

001

KODIAK/ALEUTIANS SUBSISTENCE
REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

PUBLIC MEETING

VOLUME II

UNALASKA PUBLIC LIBRARY
Unalaska, Alaska
September 16, 2026

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rebecca Skinner, Chair
Patrick Holmes
Coral Chernoff
Daniel Smith
Brett Richardson

Regional Council Coordinator, Leigh Honig

Recorded and transcribed by:

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Unalaska, Alaska - 9/16/2026)

(On record)

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, we'll go ahead and get going with our meeting here. And we'll start with roll call and checking quorum. Leigh.

MS. HONIG: Thank you, Madam Chair. Leigh Honig, for the record. We'll start off with Pat Holmes.

MR. HOLMES: Present.

MS. HONIG: Sam Rohrer.

(No response)

Okay. Coral Chernoff.

MS. CHERNOFF: Here.

MS. HONIG: Rebecca Skinner.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Here.

MS. HONIG: Daniel Smith.

MR. SMITH: Here.

MS. HONIG: Natasha Hayden was excused. And Brett Richardson.

MR. RICHARDSON: Here.

MS. HONIG: Okay, great. We have quorum. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank you. So, as I said, we will start off with any public comments this morning. These would be on non-agenda items. So, if you have comments on the fisheries proposals, we'll take those proposal by proposal later in the day. Is there anyone in the room who wishes to give public comment on non-agenda items?

(No comments)

1 Okay. I'm not seeing anyone in the room.
2 Is there anyone online who wishes to give public comment?
3 Public and Tribal comment?

4
5 (No comments)

6
7 Okay. I am not seeing any indication
8 that we have anyone online either. So, the next item
9 that we're going to take up this morning is under
10 reports, under the Fish and Wildlife section. We'll hear
11 segment of northern sea otters and there's a handout.
12 So, the -- is the handout in the stack of papers we got?

13
14 MS. HONIG: Yes.

15
16 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. So, this is
17 a handout that was in the stack of papers that was --
18 were sitting on the table. After we finish this, we'll
19 see if there's any other reports in the report section.
20 And then, I plan to go back to the fishery closure
21 reviews and fishery proposals and then go in order and
22 pick up everything else on the agenda. All right. So,
23 if the segment on northern sea otters is ready, you can
24 start whenever you want.

25
26 (Pause)

27
28 Okay. It looks like that person is not
29 on, yet. So, if there's -- my understanding is there's
30 no other reports in the report section except for Office
31 of Subsistence Management. But I'll just double check.
32 Is there anyone else from either Tribal governments,
33 Native organizations, Alaska Department of Fish and
34 Game? Anyone else from Fish and Wildlife that had a
35 report that wanted to give a report, this would be a
36 good time to indicate that.

37
38 (No response)

39
40 Okay. I'm not seeing any hands, so we'll
41 go ahead and take 14.e, Office of Subsistence
42 Management.

43
44 MS. GREDIAGIN: All right. Good morning,
45 Madam Chair, members of the Council. For the record, my
46 name is Lisa Grediagin with the Office of Subsistence
47 Management. And I'll be giving you a summary of what all
48 has happened with OSM and the Federal Subsistence
49 Management Program since your winter 2026 meeting ended,
50 as well as a preview of upcoming events. The Federal

1 Subsistence Board met last April for the wildlife
2 regulatory meeting. The final rule for the 2026-28
3 Wildlife Harvest Regulations has still not published in
4 the Federal Register. Until publication, the 2024-26
5 Federal subsistence harvest regulations remain in
6 effect. However, please be sure to check for temporary
7 regulation changes via special actions before heading
8 into the field. The Secretarial Review of the Federal
9 Subsistence Management Program is still ongoing. While
10 there are no major developments to report at this time,
11 Kara Moriarty, the senior advisor to the Secretary of
12 the Interior for Alaska Affairs, has noted that all
13 comments that were submitted earlier this year will be
14 reviewed, and that no decisions have been made on whether
15 the review will result in any program changes. As a
16 reminder, any tribes can request a separate consultation
17 on this topic at any time.

18
19 The Federal Subsistence Board met in
20 Anchorage in August for its summer work session. During
21 the work session, the Board approved reply to the
22 Council's annual reports. This was the second year when
23 all Council Chairs or representatives were invited to
24 attend and discuss annual report topics in person with
25 the Board, and most Councils took advantage of this
26 opportunity. Board members, Council representatives, and
27 OSM staff benefited greatly from direct interactions,
28 and OSM hopes to make Council representative attendance
29 a regular part of the Board's annual report work session.
30 The Board also discussed the annual report reply
31 process. Received a report out from the Council Chairs
32 on their Alaska Salmon Crisis Workshop. Reviewed Council
33 and Board correspondence. Approved Wildlife Special
34 Action Request WSA26-04 regarding a winter moose hunt
35 in Unit 24A. Approved a delegation of authority letter
36 for Unit 7 caribou, and approved Wildlife Special Action
37 Request WSA26-08 to implement a Board action approved
38 at their April meeting. During the executive session,
39 the Board developed recommendations to the Secretaries
40 for Council member appointments. 11 fisheries proposals
41 and 10 fishery closure reviews are being considered
42 during the 2027 fishery regulatory cycle. Most of them
43 at this meeting. Tribal consultation opportunities on
44 these proposals and closure reviews occurred on August
45 18th, 2026. Additional Tribal consultations will occur
46 after the fall Council meetings on November 10th. The
47 Board will meet in Anchorage February 1st through 5th,
48 2027, to act on the fishery regulatory proposals and
49 closure reviews under review this cycle. The Board will
50 also consider three deferred wildlife proposals and two

1 wildlife special actions.

2

3 As a reminder, public testimony provided
4 to the Council on regulatory proposals does not go
5 directly to the Board. For those who want to provide
6 testimony to the Board, the Board receives comments and
7 testimony on regulatory proposals when they come up on
8 the agenda during the Board meeting. Public testimony
9 on non-agenda items will be allowed one day only, the
10 morning of Wednesday, February 3rd. This is a change
11 from previous years, so please spread the word. Another
12 opportunity for Tribal consultation will take place
13 immediately preceding the Board meeting on February 1st,
14 with virtual and in-person options available. The
15 Board's recommendation on the Council member
16 appointments are being reviewed by the Office of the
17 Secretary of the Interior, and it is expected that the
18 next set of appointments will be issued this December.
19 Although the official call for Council membership
20 applications is currently not open, if you know of anyone
21 who is interested in applying or would like to nominate
22 someone, the applications and nominations can be
23 submitted at any time throughout the year. OSM will keep
24 them until the next appointment cycle starts.

25

26 While many vacancies remain within OSM,
27 several staffing changes have occurred. Glenn Westdahl,
28 Executive Secretary, retired in April. Kristen Morrow,
29 Pathways anthropology intern completed her PhD and was
30 successfully converted to a permanent cultural
31 anthropologist. Grace Cochon has lateraled into a
32 Council Coordinator position for the Northwest Arctic
33 Region. Christopher Paulsen, formerly with the Fish and
34 Wildlife Service, is also lateraling into a financial
35 specialist position with OSM. And we're pretty excited
36 to have them all on Board. Brent Vickers, former OSM
37 anthropology division supervisor, is lateraling into the
38 BLM as their subsistence coordinator and ISC member. And
39 we would also like to take a moment to let the Council
40 know that OSM continues to have a number of openings
41 that were not yet able to fill. As we wait, multiple
42 folks within and some outside OSM have stepped up to
43 temporarily fill these roles. Some of these people are
44 in the room. So, Anna Senechal is fisheries biologist,
45 but she's currently acting as the fisheries division
46 supervisor. And Jason Roberts, anthropologist, has also
47 just started his detail as the acting anthropology
48 division supervisor. So, thanks. We're grateful to all
49 of them. That concludes the presentation. So, thank you,
50 Council members and all others in attendance for your

1 hard work and participation in this meeting and
2 dedication to the Federal Subsistence Management
3 Program. I'd be happy to answer any questions, if any.

4

5 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Great, thanks. Are
6 there any questions? Coral, go ahead.

7

8 MS. CHERNOFF: I just have a question.
9 When is the next Council member cycle?

10

11 (Pause)

12

13 MS. WESSELS: Good morning, Madam Chair,
14 members of the Council. For the record, Katya Wessels.
15 We're currently trying to decide on the exact opening
16 date of the next obligation period, but in a way, anyone
17 can apply at any time, which is going to hold the
18 application, you know, until the process starts. So, in
19 practice, season is open all year round. You know, it's
20 not like we're not going to accept applications.

21

22 MS. GREDIAGIN: Right, like, you know,
23 when it closes for this next year.

24

25 MS. WESSELS: It also will depend on when
26 it opens.

27

28 MS. CHERNOFF: Okay. Will you -- how --
29 can we be contacted to know that information? Because I
30 think.....

31

32 (Simultaneous speech)

33

34 MS. WESSELS: Yeah.

35

36 MS. CHERNOFF:you know, if we're
37 talking to people and encouraging them or nominating
38 them to be on the Council, it's nice to give them that
39 information that.....

40

41 MS. WESSELS: Yeah, we definitely can
42 communicate it to all the Council members as soon as we
43 decide. We just didn't, unfortunately, have time to
44 think it through before this first Council meeting.

45

46 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Coral,
47 go ahead.

48

49 MS. CHERNOFF: And second question. Do
50 we have new -- I think you said new -- there has been

1 new Council member appointments. Will we have new
2 members here or is that information released yet?

3
4 MS. WESSELS: Thank you. There was one
5 application from Kodiak/Aleutian region for the last
6 meeting cycle, and that name got forwarded to the
7 Secretaries. They had not made their final decision yet.
8 So, we don't know -- we don't have any information on,
9 you know, if that one individual will get appointed.

10
11 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Can you go over the
12 current status of KARAC membership? I know we have some
13 vacant seats, but can you just remind us, and remind the
14 public what our current status is as far as seated
15 members.

16
17 MS. WESSELS: Well, right now you have
18 three vacancies for the voting members positions, and
19 you have one vacancy for the non-voting young leader
20 position. When we gave the interview to the radio the
21 other day, we were encouraging our folks in the community
22 to apply, as well as if they know anyone ages 18 to 25
23 to apply the non-voting position. Next year, if that one
24 individual gets appointed, you will have four vacant
25 positions as for non-voting -- I mean, for voting members
26 and one for the young leader. So, that's quite a bit of
27 vacancies for a 10-member Council.

28
29 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. I would
30 also encourage -- if you're 18, you're old enough to be
31 on the Council. So, don't feel limited to applying for
32 the non-voting youth seat. Feel free to apply for a full
33 voting seat, especially if you can demonstrate
34 experience with subsistence, knowledge and experience
35 with subsistence. So, don't feel limited.

36
37 MS. WESSELS: Yeah, exactly. You're
38 exactly right, Madam Chair. You know, if you're 18,
39 you're considered an adult and you can apply to serve
40 on the Council.

41
42 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Coral, go ahead.

43
44 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah. And I just had a
45 thought that occurred to me. Can you serve on the Council
46 if you work for ADF&G or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

47
48 MS. WESSELS: ADF&G. We've never had
49 anyone from ADF&G. So, maybe. I don't think that would
50 prevent them because they basically will be volunteer.

1 The issue with federal employees that there might be
2 conflict of interest. So, it will need to -- we had a
3 couple of people that were Fish and Wildlife employees,
4 but they weren't, you know, like permanent and they
5 weren't even full-time. So -- and there was a, you know,
6 ethics determination. So, it's a little bit complicated
7 because they kind of -- they will need to basically
8 recuse them from their own position and travel to the
9 meeting. But then, we're paying for this travel. So,
10 it's a little bit complicated, but ADF&G, most likely
11 yes. Or any State employee.

