29 on the federal side. I will note that if there is a --
30 if it becomes apparent that there is a problem not having
31 hours like daily hours of operation this can always be
32 revisited in the future. So, while I do support this
33 that is something that I would be waiting to see in the
34 future if this became problematic. All right. Any other
35 comments before we vote? Pat, go ahead.

36
37 MR. HOLMES: Just to add the thought on
38 the timing is if you don't have a restriction, then you
39 could end up with one person or one person in a body at
40 McLees Lake. You go to that marker place there on the
41 beach. You could have one group of people monopolizing
42 the best set for the entire summer. And so, I think that
43 it should be -- you have to have a defined time period
44 when you're there. And then when you get to the end of
45 it, then you have to yield and give up. And you know,
46 it just provides for better passage of the fish and just
47 eliminates one possible level of cheating on other
48 folks.

49
50 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Natasha.

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. HAYDEN: Thanks, Madam Chair. I just have a question for Pat. Pat, are you referring to people subsistence fishing with a rod and reel at the marker?

MR. HOLMES: On rod and reel, when we revisit it, I'll have comments on that, but I'm talking about -- we're talking the federal subsistence salmon harvest. And right now, it can be taken with setnet gear, seine, other things. And so, I think there needs to be some time limits on that. And as far as sport fishing down there, the one place they would be fishing would be in Summers Bay. And I think that if we do get to the point of when we finalize rod and reel, it should be with single hook. Because I know people down there. I've tried to catch them. That snag in fresh water with big MF hooks. They cheat and the ones that are out there late at night when I give up and was out there and coming into town to go to bed at like ten at night, there'd be people heading out there and you know that they're not going to be playing kosher. And so, you need to have some time limits for when you're doing those things.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. I think Scott has a clarification on methods and means out there.

MR. AYERS: Thank you, Madam Chair. For McLees Lake currently, the federal public waters for the fresh waters are closed to subsistence harvest. So, there's no rod and reel, no nets, nothing else in the fresh waters at this point in time. It is open to sport fishing. However, there are existing regulations that prohibit fishing within x amount of distance of a structure such as a weir under both the state and federal regulations at this point in time. And that outlet system is pretty small. I'm not sure how much of it is still open to fishing, given that prohibition on fishing in that area. It is -- the marine waters are open under state subsistence and that would be affected as member Holmes has stated by the change in the state regulations for subsistence to be able to fish at any point in time. But that's outside of the purview of our group here. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Natasha.

MS. HAYDEN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just to put a finer point on it, that the motion that is on the floor is -- has -- is -- no impact or influence over

1 saltwater fishing, subsistence saltwater fishing,
2 because that's not under our jurisdiction for this
3 purpose.

4
5 MR. AYERS: Yes. Through the Chair.
6 Member Hayden, that is correct in this area.

7
8 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Are
9 there any further comments before we get to a vote?

10
11 (No comment)

12
13 All right. Seeing none, is there any
14 objection?

15
16 (No response)

17
18 Okay. Noting that Member Holmes -- an
19 objection from Member Holmes. So, with one objection,
20 this motion passes. Sam, go ahead.

21
22 MR. ROHRER: Thanks. Through the Chair
23 before we do our closing comments. Maybe I missed it,
24 but I don't think I did. Can we get an update on the
25 wildlife proposals that the Board -- that the RAC
26 supported last year? Last fall at the fall meeting? Did
27 those -- has the Federal Subsistence Board heard those
28 yet or will that be at the coming April meeting?

29
30 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. The Board
31 will take action on those at the April meeting.

32
33 MR. ROHRER: Okay. Very good. Thank you.
34 I withdraw then.

35
36 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: It's a good
37 question, though. Okay. Well, that takes us to Council
38 Member Closing Comments. I will start with Sam.

39
40 MR. ROHRER: Through the Chair, Sam
41 Rohrer here. I don't have a lot to comment on. Just
42 appreciate everyone being here. Appreciate all the staff
43 coming into town for this. I didn't think I would
44 appreciate the whole SWOT/A got to have action on the
45 SWOT/A but it was interesting. And I thought maybe I
46 should try that in my own, like business with the guys
47 I work with. It might be interesting. So anyways, that
48 was an interesting exercise. I learned a lot and yeah,
49 just generally thanks everyone for being here and for
50 the discussion, I appreciate it. Thanks. Oh, and good

1 job running the meetings and keeping paperwork and
2 emails and information coming to us throughout the year.
3 So good job on that. Even though I don't always respond.
4 I always read it. So, thank you.

5
6 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: You. I assumed so.
7 I assumed. Jeff.