12

13 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat. Go ahead.

14

15 MR. HOLMES: Madam Chair. Coral, I don't
16 know if you're aware, but there are two positions, one
17 on the federal side and one on the state side, where
18 they have an agency coordinator that helps facilitate
19 and work with OSM on different issues and as things come
20 up. And one person I recall was George Pappas, was very
21 active on the Fish and Wildlife side. And then he left
22 and now he's a coordinator on the state side. And so,
23 there are some people that kind of are agency reps that
24 help facilitate things and make the flow of paper and
25 concepts move smoothly.

26

27 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Brett, go ahead.

28

29 MR. RICHARDSON: Good morning. You
30 mentioned a radio interview. Where did that play?

31

32 MS. WESSELS: On the local radio station,
33 supposedly yesterday. I haven't heard it, so. But we
34 were interviewed. Leigh and I were interviewed by the
35 radio station. So, maybe we can get a recording so at
36 least we know how it sounded.

37

38 MR. RICHARDSON: Yeah. Is there any
39 budget for social media outreach or anything that will
40 attract younger people? I try to listen to the radio. I
41 don't get around to it as much as I would like.

42

43 MS. WESSELS: Well, we try to advertise
44 as much as possible. We kind of stopped advertising the
45 newspapers because it wasn't really bringing any
46 applications. We advertised on the radio, we advertise
47 on our website, on our Facebook. So -- but the best way
48 is actually the word of mouth. Because, you know, when
49 you just like listen to an ad, are you going to apply?
50 You don't really know what's it about. So, when people

1 -- when we travel to the communities, we try to talk
2 with as many people as we can. Because we really, you
3 know, want more applications. We don't want, you know,
4 a flood of applications, of course, because that would
5 be a lot of work to interview everyone. But we want a
6 decent amount of applications. You know, some regions,
7 like they will get maybe two applications per seat. And
8 then we'll also have alternates as a result in those
9 regions. And the alternates that we have is [sic]
10 different. Those alternates, they're vetted. So, if
11 somebody on the Council resigns or like if they, you
12 know, pass away unfortunately, that person can get
13 appointed out of cycle very easily with a simple letter.
14 They don't need to go through the whole big process. So,
15 that would be great. You know, if your region has full
16 seats and also alternates in case something happens and
17 somebody needs to step down, then you don't have a vacant
18 seat the whole year.

19
20 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: I have a question
21 on the alternates. Does somebody apply to be an alternate
22 or that's not how it works. They apply for a full seat
23 and they just don't get appointed to a full seat. So,
24 I'm asking, can somebody choose that they want to be in
25 that standby position, or is that not an option in the
26 application process?

27
28 MS. WESSELS: It's not an option at this
29 time. Everybody applies just for regular seat and they
30 just score lower and they end up being an alternate, but
31 they still qualified or highly qualified usually. So,
32 they, you know, they're good to be the real Council
33 member but they maybe scored a little bit lower than
34 somebody whose name gets forward for a regular seat.

35
36 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat, go ahead.

37
38 MR. HOLMES: Madam Chair, I think one of
39 the areas that's been quite successful in the past is
40 membership contact, as well as OSM contact with the
41 tribes. And Daniel Smith, our newer member from Kodiak,
42 as a Sun'aq member. Natasha Hayden as a Native Village
43 of Afognak. And so, you know, when I run into folks from
44 the peninsula or out in this neck of the woods, I also
45 mentioned it to them. And I believe that Rick Koso who
46 used to be the representative for Adak, I forget which
47 tribal group he's with, but I mean, that's a very
48 valuable interconnection that I know you folks pursue
49 as well. And I think it -- also for the members, if you
50 know someone in the various tribal groups or something

1 like that. And I believe Orville Lind with the BIA, also
2 tries to stimulate that. So, I think we'll just have to
3 be patient. And I think we'll probably get some very
4 good applicants to fill empty slots. Thank you, Madam
5 Chair.

6
7 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. And we're
8 not prohibited as individuals, if somebody was active
9 on social media or Instagram or whatever, if they wanted
10 to post, we, you know, I encourage you to apply to KARAC.
11 It's super fun. And you mean [sic], you get to travel
12 to communities in the region. And I think it's a -- I
13 said that in a sarcastic way, but it, I mean, it is fun.
14 This -- it's a great experience. It's getting to go see
15 the places that we talk about and then meet the people
16 in the communities. We -- we're free to encourage our --
17 -- use our networks to encourage people to apply. Go
18 ahead, Katya.

19
20 MS. WESSELS: Yeah, definitely. You know,
21 we really encourage Council members to help us with the
22 recruitment and you're free to post on your personal
23 pages, you know. Advertising for us, you know, and or
24 share ours when we have them, or we even can provide you
25 with flyers. And, you know, Leigh is the one usually
26 creates them. She's kind of an outreach person for
27 Council coordination. So -- and, you know, like one of
28 the points to strike that it's a service, it's a service
29 to the community. It's a service to your user group. You
30 know, you just making things better for the people by
31 serving on the Council. And yeah, you get engaged with
32 the Federal subsistence management. So, you haven't --
33 because Councils have the deference, so you have real
34 influence on the process. And, you know, like people
35 sometimes complain later or they go to the Federal
36 Subsistence Board meeting, they complain that nobody
37 listens, but they really should come to the Council
38 meetings and say what they want to the Councils and
39 convince the Councils to vote one way or the other. So,
40 that's why Councils have the power. So, I think so it's
41 very honorable serving on the Council. And you know,
42 we're thankful to you, all of you, you know, for doing
43 this for your people, for your communities.

44
45 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, I guess I'll
46 say this just so that I know I have articulated it. I
47 go to a lot of management meetings, the North Pacific
48 Council, the Board of Fish, International Pacific
49 Halibut Commission and subsistence meetings. And so, I'm
50 in this meeting system all of the time. So, I think

1 things I take for granted that should be -- it's like,
2 well, of course you should know that's how that works.
3 I -- that's probably not true because most people
4 probably don't spend as much time going to meetings as
5 I do. But your point about people coming to these
6 meetings to say their peace and share their perspective,
7 share their concerns, share their requests. If we hear
8 that, then we can include it in our annual report, or
9 we can generate a letter and we can say, hey, we heard
10 this in public comment. Because we take that very
11 seriously. Then now you have basically the power of two
12 voices, because the original public comment and then our
13 voice going to the Federal Subsistence Board. And I mean,
14 that's how this process is supposed to work, but we
15 can't forward and amplify messages if we don't have the
16 message. So, I just want to really highlight that your
17 voice can be heard and you can make a difference. I
18 mean, I've seen it make a difference. But the first step
19 is just showing up and saying what you have to say. And
20 you don't have to show up if you don't want to speak
21 into the microphone, that can be really -- it can be
22 intimidating. You can speak to us one on one. You can
23 email us, you can email the program. So, there's multiple
24 ways of sharing. Sharing your feedback, sharing your
25 concerns, sharing your perspectives on things. And it
26 seems like maybe we should have this as a section like
27 the first section in every meeting. But it kind of came
28 up here, so I just wanted to make sure that I said that.
29 Again, for people who may not go to as many meetings and
30 kind of understand that the public comment part and the
31 public input is very, very important. Pat, go ahead.

32
33 MR. HOLMES: I would like to again
34 encourage our membership to do some more outreach. I was
35 really tickled when Brett applied for us because there'd
36 been a gap there since Vincent Tutiakoff retired for
37 representation from the Aleutians. I can recall, we used
38 to have a good representation from the Alaska Peninsula,
39 as we know, with Della, she's left. But before that, we
40 had, oh, pardon me, I forgot, but one of the leading
41 families from Nelson Lagoon. I think one person I want
42 to try to hustle is Stanley Mack at Sand Point because
43 he's been very active on the fisheries and politics and
44 things for the Alaska Peninsula for the last 40 years
45 or more. And so, maybe poking around and finding either
46 a, some young people that are enthusiastic or perhaps
47 some old geezers that doesn't do Facebook, but knows
48 what's happened and how to make things work in their
49 community. We should be poking around and chatting and
50 trying to encourage their -- applying for the RAC.

1 Because if we're short four people, we've lost a lot of
2 experience and distribution of concept and ideas in our
3 region. Thank you, Madam Chair.

4
5 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Are
6 there any further comments or questions?

7
8 (No response)

9
10 Okay. I'm not seeing any. Thank you for
11 the OSM report.

12
13 (Pause)

14
15 All right. So, I realized I kept missing
16 the first part of the report. The whole title is
17 Fisheries and Ecological Services Southwest Alaska
18 Distinct Population Segment of Northern Sea Otters. So,
19 if Paul Schuette is on, we'll go ahead and take that
20 report.

21
22 MR. SCHUETTE: Yeah. Can you hear me?

23
24 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: You're coming in
25 loud and clear. Thanks.

26
27 MR. SCHUETTE: Okay, great. Yeah, thanks.
28 Thanks for the time. Yeah. My name is Paul Schuette. I
29 know it looks like Schwedt, but it's Schuette. And I'm
30 here in Anchorage, Alaska, with Fish and Wildlife
31 Service Marine Mammals Management. And I'm the one and
32 only sea otter biologist currently. So, I wanted to give
33 an update on the southwest stock. For those that aren't
34 aware, there's three sea otter stocks in Alaska, the
35 Southeast Alaska stock, the Southcentral stock, and the
36 Southwest stock, which is listed as a as threatened under
37 the Endangered Species Act, as a distinct population
38 segment, and it was listed in 2005 following a pretty
39 dramatic declines in the 1990s, which was linked to the
40 most likely explanation is killer whale predation.

41
42 So, in 2021 or 2020, sorry, we developed
43 a species status assessment. So, a very comprehensive
44 document summarizing the biology and population status
45 and trends of each of the Southwest DPS. The Southwest
46 DPS is -- consists of five management units. So, there's
47 the Kodiak Western Cook Inlet Management Unit, at
48 Bristol Bay Unit, the South Alaska Peninsula Management
49 Unit, Eastern Aleutians and Western Aleutians. So, we
50 in our program try to -- every five to ten years, try

1 to get population estimates for each of those five
2 management units to track those populations. And those
3 were reported in the SPC status assessment in 2021. And
4 we did a five-year status review in 2021. And then we
5 just recently, 2026, actually just this past month, and
6 we updated that five-year status review for the
7 Southwest stock. And sea otters are continuing to be
8 listed as threatened.

9
10 The current status of each of those
11 management units. The Kodiak Western Cook Inlet
12 Management Unit is doing really well. It's probably most
13 people are aware there's a lot of sea otters around
14 Kodiak. Eastern Aleutians and Bristol Bay are doing are
15 doing pretty well. The Western Aleutians and South
16 Alaska Peninsula Management Units are still quite low
17 and haven't really shown much signs of recovery. So, our
18 plans moving forward, we have a couple big items that I
19 wanted to make people aware of. Well, first, the five-
20 year status review document I've shared via email and I
21 hope that can be made available to everyone attending
22 and on the email list, so you can read through the five-
23 year status review document. The second thing I wanted
24 to mention is that we have plans - we're in the planning
25 process of carrying out a widespread aerial survey using
26 photo-based methods hopefully starting next summer over
27 the next couple years. So, we have -- there hasn't been
28 a standardized aerial survey across all Southwest Alaska
29 region for sea otters since 2000. So, it's been 25 years.
30 Most of the surveys are done by boat or in kind of small
31 targeted areas every five to ten years, like I mentioned,
32 but there hasn't been a comprehensive survey like this
33 in close to 25 years. And for those that might be
34 familiar with the sea otter program a little bit, we did
35 something similar across all of Southeast Alaska in
36 2022. So, we have the methods in place and a really good
37 partner in place to carry out such a widespread, large
38 scale aerial survey for sea otters across Southwest,
39 which I think will be a pretty ambitious plan, especially
40 getting out to the Western Aleutians Management Unit.
41 So, I think we have a pretty good plan in place to get
42 that done in the next couple of years.

43
44 The last thing I wanted to mention is,
45 as we prepare for this aerial survey, we want to get
46 input from everyone that's interested. We did something
47 similar in Southeast Alaska to try to -- we designed the
48 survey -- the aerial survey with our partners at USGS
49 and ourselves. But we also reached out to other state
50 agencies, federal agencies, tribes, and other interested

1 parties to share that survey, design and gather input
2 and kind of modified our survey design to make sure we
3 captured the areas that people were interested in. So,
4 our population modeling is pretty flexible to
5 incorporate different types of surveys. So, to do that,
6 we're going to have -- we're planning a workshop in
7 March or April that is going to be led by Alaska
8 Department of Fish and Game in partnership with U.S.
9 Fish and Wildlife Service. So, we're starting to develop
10 a plan a couple sets of weeks that might work for as
11 many attendees as possible. And we're really looking for
12 people that are interested in attending this workshop.
13 The plan is for this to either be in Kodiak or in
14 Unalaska/Dutch Harbor area. So, I'm hoping that details
15 of this workshop can be shared in the meeting notes, but
16 also my email address, and if you want to reach out to
17 me to learn more about that workshop that would be great.
18 And also, if it's possible too, I can maybe just share
19 the details of this workshop to the email list for this
20 meeting. If I have permission to do that, that would
21 work as well because we're really trying to get as many
22 tribal community members to attend and other interested
23 parties. I see Matt Van Daele and Daniel Smith are on
24 the call. They're aware of this workshop, we've been
25 chatting with them about some of the plans. And we're
26 really trying to cast the net as widely as possible to
27 get as greater participation as possible. And
28 fortunately the -- there is funding for travel available
29 for a certain number of participants. So, we hope that
30 can increase participation as well because we know it's
31 expensive and difficult to travel across Southwest
32 Alaska. So, we're really excited about that workshop.
33 It's really -- at this point, it's pretty open ended.
34 We want to just capture all the key topics that are of
35 interest to members of the community. So, those are the
36 main updates I wanted to share. I'm happy to take any
37 questions.

38
39 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Great thanks. Pat,
40 go ahead.

41
42 MR. HOLMES: Yeah. Hi. Thank you for the
43 report. I'm glad that there's an agency working on sea
44 otters again. I looked through your bibliography, and I
45 noticed that there's no reference to the work of Karl
46 Schneider and ADF&G and the 60s era before the Endangered
47 Species Act. And as I recall there was a call from
48 particularly the Native Villages around the state and
49 the Alaska Board of Fish and Game at the time stimulated
50 work with the department on transplanting sea otters.

1 And they did an early experiment moving from the
2 Aleutians, I think 11, to Prince William Sound. And I
3 can't imagine they did it in a Grumman Goose and how you
4 would keep 11 otters contained in a Goose would have
5 been an exciting experience. But they -- population
6 there boomed right immediately afterwards. And the
7 amount of cubs for adult bloomed, and so, they went on
8 to transplant sea otters. They didn't do it in Kodiak
9 because there was a fair population building up in the
10 north Afognak and Shuyak areas. But they did proceed to
11 bring down a tremendous amount. And I don't know what
12 the numbers were, because that's a long time ago, to
13 Southeast. And unfortunately, and fortunately or
14 unfortunately, that is booming and causing difficulties
15 in the communities for them to get their subsistence as
16 well as conflicts on the commercial fishing side. So,
17 it certainly is a complex situation. And then with the
18 changes in regulations. But I would encourage you to go
19 back and see if you can do requests for the
20 (indiscernible) files at Fish and Game and see where the
21 otters went. They took most of them, from my
22 understanding, from Amchitka prior to the Amchitka
23 nuclear thing, as a way to preserve part of the
24 population, but also to improve the situation throughout
25 the rest of coastal Alaska. And I think that the -- I
26 think like in Sitka, the Tlingit folks, I used to talk
27 on the phone quite a bit with John Littlefield before
28 he passed away. And Tlingit tribe has their own little
29 cannery. And they found that by harvesting near the
30 village otters they've been able to improve their
31 subsistence on shellfish. And so, they've reached a
32 balance near the Sitka. But you know, the rest of the
33 state, the population is exploding. And so, that's a
34 positive thing. And then also a negative thing. So,
35 anyway, I -- I'm very encouraged to see that you folks
36 are being active in trying to study the populations and
37 then work with the indigenous folks around the state on
38 the management and contact on them.

39
40 I'd also like to make a short comment
41 on some of my experiences I recall in early 60s on
42 Shemya, that basically there were, I would bet fifty sea
43 urchins per square meter there and no otters at all. And
44 at that time, the Air Force allowed people to you know,
45 hunt around the island, whether they did otters, I
46 haven't a clue, but I know at the same time going over
47 to Attu, then the Laminaria and Nereocystis algae
48 populations were just incredible. And one could without
49 too much trouble, see a few otters in. And so, that
50 whole dynamic shifts around. And I would, I guess in

1 closing, I encourage you to contact and talk with folks
2 particularly that -- there's not too many people left,
3 but I know some of the elders there had some really
4 interesting stories about the sea otter population
5 fluctuations and their observations on orcas. And same
6 with some of the Native folks at Adak and on up the
7 Alaska Peninsula. So, I would commend you on your trying
8 to interact more with the village folks and share their
9 observations. So, my hat's off to you. And sorry to be
10 so gabby, Madam Chair.

11
12 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, Pat. I did
13 have a question. Can you describe the area for the
14 Southcentral population? So, I'm understanding, Kodiak
15 and Cook Inlet are in the Southwest population. What is
16 the general area for the Southcentral population?

17
18 MR. SCHUETTE: Yeah. So, that pretty much
19 -- so, the Southeast, if I go back to the Southeast
20 stock and we kind of work our way north and west up the
21 coast at Yakutat -- just after Yakutat is where the
22 Southcentral stock occurs. So, across Prince -- into
23 Prince William Sound, Cordova, Valdez, Seward, Homer,
24 Kachemak Bay, all of that region into Eastern Cook Inlet.
25 So, the dividing line between the Southcentral and
26 Southwest stock is like the middle of Cook Inlet.

27
28 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, thank
29 you. Coral.

30
31 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah. I had a similar
32 question. Do you have maps available of these particular
33 areas? And then also, in this area that we're looking
34 at Southwest Alaska, do you have maps of these areas,
35 and do you have I guess population densities in these
36 areas? Because I know like Kodiak -- I'm familiar with
37 Kodiak. And then but there's Kodiak, Kamishak, Alaska
38 Peninsula altogether. So, I'm interested in if you have
39 maps of population densities within these areas.

40
41 MR. SCHUETTE: Yeah. Thanks for that
42 question. Yeah, there's a few different sources. So,
43 that five-year status review has the latest population
44 estimates for each of the five management units in it.
45 There's not any maps in there. But in the species status
46 assessment I can share a link with that, that has an
47 extensive number of maps with where the aerial surveys
48 have been conducted and sea otter abundance density
49 estimates are in there, if that's helpful. Those are two
50 pretty comprehensive documents.

1
2 And can I -- if I could go back to the
3 first comment real quick. I wanted to say I really
4 appreciated those comments about Schneider. Because
5 yeah, I -- we really admire the work of Schneider and
6 Karl Kenyon as well, back into the 1960s, those were
7 really kind of the most comprehensive in-depth
8 assessments of sea otters and nearshore ecosystems that
9 inspired James Estes work out there for several decades.
10 So, -- but those are really kind of the classic sets of
11 ecological work that we still refer to quite regularly.
12 It's really, really impressive work.

13
14 Another comment I want to make is about
15 the Sitka story. So, I could share a link to a document.
16 We partnered with the Sealaska Heritage Program a couple
17 years ago. And they basically wrote a book on the Sitka
18 story. Reaching out to sea otter hunters, interviewed a
19 number of hunters and talked about the relationship
20 between sea otter harvest and shellfish populations.
21 It's a really great piece of work that was put together
22 by Sealaska Heritage that I think is it's very relevant
23 to Southeast Alaska, but also quite relevant to other
24 sea otter populations. You know, I think Kodiak in
25 particular, it would be of interest. And that kind of
26 leads into the last question -- comment about ecosystem
27 shifts. You mentioned Shemya Attu, Atka, Adak, and yeah,
28 that's very much a big part of our interest is dating
29 back to Kenyon and Estes work on these trophic cascades
30 between killer whales, sea otters, sea urchins, and kelp
31 forests. So, in 2021, we -- that was the last time we
32 were out in the Aleutians. And we have a scuba dive team
33 and (indiscernible) drop underwater camera systems that
34 we're trying to continue that long term data collection.
35 To track not just the sea otter populations, but the
36 ecosystem overall, the changes in the sea urchin and
37 kelp forest dynamics. And we hope to continue to do that
38 work out there as well. And then lastly, the comment
39 about the elders from Adak and Atka, that's exactly the
40 kind of people we love to interact with more and try to
41 get to participate in this workshop coming up in the
42 spring. So, please feel free to share my email address
43 and reach out to me as well, because we'd love to have
44 as many participants with that type of knowledge as
45 possible.

46
47 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. I was
48 just leaning over to ask Leigh, if you send email notices
49 or reports to Leigh Honig, she can distribute that
50 appropriately. I think I was already on an email chain

1 about scheduling that workshop. So, I think originally
2 you were aiming for September and then that didn't work.
3 So, it sounds like it's being moved back. I'm not sure
4 how, you know, who else was picked up on that list. But
5 if you send it to Leigh, we can absolutely distribute
6 it. And Pat, did you have your hand up?

7
8 MR. HOLMES: I may -- one other question
9 rather briefly. In chatting with the folks at Fish and
10 Wildlife Service Refuge here in Kodiak over the last 40-
11 50 years, I remember one of their bird people that would
12 be out in the field and I believe it was one of the last
13 aerial survey was done for otters. And their
14 observations were -- is that the distribution of otters
15 within the bay was a direct relationship to the
16 predominant winds on the time period of the survey. And
17 so, I'm wondering on your surveys, are your surveys done
18 aerially -- aerial surveys done in a linear transect,
19 just straight lines, certain areas, same place all the
20 time, or are they adaptive for the time of the survey?
21 And then also, if it's adaptive, do you do a stratified
22 sampling where a, the head of the bay might be quite
23 densely populated, or is it just a linear shot straight
24 down the bay and not necessarily on one side or the
25 other? Because the actual technique on doing your
26 population estimates is going to be quite variable and
27 needs to be adaptive while you're doing it. So, just a
28 brief observation and comment, but I'm sure glad you
29 folks are getting back in the game. Thank you.

30
31 MR. SCHUETTE: Yeah, yeah. Thank you for
32 that comment on survey design. Yeah. Those are also great
33 comments that we want to incorporate in our survey design
34 planning for this aerial survey coming up. Because we
35 have historical surveys or prior surveys that have been
36 done. Most of those are typically done perpendicular or
37 on line transect perpendicular from shore, extending out
38 in a systematic or random design. But we have kind of
39 increased flexibility as we illustrated in Southeast
40 Alaska to kind of stratify the sampling design a bit
41 more based on local conditions. So, yeah, we'll
42 definitely keep those ideas in mind and welcome a lot
43 more feedback like that as we design the survey over the
44 next year. And yeah, I really like what you said about
45 adaptive designs because yeah, that is a big concern for
46 -- not concern, but something that we want to account
47 for is how weather conditions are on any particular day
48 could affect distribution and abundance and visibility
49 of otters. So, oftentimes we do replicates, try to fly
50 over one to five replicates so we cover variable

1 conditions. So, those are things we do try to account
2 for as well. I appreciate the comment.