8
9 MR. WASLEY: Yeah, thanks to everyone
10 involved. Rebecca, for your leadership. I thought it was
11 a productive meeting. A lot of what Sam said, it was
12 interesting. The SWOT, it seemed very productive. So on
13 to just any local stuff with us. I know that this Board
14 didn't have a lot of representation from Cold Bay in the
15 past and a lot from King Cove. And this land exchange
16 is a pretty big deal and a lot of folks in my community
17 feel like they weren't really represented. So, there's
18 going to be some big change, and I'll just kind of leave
19 it at that. And it's -- I don't think it's fairly
20 characterized as like, it was always like birds versus
21 people. And it's, you know, there's 78 tribes in the
22 Yukon Delta that are against this exchange. There's
23 currently three lawsuits still. So, it's not completely
24 done. And actually, some of the tribes are on part of
25 that lawsuit. So, I guess we'll see and it's this thing
26 from Izembek showing that, you know, they will have
27 control of the road and it's like, we're not sure who's
28 paying for the road. So, I feel like we were misled in
29 earlier meetings that it would be open to everybody
30 because it would be paid for by, you know, federal tax
31 dollars, so. Anyways, thanks to everyone for the meeting
32 and I'll leave it at that.

33
34 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So, I think I'll
35 take advantage of this time to ask a question when we're
36 looking at putting the agenda together for the next RAC
37 meeting is the -- and I'm kind of looking at both Jeff
38 and Leigh is the -- should we look at putting an agenda
39 item to discuss that? I mean, I'm seeing nods because
40 if it's something that's going to keep coming up, I
41 prefer to just have it on the agenda so we can have a
42 discussion.

43
44 MR. WASLEY: I'd be in favor of that.
45 Thank you.

46
47 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Thanks. All
48 right. Natasha.

49
50

1 MS. HAYDEN: Thanks, Madam Chair. I think
2 that this has been a very good meeting, and yeah, Madam
3 Chair, you've done an excellent job in keeping us on
4 track and providing us with good information and having
5 a very deep understanding of everything that we're
6 having to discuss and what we're presented with. I'd
7 like to thank the staff. I think that you guys are --
8 have done a really good job of both during the meeting
9 and all the preparation that went into the meeting in
10 advance. And yeah, I think it's been a good meeting.
11 Thanks.

12
13 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank
14 you. Coral.

15
16 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah. I just want to thank
17 the staff as always who is -- keeps us really informed
18 and is here to answer our questions. I really appreciate
19 that. And I just appreciate being able to be here and
20 sit on the seat. And that's all. Thank you.

21
22 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Brett.

23
24 MR. RICHARDSON: Brett Richardson,
25 Unalaska. Thanks, Rebecca, for your work. Thanks, Leigh
26 as well. Appreciate the way you two work behind the
27 scenes together and streamline everything. Thanks to the
28 fellow council members, your input is important and
29 necessary, and I appreciate everybody's knowledge and,
30 and wisdom and especially Pat bringing a perspective
31 that I don't think anybody here has as much history in
32 this as he has. And it's great to have that. And then
33 to the staff, as Coral said your reports and work is
34 crucial to making us try to do the right thing. I think
35 I'm going to initiate the SWOT analysis at home with my
36 kids, and we'll see how that goes. I think they're going
37 to take to it really well, right. I think they're going
38 to like it. And yeah, that's it. Thank you.

39
40 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, Brett.
41 Pat.

42
43 MR. HOLMES: Well. I'm blushing. I would
44 like to apologize to everybody because I was a little
45 bit foggy and didn't come up with a good joke about
46 Skinner Motors this year. But Becky certainly is an
47 extraordinary person that I've admired for, since she
48 was very, very small. I suspect that probably she was
49 arguing with the nurse at the hospital. But anyway, I
50 think that this is a good meeting. I gained a lot more

1 knowledge and information from folks getting to know
2 people better. I certainly agree with the positive
3 comments about staff. I think that they really are
4 improving the information that we get, answering
5 questions, helping us solve problems. And I'm really
6 glad that we have Leigh here with us because she, I
7 think, is a capital coordinator and has done a really
8 fine job on putting everything together. And I'll look
9 forward to getting a copy of this on the map, because I
10 can only see so much of it at a time. But I think that
11 will be a good educational thing for me as well. And so,
12 my hat is off to everyone. Thank you very much. And I
13 hope the baldness doesn't glare your eyes.

14

15 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Daniel.