3

4 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Sorry, Brett. Go
5 ahead.

6

7 MR. RICHARDSON: Brett Richardson,
8 Unalaska. Thank you for this report. I have a couple
9 questions maybe on page 7, there's table 2. You're
10 listing potential threats in the northern sea otter
11 community and, you know, there's quite a few. And if you
12 go near the end, the subsistence harvest in the area had
13 some moderate, low or unknown threat. And then Kodiak
14 area, it says it's a moderate threat. Now my -- I guess
15 my question would be is that purposeful subsistence
16 harvest or is that like accidental bycatch of sea otters?
17 If that's even a possible thing, excuse my ignorance.

18

19 MR. SCHUETTE: I don't -- I'm just
20 looking at the table real quick. Subsistence. No, I think
21 that's just the total number of legal, you know,
22 authorized harvest. Like what's the harvest impacts on
23 population status. Is it [sic] have no effect or does
24 it -- does control -- does it control the population in
25 any way. So, these are just kind of rough categorical
26 explanations and based on -- so, we do have the mark and
27 tagging reporting program that that tracks sea otter
28 harvest. So, I think what this table -- this is from the
29 Species Status Assessment 2020, I think what it's
30 indicating is the total number of reported harvest by
31 sea otters, in 4 of the 5 management units is quite low.
32 There's not a lot of sea otters harvested in those
33 regions. And Kodiak, Kamishak, Alaska Peninsula is
34 listed as moderate, not to necessarily say that the
35 harvest levels are affecting the population much. It's
36 just that there's a moderate level of harvest in that
37 region relative to the other four areas, because that's
38 where most sea otters are harvested in Southwest Alaska.

39

40 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Go ahead.

41

42 MR. RICHARDSON: All right. Great. Thank
43 you. And then on page 5, you have an estimated available
44 habitat table. And then going over the Western Aleutians
45 region, It looks like the carrying capacity is pretty
46 high but the abundance estimate is pretty low. You know,
47 it seems to be a pretty bad situation actually. So, what
48 would you attribute that -- the threat -- what's the
49 largest threat to the sea otters in this area?

50

1 MR. SCHUETTE: Yeah. The most likely
2 explanation has -- is killer whale predation. So, that's
3 what Jim Estes came up with back in the late 90s, is
4 increased predation pressure from killer whales as they
5 switched from -- kind of the working hypothesis is that
6 they were -- killer whales were hunting -- the mammal
7 eating killer whales that were eating small whales.
8 Those whale populations declined, and then killer whales
9 switched to sea lions, and sea lions were in decline.
10 And then they switched to harbor seals and harbor seals
11 declined. And then sea otters were kind of the last one
12 of the marine mammals with large populations. And killer
13 whales then preyed upon them. So, that's the most likely
14 explanation. There's been a lot of great work by Tim
15 Tinker and Dan Monson and others over the last couple
16 of decades trying to rule out all the other possible
17 explanations. So, there isn't really any signs of
18 disease. Is there really any signs of other
19 contaminants? It all kind of lends itself towards the
20 explanation that that killer whales could have caused
21 this. And it's pretty apparent, I mean, it's really
22 difficult to see killer whales killing sea otters in
23 pretty remote areas. But it certainly makes sense when
24 you do go out there, you know, if you go into Kachemak
25 Bay or on Kodiak or Valdez, you see sea otters kind of
26 all over the place and pretty far from shore in these
27 areas where they're abundant. But when you go out to
28 Adak and further west into Attu, sea otters are --
29 they're not only low in abundance, but they're also super
30 skittish and found only really close to shore, usually
31 less than like a 100 meters from shore or even 50 meters
32 from shore. And in really shallow water, like 10-15 feet.
33 So like, I'm currently working on a paper to kind of
34 illustrate this more but because we have all the sea
35 otter location data from recent surveys out there. But
36 they really give all the telltale signs that they are
37 limited by predation risk by killer whales. So, only
38 occurring really close to shore and really shallow
39 waters. And that is a concern because they're often
40 limited to these really shallow bays and harbors. So,
41 there's concerns that even if they are doing well in
42 some of these predation refuges, they're not easily able
43 to disperse across kind of deeper open water to
44 repopulate areas where they've declined. It's a pretty,
45 pretty fascinating story. You know, I -- be great to --
46 yeah. It's an area of great interest to me for sure.

47
48 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Great, thanks.
49 Daniel, you have your hand up.
50

1 MR. SMITH: Yeah. Thank you, Madam Chair.
2 And yeah, thanks for the report, Paul. I have a couple
3 questions. One was also in relation to Table 2, related
4 to the genetic diversity of the different units. Are
5 those units considered genetically distinct within the
6 Southwest Alaska DPS? Amongst let's say Kodiak and then
7 Eastern Aleutians, Western Aleutians, Bristol Bay, or
8 is there potential mixing between the populations? Or
9 is that data just not really known at this point? But
10 that kind of just sparked my interest with the genetic
11 diversity you have as a threat there. And then the second
12 question is, you know, a concern of mine is, you know,
13 especially in Kodiak with the apparent increase in sea
14 otter populations and in Chiniak Bay specifically. And
15 also looking, you know, on page 5 with the carrying
16 capacity in Kodiak definitely hasn't reached that
17 threshold yet, but I guess is competitive impacts
18 considered a stressor within this analysis? Mainly
19 competition amongst sea otters and if there's any sort
20 of indication that some of these sea otters are
21 nutritionally stressed in the areas where there are more
22 abundant. Sorry, there are kind of two big questions,
23 but I just wanted to maybe see if you have some responses
24 to those. Thanks.

25
26 MR. SCHUETTE: Yeah. Thanks, Daniel.
27 Yeah, those are great questions. Yeah. Genetic diversity
28 that -- so, there's a paper that's referenced in here
29 by Flannery at -- looking at genetic -- kind of genetic
30 uniqueness among the three stocks of Southeast
31 Southcentral and Southwest, but not at the finer scale
32 of within the five management units of Southwest. That's
33 something that is of great interest to us. If you know
34 Dan Monson, who's now retired from USGS, that's a big
35 question he's had and been pushing for myself and others
36 to try to investigate. I think it would be a really
37 fascinating study to look at how isolated these
38 populations are within the five management units and
39 what their kind of historic and current levels of genetic
40 connectivity are. Because there are concerns that if
41 they are increasingly isolated by small population
42 sizes, like I was talking about in the Western Aleutians
43 in particular that they may be experiencing some sort
44 of bottleneck genetically. So, that's something that
45 would be really interesting to do. We just would need
46 the samples. That's kind of what came out in that
47 Flannery work is there just wasn't enough -- we didn't
48 have enough sea otters or they didn't have enough sea
49 otter samples available to kind of go to that fine scale.
50 But that's something we'd love to pursue in the future.

1 It's a really interesting consideration for sure for the
2 conservation of sea otters in Southwest.

3
4 And then your other question about
5 Kodiak and competition among sea otters and nutritional
6 stress, that's a really good question. So yeah, this
7 kind of comes up in Southeast Alaska too, when there's
8 a -- an estimate of carrying capacity. And then there's
9 like the most recent abundance estimates. And when the
10 population is not a carrying capacity, there's concerns
11 in particular bays or regions of interest that maybe sea
12 otters are going to like get even more densely populated.
13 And in Southeast, for example, there's a lot of areas
14 where sea otters have not repopulated yet. So, it's not
15 necessarily that certain bays will get more and more
16 otters because there just wouldn't be enough food, and
17 they're not going to eat themselves out of house and
18 home. They'll repopulate areas where they're not
19 currently abundant. So, I don't have the distribution
20 map for Kodiak in front of me but if there's other
21 regions that sea otters haven't repopulated or are less
22 densely populated, that's where sea otters could go. But
23 to your question about nutritional stress, that's a
24 really good question. That's something we can also talk
25 about at the workshop. Because there's a really nice --
26 nicely established methods that USGS has been doing for
27 a few decades on sea otter foraging observations and by
28 observing sea otters and what they're consuming and
29 their rate of foraging dives. You can look at basically
30 how hard they have to work to obtain the food they need.
31 So, you can use that as an indication of whether they're
32 nutritionally stressed or not relative to their
33 population abundance. So, that's something -- it's a
34 really neat method in a way of looking at population
35 density and nutritional stress in sea otters and the
36 status of an ecosystem overall that we -- USGS carries
37 out those surveys long term across Southcentral and a
38 little bit in Southwest Alaska. And it's something we'd
39 love to expand to other areas as well. Yeah, something
40 that we can add to the list of good topics for the
41 workshop as well.

42
43 MR. SMITH: All right. Thank you, Paul.

44
45 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat, Go ahead.

46
47 MR. HOLMES: Yeah, that's really
48 interesting. I was wondering on the genetics, if there
49 might have been any samples or if you could get your
50 profiles from any of the pelts or whatever were collected

1 at Amchitka and see where the Central Aleutian
2 population, if some of that structure carried through
3 into Prince William Sound and Southeast, where so many
4 of the otters were transplanted. And the other comment
5 I would have is nutritionally [sic] stress. I think
6 that's probably very significant because I noticed when
7 I used to do a lot of field work around Kodiak, as the
8 population increased and they moved down from Shuyak and
9 west side of Afognak into the main parts of Kodiak, that
10 you'd see populations of -- I can recall counting 250,
11 500 sea otters within a couple square miles of Uganik
12 Pass on the west side. And then stopping there later in
13 the season and finding literally pits that would be four
14 or five feet deep, where they had just gone in and such
15 great numbers to basically vacuum clean out all of the
16 butter clams and things like that. And so, that's
17 obviously significant. But then when they -- if the
18 population is reasonably stable and they can't get to
19 their food because of the otters, and that obviously is
20 giving you quite a bit of complex relationships to try
21 to evaluate. Gee, I wish I had some -- Uncle Ted was
22 still alive and ask him to give you guys a million bucks
23 to do some extra work because it's really needed. Thank
24 you very much.

25
26 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Are
27 there any further comments or questions?

28
29 (No comments)

30
31 All right. I'm not seeing any. Thank you
32 Paul Schuette for that -- the report. It was really
33 helpful. And I think we had some good dialogue on it
34 this morning. So, that concludes the report section of
35 the agenda, so the entire number fourteen section. We're
36 going to take a 10-minute break now so that staff can
37 set up for the closure reviews and fishery proposal
38 section. So, let's go ahead and come back at 10:15.
39 Thanks.

40
41 (Off Record)

42
43 (On Record)

44
45 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, so
46 calling the meeting back to order. We're now on the
47 section of the agenda 11.a, the -- these are fishery
48 closure reviews and fishery proposals. And I will hand
49 it over to Anna Senecal to start us off.

50

1 MS. SENEAL: Okay. Good morning, Madam
2 Chair, Council members. For the record, my name is Anna
3 Senecal and I'm a fisheries biologist for the Office of
4 Subsistence Management. So, we spoke yesterday a little
5 bit at a high level about the Unalaska proposals and how
6 they relate to each other. And today we're rolling right
7 in to further deliberation and your action items. So,
8 that's exciting. So, you have five fisheries closure
9 reviews and five proposals to consider. I want to go
10 back to that overview really quick and clarify something
11 that I don't think I addressed very well yesterday. So,
12 if you reference page 10 of your supplemental materials
13 for the map, the bottom map of the superimposed closures.
14 There was a question, what happens if you rescind the
15 umbrella Unalaska closure? How does that affect the
16 other ones? The other ones would still be in place
17 because they're double dipped. Okay. And then looking
18 at the agenda, the way the flow of the related proposals
19 and closure reviews goes, we're addressing proposals
20 first, and the action on the proposal may render the
21 closure review null. So, you may not need to take it up.
22 However, it's important for OSM to understand the
23 intention of the Council regarding the closure review
24 in the case -- the unusual case, unlikely case, that the
25 Federal Subsistence Board does not vote in line with
26 your recommendations on the proposal. Does that make
27 sense?

28
29 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: No. Can you say
30 that using more in different words? Because I didn't
31 follow what the point of the concern is.

32
33 MS. SENEAL: For example, the Unalaska
34 umbrella closure or proposal rather, if the
35 recommendation is in line with the OSM recommendation
36 to support it. It would in effect render the paired
37 closure review null, it would take the place of it. So,
38 you don't necessarily have to take up the closure review
39 in that instance. However, what if the Board doesn't
40 support your recommendation? We need to know what your
41 intent is regarding the closure as well.

42
43 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. So, I think
44 what I'll do then from a -- being on this side of the
45 table, even after we vote on the proposal, I'll just
46 then have a little bit of discussion on the closure
47 review. We won't -- if we don't need to, we won't take
48 action but I'll just make sure to get some comments.
49 Thank you.
50

1 MS. SENECA: That sounds wonderful.
2 Okay, so again, Anna Senecal for the record. We are
3 tackling the paired proposals and closure reviews in a
4 single presentation. A lot of the information is
5 redundant. It is the same. So, you'll be asked to act
6 on the proposal. If the proposal passes, it takes the
7 place of the closure essentially rendering it null.
8 However it's -- so, we talked about, it's important for
9 us to understand your intent. And the first proposal
10 we're taking up is that big umbrella proposal, Unalaska
11 Bay Rod and Reel. It's on page 19 of your RAC book, and
12 the associated closure review is page 47. So, each of
13 these Unalaska proposals and closure reviews have the
14 same or very similar regulatory history, cultural
15 harvest and biology background information. So, the
16 subsequent presentation -- so, not only are the
17 proposals similar to the closure reviews because they're
18 so close together and the data are limited, they are
19 very similar to each other. So, subsequent presentations
20 are going to be pretty brief unless you ask for
21 additional follow up information and you do have it all
22 in your books.

23
24 Okay. So, the issue associated with
25 proposal 27-02, that's the Unalaska Bay Rod and Reel,
26 requests that the Federal Subsistence Board establish
27 rod and reel subsistence salmon fishing limits
28 throughout Unalaska Bay freshwaters consistent with
29 State sport fishing regulations. And the intent here
30 really is to remove that 25 year old standing closure
31 to Federal subsistence fishing. And that, again, is the
32 parallel closure review, that's 27-06, page 47. This
33 proposal was submitted by yourselves, the
34 Kodiak/Aleutians Subsistence Regional Advisory Council.
35 And as a reminder, the Council would be acting on the
36 proposal, 27-02. So, the proponent statement that's you.
37 This area has been closed to Federal subsistence fishing
38 since 2001, but during that time, the area has remained
39 open to sport fishing. And this runs counter to the
40 subsistence priority required by Title VIII of ANILCA.
41 The proponent seeks to limit any conservation concerns
42 associated with rescinding the Unalaska closure by
43 limiting allowable gear to rod and reel and matching
44 seasons and areas to State sport fishing regulations.
45 So, when considering rescinding closures, there's always
46 a conservation concern or it's always a point of
47 consideration. Instead of rescinding the closure and
48 opening the area up to, -- area -- Federal subsistence,
49 general Federal subsistence regulations, which would
50 have higher limits, which wouldn't have the gear

1 restrictions, the Council has chosen to put forward this
2 proposal that is more conservative and limits those --
3 reduces those limits and restricts those gear types to
4 be in line with State subsistence. And there are seasonal
5 restrictions in there as well.

6
7 In terms of regulatory history, as is
8 the case with many of the Unalaska closure reviews we'll
9 consider today, this area dates back again to the early
10 2000s after the Board announced regulations for
11 subsistence fishing and navigable waters. Many of those
12 initial regulations were carried over from the State
13 regulations, and the assumption there was that the State
14 would resume management of Federal subsistence resources
15 at the earliest opportunity. This has not transpired.
16 So currently, the Federal subsistence regulations
17 require that these closures be review [sic] every --
18 reviewed every four years as a matter of process. These
19 closures were first reviewed in 2021 at the Board meeting
20 and deferred in order to gather community input, which
21 was in line with your recommendations at the time. The
22 Board took these closures up again at their 2023 meeting
23 and voted to maintain status quo. So, they voted to keep
24 the closures in place based on RAC input regarding
25 conservation concerns and enforcement. In March of 2026,
26 so this last meeting cycle, you reviewed the closures
27 again as non-action items, and this gave you time to
28 prepare parallel proposals that would address some of
29 those conservation concerns. And what you see before you
30 today in FP27-02 is an example of that proposal resulting
31 from that process.

32
33 In terms of culture, harvest and
34 biology, we know you know very well harvesting wild
35 resources has been and continues to be central to local
36 identity, culture and economy. Today, people across the
37 region continue to practice and value a subsistence way
38 of life with the combination of subsistence and
39 commercial fishing forming a key basis for the
40 maintenance of individual -- this is a quote,
41 "individual identity, social relationships, and
42 collective identity and livelihood". So, the drainages
43 -- the area that we're considering is large, the whole
44 -- all the watersheds that drain into Unalaska Bay.
45 Collectively, those drainages support all species of
46 Pacific salmon save chinook. The major Unalaska Bay
47 tributaries that have been discussed and get paid
48 attention to, the Makushin, the Nateekin, Shaishnikof,
49 plus those adjacent tributaries that we visited
50 yesterday so the Iliuliuk, Summers and Morris drainages.

1 And we heard yesterday in public comment how those road
2 adjacent systems are important to local residents given
3 the accessibility and how those runs return to them.
4 Just -- it doesn't require expensive boats. It doesn't
5 require fuel. We also heard about the vulnerability of
6 those systems, how small they are, how accessible they
7 are, and the lack of law enforcement. We know in this
8 area that there's limited survey information to go on.
9 A lot of these areas are hard to access. They're not
10 indexed annually. The surveys are expensive and are
11 prone to being delayed or discontinued truncated given
12 weather. So, these road adjacent systems have had aerial
13 drone surveys since 2018; 2018 through 2023 are the
14 publicly available data. And we also have some weir data
15 to go off of. So, weir at the mouth of Town Creek
16 Unalaska Lake. So, we have information on the Unalaska
17 Lake drainage, Summers Lake and Morris Lakes. And then
18 we can make inference. You have anecdotal information.
19 You have community input for those systems that are
20 further afield and not on the road system. So, the drone
21 averages for that time period for Unalaska Lake around
22 500 sockeye salmon. Summers Lake quite a bit higher,
23 around 2400. And Morris Lake quite low, around 200.
24 Pairing the drone averages with the one year of weir
25 data that were [sic] available at the time of this
26 analysis, it -- there is a discrepancy between the drone
27 estimates and the weir counts. The weir's being much
28 higher. So, put a grain of salt there. And I'm
29 referencing table 2, that's on page 29 of your meeting
30 books.

31
32 In terms of alternatives considered, of
33 course, we considered what general area wide Federal
34 subsistence regulations would look like in the case of
35 rescinding the closure and not coming forward with that
36 more conservative proposal. And there were conservation
37 concerns associated with that. So, we know we're working
38 with limited data. A lack of escapement goals. We know
39 that these systems are remote. Particularly the ones off
40 the road system. They're expensive to survey and they're
41 hard to get to. We also know that sport fishing
42 regulations are in place throughout this watershed.
43 While the system support small populations, fishing
44 pressure according to State subsistence surveys is
45 unlikely to increase. So, what I have is a quote is,
46 "community input suggests that these changes are
47 unlikely to result in increased harvest pressure, as
48 rural users are already engaging in consumptive harvest
49 practices under State regulations". So, under state rod
50 and reel regulations mitigating any conservation

1 concerns. Perhaps not any but mitigating some
2 conservation concerns. So, there is a documented
3 practice of subsistence use regardless of the management
4 structure that it takes place under, whether it's sport
5 -- State sport fishing with rod and reel, whether it's
6 state or pardon me, State subsistence fishing in the
7 marine waters with nets. We understand that the fish are
8 harvested and they're taken home and they're consumed
9 for the most part, if they're taken legally. And I'm
10 sure there'll be more discussion around that.

11
12 So, what would happen were this proposal
13 to move forward? Instead of -- our hypothesis that is.
14 Instead of adding additional users to the user base,
15 what it would do is, it would allow those harvesters to
16 choose the management system they prefer to operate
17 under. It also allows an in-season manager the authority
18 to provide that priority under ANILCA and provide some
19 conservation safeguards there. So, the in-season manager
20 would have the ability to close the federal fishery to
21 non-qualified users, for example. And that's not
22 something that is currently available. So, the OSM
23 preliminary conclusion given all of that is to support
24 the proposal. The justification being that for the
25 remote locations the user base is unlikely to increase
26 and there is an existing sport fishery. Even for those
27 road adjacent systems, there is an argument that the
28 users that currently operate under the State sportfish
29 program management system would have -- would
30 redistribute if they so choose, to the federal system.
31 So, we wouldn't be adding users. We would be a
32 redistribution. And it is really our charge every 4 years
33 to pick up these closures and look at them really closely
34 and think about them in the context of when they were
35 established. And what the community and the population
36 looks like now and make the decision whether or not
37 they're still useful. Are they useful? So, our jobs are
38 to provide as much opportunity and priority for those
39 federally qualified users as is biologically sustainable
40 and possible.

41
42 So, some things to bear in mind for this
43 particular suite of closures. So, rescinding the
44 Unalaska closure here and adopting language to match
45 State sportfish throughout the waters draining to
46 Unalaska Bay could apply to Summers and Morrison and
47 Unalaska Lake drainages as well. This again is the
48 umbrella proposal. So, I have three choose your own
49 adventures. Three paths for you to consider. So,
50 consider if the closures are rescinded and you have a 1

1 to 1 Federal and State regulatory match across the Board.
2 Consider if the closures are modified. So, in this case
3 Morris Lake drainage remains closed. You have one carve
4 out from that 1 to 1 match across the Board. And then
5 finally this third option -- and there are more, you
6 have many options available to you. Consider if the
7 Unalaska lake closure is maintained. So, then you have
8 two small polygons, two small watersheds that are closed
9 within the larger area. And those are all options
10 available to you. So, that concludes my presentation on
11 this proposal FP27-02. And I'm very happy to take any
12 questions.

13
14 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. Thank you,
15 Anna. Can you talk a little bit more, using more words,
16 maybe some examples about the aspect of rescinding the
17 closure and opening? So, allowing a Federal subsistence
18 closure would give the in-season manager more
19 flexibility, for example, to close the fishery to the
20 non-federal -- federally qualified users. Can you just
21 talk a little bit more about that to make sure we
22 understand what the -- kind of what that option is, what
23 it looks like when it's available, et cetera?