16

17 MR. SMITH: Yeah, I thought it was a
18 great meeting. I'd like to thank Rebecca for chairing
19 and then Leigh for organizing and coordinating the
20 meeting, as well as OSM staff for all their great
21 analyses in the fisheries closures. Really appreciated
22 the FRMP discussion earlier this morning. And then the
23 opportunity that OSM gave us for providing hopefully
24 more RAC input in that process going forward. And yeah,
25 just felt, it was great to connect with all the members
26 of this meeting those not from Kodiak, but also from
27 Kodiak getting to know folks, council members better
28 over -- that's my third meeting. And looking forward to
29 visiting Unalaska this fall. I'm going out to Dutch
30 Harbor. Thanks.

31

32 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thanks.

33

34 MR. HOLMES: Would you take one footnote?

35

36 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes. Go ahead.

37

38 MR. HOLMES: Forgetful old man. I think
39 one of the things that's really neat is having a new
40 young puppy participating in our group. Someone that
41 young, we were talking about video promotion for people
42 to join the RAC or something, but this young fella is
43 really pushing ahead on his PhD. He's a bright young
44 fellow from Ouzinkie. And I think it's just kind of a
45 credit to our whole island wide community to have someone
46 this bright join us. And I hope he's on here 30 years
47 from now.

48

49 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thanks,
50 Pat. Kind of along those lines, the nomination process

1 is open, I think, until April 4th? 3rd? April 3rd. I
2 would encourage everyone to encourage people to apply.
3 Right now we do have two vacancies. So, what you're
4 seeing around the table, this is all of our members in
5 attendance, which is great. I think I want to note that
6 we have full attendance, but we do have two vacancies.
7 And if we don't have people apply, we're obviously not
8 going to be able to fill those seats. So that's one
9 thing. Encourage people to apply. Kind of joking Kind
10 of not. If there's an option at OSM, maybe we can get
11 quieter books. Turning the pages was very squeaky.
12 Throughout the meeting, but just the binding on the
13 books. And then I really want to recognize and
14 appreciate, Leigh. You're just very calm and smooth and
15 efficient and it's very easy to get things done and to
16 work with you. So, I just want to really appreciate
17 that. And I do want to thank Anna for bringing this new
18 way of doing things. I mean, you have not been on the
19 job very long, and we appreciate that you're bringing
20 new ways of doing things. And I do think that this was
21 a productive process. Talking about FRMP and excited to
22 hear how Brett's kids enjoy the SWOT process that he is
23 going to unleash on them.

24
25 And other than that, thank all of the
26 staff that support this process and this meeting and
27 then everyone who submitted reports and did
28 presentations. I know that's a lot of work to put those
29 -- the presentations and reports together. And thank you
30 to all of the RAC members. Two days, especially for
31 people flying in. It's more than two days. It's a lot
32 of time. And I really appreciate the level of commitment
33 and passion that we can all take the time to come to
34 these meetings and work to support subsistence in our
35 communities. Pat, go ahead.

36
37 MR. HOLMES: On our outreach committee
38 that was -- we got a few minutes on that, and I was
39 thinking that Brett and I, what we'll do is be working
40 on trying to develop a list of communities and community
41 contacts for our meetings so that we can have a list for
42 the coordinator to be able to send these materials out.
43 Say these issues are coming up. And I think one of the
44 things that we should have in there to be on the start
45 of this little -- hey, folks, here's going to be some
46 information for you in the future. We are looking for
47 new members, and we have representatives from blah,
48 blah, blah, blah. But you know, we have these vast gaps
49 that would be really good to get folks from. And you
50 know, we just had that one lady on just for a short

1 while from Sand Point. Dallas retired from King Cove,
2 but some -- I'll work on with Brett, some kind of a
3 verbiage for new membership, as well as a notice of
4 outreach so that we can get things going. And so, if you
5 folks have somebody with one Native corporation or
6 tribal unit or something that you think we should
7 address, if you give me a call or an email or something,
8 then we can kind of -- Brett and I will work on putting
9 a package together with Leigh and bounce it through
10 Becky, I guess. If that -- anyway.

11
12 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. That
13 brings us to the end of our time. Is there a motion to
14 adjourn? Or we could just stay here the rest of the day.

15
16 MS. HAYDEN: Madam Chair, this is
17 Natasha. Make a motion to adjourn.

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

21
22 MR. RICHARDSON: Second.

23
24 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Brett.
25 Is there any objection?

26
27 (No response)

28
29 All right. Seeing none, this meeting is
30 adjourned. Thank you.

31
32 (Off record)

33
34 END OF PROCEEDINGS

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
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 0 through 70 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the KODIA/ALEUTIANS SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME II recorded on the 5th 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 24th day of March 2026.

Rafael Morel
Chief Project Manager