24
25 MS. SENECA: I can certainly try. So,
26 it seems counterintuitive that adding an additional
27 management system, basically a different way to harvest
28 fish, would give more conservation support, would be
29 more conservative than not opening up an additional
30 avenue to harvest fish. But in this case, the assumption
31 here, based on the information available to us, is that
32 the existing users using -- utilizing that harvest
33 opportunity are unlikely to change, they're mostly rural
34 users. Which means they would qualify as federal --
35 federally qualified subsistence users. However, if there
36 are folks from Anchorage, for example, that travel to
37 your beautiful community and are interested in
38 harvesting some fish and seeing some systems, and they
39 would like to go out with rod and reel and catch some
40 of these species, and we do know that there are
41 conservation concerns, the in-season manager could make
42 the decision to close that fishery to non-federally
43 qualified users, to federally qualified subsistence
44 users, to all users. So, they can do any number of those
45 things. So, you would have the opportunity for -- to
46 restrict access to that resource to only the rural
47 residents of your community. So, only the federally
48 qualified subsistence users. I don't think that, again,
49 based on the information available to me it doesn't seem
50 like that is a significant source of take, but it exists.

1 I'm assuming it exists. I'm seeing affirmative nods from
2 Council members. And so, that's a lever that is not
3 currently available and would be if there's no federal
4 harvest. So, the in-season manager, the federal in
5 season manager has no jurisdiction to restrict the
6 fishery in times of conservation needs using a special
7 action, temporary or emergency that would be available
8 if there were a federal fishery here.

9
10 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Great. Thank you.
11 Are there any questions on the analysis that was just
12 presented? Pat, go ahead.

13
14 MR. HOLMES: Could you repeat your last
15 question that -- your information there, I -- my brain
16 kind of shut off for a moment.

17
18 MS. SENEAL: Sure. I'll sure try. Not
19 doing a great job with brevity. The -- if this proposal
20 passes, harvesters could choose if they want to fish
21 under State sportfish regulations, or if they want to
22 fish under Federal subsistence regulations. And the
23 regulations would match; they would be the same. Under
24 Federal subsistence regulations, you would, of course,
25 have to be a rural resident. You would have to be a
26 federally qualified subsistence user. So, somebody from
27 Anchorage or Fairbanks or Kenai, could not fly to Dutch
28 Harbor and fish under the federal management system.
29 They would have to fish under the State sportfish system.
30 If there were a federal fishery in place within waters
31 under Federal jurisdiction and there were conservation
32 concerns, the federal in season manager could choose to
33 engage, explore, use of a management tool. So, a special
34 action, either emergency short duration or temporary
35 potentially longer duration, that could restrict access
36 of that fishery to only federally qualified users, or
37 to nobody. That's not currently available because there
38 is no federal fishery, there is only the State sport
39 fishery. So, there's no Federal jurisdiction. The in-
40 season management is on the state side.

41
42 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Coral, you -- Pat,
43 did that answer your question? Okay. Can you hit your
44 microphone? Thanks. Coral, your hand was up. If you'd
45 like to think I can call on Brett.

46
47 (Talking)

48
49 I need to -- yeah, we need bidding
50 paddles so it can be clear up. Brett, go ahead.

1

2

MR. RICHARDSON: Thanks for explaining all that. I know this is -- it can get complicated. So, and I'm not sure if you're the best one to answer this, but since everybody in Unalaska -- subsistence users operating on a State permit, not a federal permit. Would this change that at all? Since the Federal waters are the fresh waters, say in Nateekin we're going for is to be able to from the mouth to the marker two miles in, be able to fish those waters as subsistence user. Would that change on the state side, and how would that look?

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. SENEAL: Through the Chair. That's a great question. You would still be required to -- a federal user fishing under the federal system would still be required to get a State permit because there is no federal permit here, and that is in regulation. The Council or proponent, anybody can come forward at the next regulatory cycle and propose to change that but right now that is in regulation. So, you still have to go get a State permit. But you'd be fishing under the Federal Management System.

MR. RICHARDSON: Understood. Did the State permit regulations change then automatically, or is it just assumed like if I'm on my State permit in those waters, I can just tell enforcement, no, I'm fishing federally right now.

MS. SENEAL: Through the Chair. I'm honestly -- I don't know the answer to that question. How do you communicate that you're fishing under one system if you are required to have a State permit. So, I'm waiting for a friend to phone in.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Can I ask another question while you're waiting?

MS. SENEAL: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So, I want to clarify this to make sure I understand what you said a little bit ago. So, opening -- I'm going to use the word opening a Federal subsistence fishery would allow the in-season manager -- this is the part I want to understand. To close the subsistence -- close all, to restrict state fisheries. So, if we have a federal fishery, the season manager can basically disallow state fishing and only allow fishing by federally qualified users. Is that a correct interpretation of what you said?

1

2

MS. SENEAL: That that is correct. But it only applies to waters which we have jurisdiction over which are limited.

5

6

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat, go ahead.

7

8

MR. HOLMES: Explain how the in-season manager is going to take place, because I understand there's only one person with the Maritime refuge. And I don't even know if they're hired. And then there's, I believe -- I might be wrong in all this, but there's like one person that's a dedicated salmon person for the whole state. How are they going to know what's going on in the streams and how are they going to make in-season judgment? Who's going to advise them? To me, that seems an impossible task to be done from Anchorage or Juneau.

18

19

MS. SENEAL: Through the Chair, member Holmes. That's a great point. Your delegated federal in season manager here is out of Anchorage out of the Fish and Wildlife Service field office, Jon Gerken, who we heard from yesterday, around the FRMP. And it is frankly -- I'm sure it feels like an impossible task. The data are [sic] limited. It does seem like there are some additional opportunities that are coming to light around seeking external funding sources, the involvement with the Q Tribe. But there has to be communication between among the communities and the managers. And I'm sure that's something that would be explored. But you're right, it's not a cookie cutter perfect system. It is -- it's not black and white. It requires that folks talk to each other and make the best use of the data that are [sic] available.

34

35

Okay, I have a -- information coming in. So, the federal in-season manager can currently close the state fishery to all through his delegated authority letter. However, he cannot provide Federal subsistence priority limit to federally qualified users because there is no Federal subsistence fishery in this area. So currently, under the current structure, with the closure in place, you can close -- the manager could close to all. But you cannot give the priority to federally qualified users, pardon me, because there's no federal fishery. And then to -- back to your question, member Richardson, the harvester under the federal system, using the State permit, would just say they are fishing under federal regulations. And it's really for data. It's -- we're -- yeah.

50

1

2

MR. RICHARDSON: Okay. So, no paper hard copy proof required?

4

5

MS. SENEAL: No, sir.

6

7

MR. RICHARDSON: And then somewhat related might be, if I am -- so, this becomes subsistence, I can set a net on a beach and take a rod and reel up the stream? And it's all subsistence? Currently, if it's state, that's not allowed, right? State sports fishing while subsisting at the same time would become subsistence. So, I could theoretically send my wife, who's on my permit, to fish in the river legally, and then have take on my vessel at the same time. Is that is that correct? Do you know?

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

MS. SENEAL: I feel like that's not true. But I'm waiting for someone to help me out. You have to choose one system to participate under. But if they don't overlap -- so like, for example, the State subsistence fisheries and the marine waters, the jurisdiction doesn't overlap. So, I'm not clear on that. And I'm waiting for somebody to chime in. So, is it possible for an individual who would be federally qualified to participate in the state marine subsistence fishery and hold a -- and also participate in the Federal subsistence fishery in fresh waters, is that possible? And that's what we're waiting to find out.

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

MR. RICHARDSON: Just to add to that, I think the reasoning behind it is simply because it's all being reported on one State permit, right? If there were a separate reporting system, separation, it would kind of be obvious that it wouldn't be allowed. To my thinking.

38

39

40

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat, are you trying to jump in?

41

42

43

44

45

46

MR. HOLMES: If I may.

47

48

49

50

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yep. Go ahead. And I think we're still waiting on answers to come in but go ahead.

MR. HOLMES: I guess what I'd like to get on the record here is that the existing regulations and restrictions on harvesting fish within streams that are -- that part that's closed, this whole thing has been

1 an evolution that has been driven locally at the request
2 of local folks and through the local Fish and Game
3 Advisory Committee, and their concerns that this evolved
4 from was the potential of overharvest and damaging of
5 returning runs. We had our little tour of the systems
6 here, and one can -- the -- like for the Iliuliuk is
7 closed from the Bishop's hole out it's open, but that's
8 the end of it within stream. Because folks here used to
9 see when it was open to rod and reel, before they
10 implemented the restrictions that exist now, literally
11 hundreds of people down in that little section of the
12 stream that's ten feet wide, hundreds of people fishing
13 and snagging fish. And so, when you have that happen,
14 that has potential impact on the spawning fish. The
15 evolution of the net fishing, particularly on Town
16 Beach, I can't help but think that the adaptation of
17 recently for adjusting the time periods where it's open
18 on the beach. That's probably been more responsible for
19 the last two years pulse increase of fish getting up
20 into the lake. And I think those closure things are just
21 so critical. And that's why folks -- why the regulations
22 exist is because that's what the community desired. And
23 I frankly cannot conceive -- I can understand the point
24 of view from you folks that that would be handy for
25 folks to be able to go up and fish in stream for their
26 subsistence. But I don't see how that can really be
27 accomplished. If you look at, there's 1400 local
28 residents here on the island, and out of those, there's
29 probably what, 107 permits issued? Maybe half of them
30 fish. But he goes out and fishes not only for himself,
31 but his family, probably gives them away to half a dozen
32 people. So, if those half a dozen people weren't relying
33 on him, you could get six people up the creek and one
34 person out in the net. And so, even though the permit
35 just covers that one family unit, what is delivered
36 there, I can see you would end up with this system having
37 more harvest of the stock than would exist if the from
38 the net fishery offshore. And yes, they can fish in the
39 lake for salmon, but you cannot fish up in there for
40 reds. And that species specific thing is the reason why
41 the community wanted to have that closed. So that people
42 were not up on the spawning grounds or on the access
43 string for spawning. The same discussion at Summers Bay.
44 Yeah, you could probably fish, I mean, you got what,
45 fifty yards of stream out and people could -- they can
46 fish up in the lake. That's not as difficult a thing,
47 but you wouldn't want people to be able to fish in the
48 mouth of the stream and snag that.
49
50

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Hey Pat, I'm sorry
2 to interrupt, but -- and I think I may have let this get
3 a little bit off track. This is now questions for Anna
4 on her analysis. Our discussion on where you want to go
5 once a motion is on the floor, that will come later and
6 I apologize. I think I did not clarify that.

7
8 MR. HOLMES: Sorry to misinterpret, Madam
9 Chair.

10
11 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Anna,
12 did you get an answer back? We have Jon Gerken with his
13 hand up and Coral has her hand up. So, Anna.

14
15 MS. SENEAL: Madam Chair, thank you.
16 Through the Chair. Yeah, I have an answer back. What we
17 have to go on is the regulation language, which states
18 that harvest limits authorized by federal regulation and
19 harvest limits established in State regulations may not
20 be accumulated. So, you can't -- one can't double dip.
21 That's what it says. And what -- adding on to that, like
22 connecting those last two threads, what that means
23 opening up the federal fishery here with limited limits
24 and gear. Its rod and reel, there's no nets. Harvest
25 limits are low in line with State sportfish regulations.
26 Federally qualified users are probably going to elect
27 to fish under the State subsistence fishery. It's more
28 meaningful. It happens in in the salt water. Why does
29 it matter if there's a federal fishery at all? Well, you
30 have the ability -- the in-season manager would have the
31 ability to close it completely which I guess they do
32 now. So, I'm just talking myself into circle. So, I'm
33 just going to answer your question. You can't accumulate
34 harvest limits. These things are so confusing.

35
36 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. I'm gonna --
37 I raised my hand in the middle. So, I have a question
38 that may need to get crowdsourced. Then I'm going to go
39 to Jon. Then I'm going to go to Coral. So, my question
40 is around the -- getting the State permit. So, yesterday
41 we heard concern that when the subsistence permit is
42 given out here, residency isn't checked. So, for like
43 Alaskan subsistence anybody in the state can do
44 subsistence in a subsistence use area. They don't care
45 where you live. But if we're using the State permitting
46 system to engage in Federal subsistence, where it
47 matters very much where you live, my question is, when
48 that permit is given out here locally, are they checking
49 residency at all or are they just applying the normal
50 Alaska standard where they're just making sure you're

1 an Alaska resident, but you could be an Anchorage
2 resident? So, that's the question I figure that needs
3 to be crowdsourced so we can come back to that. So, now
4 I'm going to go to Jon Gerken. If he still has his hand
5 up and then to Coral.

6
7 MR. GERKEN: Good morning. This is Jon
8 Gerken. Through the Chair. I'll just help Anna provide
9 a little bit more clarity there on, I guess, how I see
10 this working here. So, I think what folks are getting
11 confused in is, there's -- there is subsistence and
12 that's what we're talking about on the Federal and State
13 side. But then we're trying to use sportfish regulations
14 or mirror sportfish regulations on the Federal side in
15 order to get to subsistence. So, to Brett's question,
16 if you were going to go fishing on any of -- this is
17 assuming the closures are rescinded and everything's
18 under Federal. But you would have to go down if you're
19 going to push the commission up to the marker from the
20 mouth, you would have to go down and get a State
21 subsistence permit. And then to your point, I don't know
22 how well they check. I'm assuming they got to do
23 residency. But right now, the Feds would -- do not issue
24 those permits in Unalaska. So, right now they just have
25 -- any user would just need to report their harvest,
26 Federal harvest under the State permit. So, Brett would
27 go get a permit, State permit. He's going to go out and
28 fish the Federal waters, but he's going to fish those
29 Federal waters under the sportfish regs that are in this
30 proposal, which means you can only harvest up to 10
31 fish, 5 fish a day, no more than 2 sockeye, no more than
32 2 coho. Those 5 fish count toward the overall subsistence
33 harvest under Federal regs, which is 25 for the permit
34 holder and then 25 more for each of the folks that he
35 has listed on his permit. So, he can't fish the same
36 permit, you know, at the same time. So then presumably
37 Brett could go down and then fish the remaining number
38 of fish because like Anna said, you can accumulate. You
39 can accumulate up to the total, right? So, you could
40 fish those in each fishery, but they would still count
41 towards subsistence. So, we're only using -- we're using
42 the sportfish regs as a proxy or as a way of harvesting
43 Federal subsistence fish on what would presumably be
44 open Federal waters.

45
46 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. And I just
47 want to clarify, we're not using the sportfish regs.
48 We're taking the limits out of the sport fish regs and
49 we are creating Federal regs. Just so there's no
50 confusion about what we're doing. Okay.

1

2

(Simultaneous Speech)

3

4

MR. GERKEN: Yeah. Thanks for that. We're mirroring the sportfish take. Yeah.

6

7

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. Okay. Did that conclude your comments, Jon?

9

10

MR. GERKEN: Yep.

11

12

13

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Thank you. I'm going to go to Coral and then Pat has his hand up.

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. SENECA: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. That's probably good.

(Pause)

Were you done?

1 MS. SENEAL: Madam Chair, through the
2 Chair. Circling back to the eligibility. The -- on the
3 federal side, we don't confirm eligibility. We have no
4 contact with the harvester. Our regulations dictate who
5 is eligible to fish under federal regulations. So,
6 there's -- there is that. And circling back to what your
7 in-season manager Jon Gerken, contributed regarding
8 fishing state and federal fisheries up to the permit
9 limit, we likely agree with that. There is so much
10 untested gray area in these -- in this set of proposals.
11 But, yes. So, you cannot add limits together. You cannot
12 exceed the highest limit. This we know.

13
14 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, thank
15 you. Pat.

16
17 MR. HOLMES: I believe it's been a long
18 time since I was involved in issuing permits, but I
19 believe that under state law you can get -- do proxies
20 and then, you can have that put on to your personal
21 family list. And so, some folks do that routinely. A
22 question I would have on this whole issue is, let's say
23 you've got your State permit and you're calling it the
24 federal permit. Would that allow you to use sport gear,
25 rod and reel in closed waters in stream?

26
27 MS. SENEAL: Through the Chair, member
28 Holmes. The question was, if you were fishing under the
29 federal system with the State permit, could you fish in
30 closed waters? I don't believe so. Close to whom?

31
32 MR. HOLMES: Well, we're talking about
33 doing away with the state closed waters. The verbiage
34 in some of these permits. And so, if you that stays
35 closed waters, those are going to be the spawning areas.
36 So, if you're dropping that, are you going to -- are
37 those going to be maintained? Because there are areas
38 that just don't logically -- folks don't want people to
39 be fishing in those close waters because they're
40 important for spawning, particularly for the reds.

41
42 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: And Pat, I think
43 you need to be very specific about which waters you're
44 talking about. Because the proposal itself leaves some
45 waters closed and it opens other waters in that Unalaska
46 Bay area. So, you need to be specific. It'll help Anna
47 answer the question, if you're specific, about which
48 specific waterway or body of water you're concerned
49 with.

50

1 (Pause)

2

3 MR. HOLMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. I
4 guess on this permit on the back side, I assume that's
5 what we would go to if we had the federal system. Then
6 the waters that are closed to sportfish gear would remain
7 closed.

8

9 MS. SENECA: Through the Chair, member
10 Holmes. That is correct.

11

12 MR. HOLMES: Thank you.

13

14 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Are
15 there any other questions on the analysis and Anna's
16 report? Cause we have a whole list of we're going to be
17 seeking feedback from a whole list of other people and
18 entities.

19

20 (No response)

21

22 I could say this later, but during
23 public testimony, I'm going to be particularly
24 interested in hearing from the public their view on the
25 value of having the ability, so the in-season manager
26 having the ability to restrict these fisheries to just
27 federally qualified users. So, right now what we're
28 talking about, they are -- they're already open to State
29 sport fishing. This proposal would open a federal
30 fishery, which would actually allow more restriction on
31 the fishery, and would allow the in-season manager to
32 close the -- close access to the State sport fishery and
33 allow only federal -- federally qualified users. So, I'm
34 going to be particularly interested in the people who
35 live here, what is your view on that? Do you think that
36 has value? Do you have -- do you think it doesn't have
37 value or, and do you have concerns? Okay. So, I'm going
38 to move on to the -- we've now heard the introduction
39 of the proposal and the presentation of the analysis.
40 Next, we're going to hear report on Board consultation.
41 So, Tribal consultation and ANCSA Corporation.

42

43 MS. HONIG: Madam Chair, there were no
44 comments received.

45

46 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Thank you.
47 Next, we'll hear agency comments starting with Fish and
48 Game, Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

49

50 (No comments)

1
2 Okay. I'm not seeing anyone from Fish
3 and Game. Next would be agency comments. Are there any
4 federal agency comments?

5
6 (No comments)

7
8 Okay, I'm not seeing any or hearing any
9 there. Are there any Tribal entities? Native, Tribal,
10 Village, other.

11
12 (No comments)

13
14 Okay. I'm not seeing or hearing any.
15 Next, we'll hear from advisory groups, other Regional
16 Advisory Councils, Fish and Game Advisory Committees,
17 or Subsistence Resource Commissions.

18
19 MS. HONIG: I guess just a reminder for
20 those online, you can raise your hand if you're calling
21 and you can press star six to unmute, star five to raise
22 your hand. Thanks.

23
24 MR. HOLMES: Madam Chair, I think Vincent
25 is outside there. He probably did not hear your request
26 for Tribal and local indigenous input.

27
28 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, so we're
29 going through the comment process. Are there any
30 comments from Tribal entities? Native, Tribal, Village
31 or other? And Vince, were you wanting to comment under
32 this section?

33
34 (Pause)

35
36 So, you can comment under -- as a tribal
37 entity, or if you were going to comment as an individual,
38 you could do that in a little bit. I'm not sure what
39 your intent was.

40
41 MR. TUTIAKOFF: My name is Vince
42 Tutiakoff, Sr. Sorry I didn't make all the meetings
43 yesterday with everything going on in our city and
44 corporation people are in town. The proposal -- I'm going
45 to try to address this. Number one, the proxy issue.
46 Number two, the permit issue that I mentioned once
47 before, the process, and enforcement. And I don't know
48 what you can do about the enforcement that's state --
49 well federal funding would be needed to keep track of
50 these people that are out here. Some are non-residents,

1 as I mentioned before. They're traveling from other
2 areas. They have family here. My concern is the future
3 of the fishery. There's three to five years we see
4 decrease. We had a fairly good run this year and we had
5 about two years of -- we had to actually go out and fish
6 for five or ten hours sometimes. And the weather. And
7 we're getting further and further away from our
8 community to do that. I don't have a \$30- or \$40,000
9 boat. I have a, like most locals, a small skiff, 18-
10 footer. And the weather's not getting any better, as
11 everyone knows. Temperatures change and the fish are
12 moving out. Those that would have come [sic] back are
13 not making it up the river. Last year we had thousands
14 of humpies that died before they even made it into the
15 creek here. We'll see results of that probably in a
16 couple three years. This year the humpies are over
17 flooding, whatever you want to call it. You see it in
18 the creek here. It's the most I've seen in four to five
19 years at one time.

20
21 How we try to feed our people. I just
22 go out and fish and get my limit according to proxy by
23 -- according to the permit. Most of my family live here
24 in Unalaska. Most of them won't help me go fishing or
25 help me clean up and put stuff away and deliver fish to
26 the elders that -- and people who don't have the ability
27 to go out fishing. They don't have a boat. They don't
28 have a vehicle. And in most cases, they can't really
29 walk to -- very far. That's about it for how I feel
30 about the closures that -- I'm not supporting the sports
31 fishing inside of -- in any of these lakes that you've
32 mentioned. I think it's -- it can become very political
33 and also very bad for the runs to have -- there's plenty
34 of room on the front beach. There's plenty of room in
35 the entries of the creeks. Certain closures that I just
36 read earlier and heard, that I would probably support.
37 But I don't support allowing the subsistence or the rod
38 and reel group to go beyond the two mile even. Because
39 that's where they're spawning and most of them are not
40 Native and are fishing up there. Because they could reach
41 some of these areas with a bigger boat that they have
42 Be carrying more people. And you'll see groups of seven
43 or eight at a time going up, not only Summers Bay, but
44 in Nateekin, Winslow and the one area that was not
45 discussed was Volcano Bay. Volcano Bay has been targeted
46 for the last three to five years by the bigger boats. I
47 myself have only gone out there once last year and none
48 this year because of the weather. So, I don't know. At
49 some point we're going to have to talk about Volcano Bay
50 and it's a question area. (Indiscernible). That's all

1 I've got. If you have any questions.

2

3 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. Thank you. I
4 have a question. And this may be something Anna can
5 clarify as well. It was my understanding from the
6 analysis that the areas we are talking about for
7 rescinding the federal closure are already open for
8 State sport fishing. And I just want to make -- that's
9 a very important point to me. And I just want to make
10 sure that I'm understanding that correctly. So, we're
11 not talking about allowing a new activity. We're talking
12 about allowing federally qualified users to engage in
13 that activity that's already allowed under State
14 regulation.

15

16 MS. SENECA: Madam Chair. Anna Senecal,
17 OSM for the record. That's correct.

18

19 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat, go ahead.

20

21 MR. HOLMES: I wonder if you could
22 elaborate what the state open areas are.

23

24 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Was that to Anna?

25

26 MR. HOLMES: Yes.

27

28 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Sorry.

29

30 MR. HOLMES: I timed for when you're
31 walking away.

32

33 MS. SENECA: Through the Chair, member
34 Holmes. I'm not going to give a comprehensive overview.
35 I don't have all of my things in front of me, but all
36 of the areas that are closed under State sport fishing
37 regs would continue to be closed. So, I know there are
38 geographical markers on the Nateekin and the Makushin.
39 The -- there are seasonal closures for Summers Bay. I
40 believe the outlet stream is closed. Is that correct?
41 Yeah. The -- so, the Unalaska Lake drainage would be
42 closed to harvest of sockeye. And it's open up to Church
43 Hole. The rest of the drainage is closed, I believe. And
44 then it's rod and reel only, no nets. So, whatever is
45 in -- and this is -- these are the proposals. You can
46 you can change them. You do not have to match State
47 sport fish 1 to 1. But that is what is being proposed.

48

49 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: And Leigh is
50 bringing the map. I didn't catch the number of the map,

1 but the map is in the books. It's in the materials,
2 which she's also going to bring it up on the screen. I'm
3 sorry. So, to let Vince go, are there -- you have a
4 question? Okay. Thanks, Brett.

5
6 MR. RICHARDSON: Vince, thanks for coming
7 again. McLees Lake is also part of the closure review
8 at this point, but it's outside of the Unalaska district,
9 right? So, it would allow federally qualified
10 subsistence users to go into the lake and use rod and
11 reel to catch the bag limit out there, which is greater
12 than the bag limits inside the district. So, it's 10
13 total fish. Are you in support of that? Do you have any
14 issues with that?

15
16 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Other than getting there.
17 I mean it's a 15-mile, 12-mile run. Weather changes
18 within 10 minutes, everybody knows. I think that the
19 only ones that could make it out there and do it would
20 be the bigger boats, the 35 and 32 footers that carry 5
21 to 8 people. And then getting ashore and getting off
22 again would be the other issue that they would -- I've
23 yet to see a federal user even inside the lake since I
24 believe the last time I saw that happening was in late
25 60s when there's a commercial fisheries for red salmon.
26 And they were in the lake setting out net, that small
27 net but a net. And doesn't take a very big net to get
28 400-500 in one -- another hour or so. But I haven't seen
29 that happen for -- since then.

30
31 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right.

32
33 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Most people do not even
34 know that you could do that. So, they -- they're hesitant
35 to go near a lake. At least the ones that live here.

36
37 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Vince, I did want
38 to ask a follow up. So, two questions. With the
39 clarification that Anna just gave that for the -- this
40 proposal, it's not creating new rod and reel fishing
41 opportunities. It's just opening a federal fishery that
42 would allow the use of rod and reel. That's the same as
43 what is currently allowed under state regs. And then
44 what that does is it would allow the federal in-season
45 manager to close -- to basically close the sport fishing
46 under state regs and then only allow federally qualified
47 users. So, it's -- this proposal is trying to provide
48 in my opinion, this is my interpretation, more
49 opportunity and more protection for the federally
50 qualified users. But I'm not going to support it if at

1 a local level there's concern with going down this road.
2 But if we don't support rescinding the closure, we need
3 to explain why we're doing that. Because currently State
4 sport fishing is allowed and we would be maintaining a
5 closure for Federal subsistence. So, I -- if you can say
6 anything about your view on that. If particularly if you
7 think the Federal subsistence closure should remain in
8 place, why do you think that should stay in place given
9 that you can, you're still going to be able to do the
10 State sport fishing with rod and reel? Thank you.

11
12 MR. TUTIAKOFF: That's probably a hard
13 one to answer because when I was on the Subsistence
14 Board, I started to realize and recognize that the
15 Federal Board was moving towards State laws, State
16 requirements. And I was in opposition to that based on
17 my knowledge of subsistence use by rural residents. They
18 had a road system in Kodiak. They have -- now we have a
19 road system here in Unalaska to Summers Bay and Morris
20 Cove. Over the years, in the last five to six years,
21 I've seen maybe five or six incidents of rod and reel
22 fishing in Summers Bay and Morris Cove and actually in
23 this lake here, Iliuliuk Lake. And there's people like
24 me that have a subsistence use in mind, say, why are
25 they out there? Not understanding the rules been
26 changed. They got the biggest issue. Like Brett
27 mentioned, a lot of people don't know that they could
28 go to Winslow and utilize the rural badge, so to speak,
29 and go up inside the lake. It's quite a hike. It's big
30 boulders, a lot of work. Most people will not even do
31 that. But, no, I support whatever the Council decides,
32 but we need to get educated amongst the community about
33 what is open and what is closed. At this point, certain
34 areas, we don't even understand why they're closed or
35 open to anyone. So, that's all I got.

36
37 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank
38 you. And thank you for your patience with all of our
39 questions. It's been really helpful, I appreciate it.

40
41 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Yeah. I'll be back later.
42 I've got another appointment at 1:00 to get -- go get
43 to.

44
45 (Simultaneous Speech)

46
47 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Do you have time?

48
49 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Here until then, so.

50

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Do you have time
2 for one last question from Pat?

3
4 MR. HOLMES: No. I appreciate your
5 comments through the years. And I think that adds a lot.
6 I was just reflecting on your thoughts here and looking
7 at this last figure on page 1 and what's been, excuse
8 me, is confusing is the identification code here with
9 the pink -- with the blue lines across it saying
10 overlapping rod and reel. And so, one can look at that
11 and think, oh, does that mean that, you know, what we've
12 been arguing about is people abusing the system and
13 fishing on the spawning grounds. But those would remain
14 closed. That's correct?

15
16 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: This is one I would
17 ask Anna. I think Anna needs to clarify this. Did you
18 have -- does anyone have anything further for Vince so
19 we can let him off of the hot seat? Coral, you have a
20 Vince question? Go ahead.

21
22 MS. CHERNOFF: I do have a Vince
23 question. Thank you, Vince, for coming. And I was
24 interested in you knowing the community and how, you
25 know, your idea of subsistence fishing. Is the take of
26 2 per day, is that appropriate? Or would a -- like a
27 limit of 20 per person, per year be a more appropriate
28 way to fish? Like, would it be preferable to go out
29 there and get all your fish at once to then dry and
30 smoke and can. Or would -- do you support the 2 a day
31 or, I forget what the limit is on there. So, you'd have
32 to go -- you were talking about it is quite a drive to
33 some of these places. So, is that appropriate in your
34 understanding of how we gather and prepare subsistence,
35 to catch them 2 at a time?

36
37 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Thank you for the
38 question. My concern, I guess, with that would be the
39 ability, as I mentioned, 5 or 6 permit holders on one
40 boat, and some of them have family members listed on
41 their permit of 125 or less. And there's a limit to the
42 permit, I believe it's 250, I'm not sure. But you have
43 to reapply for another permit. Locals or people that I
44 deal with are mostly elders in the community, people
45 that don't have a boat but are willing to, you know,
46 help clean or put them away, smoke them, dry them, do
47 whatever. Two at a time would not do it. That's sports
48 fishing. You know, that's trophy hunting, if you want
49 to call it that. I don't know. But I would support the
50 ability to bring in, you know, 20-25 at a time. You can

1 put ten or twelve in the smokehouse and be able to, you
2 know, have the advantage to give some of that smoked
3 fish away and still have enough for salting and drying
4 and possibly go back out and 5 or 6 days after you've
5 taken care of the salmon, you already got. In my case,
6 it's only 25, about all I can hold in my smoker. And
7 even then, it's a lot of work for an individual.

8
9 MS. CHERNOFF: Yes, I thank you for that.
10 I think also, you know, a lot of times we have weather
11 situations, right? Where we're drying and smoking and,
12 you know, we can't get to places. And so, I just thank
13 you for responding to that. And I did have one other
14 question for Anna after this is done.

15
16 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, thanks.
17 So, I have a follow up to Coral's question about the
18 higher limit, say twenty salmon. I am assuming, and this
19 is my question, is this correct, that you would not
20 support like a 20 fish limit using a rod and reel in
21 these sensitive areas? So, like on Morris Lake or a
22 Summers Bay, you would not want to see a 20 fish limit.
23 Okay.

24
25 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Not with rod and reel.
26 It can be quickly be abused. Especially if you don't
27 have enforcement of some sort like similar places, like
28 Homer and Hole, you got there. They got people all around
29 there, but they have enforcement. And that's what we see
30 happening in some cases at Summers Bay.

31
32 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Are there any
33 other questions? Pat, go ahead.

34
35 MR. HOLMES: Yeah. Vincent, I wonder if
36 you could clarify my fading 80-year-old memory, but
37 basically these closed waters and restrictions of
38 harvest in the spawning streams that evolved locally,
39 didn't it? Through the whole community and the advisory
40 committee and asking the state to implement those
41 closures just to protect the -- particularly to protect
42 spawning reds. Is that correct? I mean, it came from the
43 community.

44
45 MR. TUTIAKOFF: The -- talking about the
46 Unalaska Fishing Game Advisory Board? I've only gone to
47 one of their meetings in the last two years. And I was
48 there specifically to request support in closing Summers
49 Bay and Morris Cove and Nateekin and Broad Bay because
50 of the overfishing that was happening. And the ability

1 to even get enough for the elders and myself and my
2 family. And there's six kids in my family, so they eat
3 a lot of fish. And so, I have a problem sometimes with
4 how the Unalaska Advisory Board holds or calls a meeting,
5 and really, nobody shows up. And I don't think they
6 understand the importance of that Board, that they
7 control that kind of issue, so.

8
9 MR. HOLMES: I think that's changed here
10 locally since Frank left, he used to have a pretty active
11 advisory committee. And I can recall going down there
12 and people arguing way late into the night, but it's --
13 I guess my questions relating to this is that they did
14 originally evolve locally. That's an important point.

15
16 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Coral, go ahead.

17
18 MS. CHERNOFF: I had a question. You just
19 named a bunch of places. Are those the lakes, the streams
20 or are they like ocean waters, can you clarify?

21
22 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Broad Bay is the stream.
23 We do get silvers and few reds up in that one. Not very
24 many, but dog salmon. Nateekin is a stream that has the
25 ability to -- doesn't necessarily have a lake, but
26 there's a lot of areas that could be called a lake where
27 they spawn. Summers Bay, Iliuliuk and Morris Cove are
28 like bays. And they go up inside the lakes on those two.
29 Volcano Bay is a lake system which is just east of
30 Makushin. Let's see. That's about it.

31
32 MS. CHERNOFF: Thank you very much.

33
34 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: You better run away
35 while you can. Okay. I'm not seeing any more hands or
36 questions. Was that a hand? Well, I have my question.
37 Oh, yes. And we'll get Anna back up. But I'm trying to
38 let Vince go. If -- we've grilled him enough. Okay,
39 Vince, thank you so much.

40
41 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Yeah. Thank you.

42
43 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. And then we
44 have -- we had the one question that was already asked
45 for Anna. And then Coral has another question, so we can
46 get Anna.....

47
48 (Pause)

49
50

1 MS. SENEAL: Madam Chair, Council
2 members. Anna Senecal for the record. Can you please
3 repeat the question?

4
5 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: If I recall, Pat's
6 question was, on the map that's on the screen, the areas
7 that are shaded in blue. He was asking, what -- would
8 those be open? Would they be closed? Are they open? Are
9 they closed? But maybe if you can just refresh us on
10 particularly the Morris Lake drainage and the Summers
11 Lake drainage, what do those blue lines signify? And
12 particularly if this is a future state, because I see
13 it's a recommendation, this hasn't happened yet. So, if
14 you can particularly touch on that. Thanks.

15
16 MS. SENEAL: Absolutely. Through the
17 Chair. The -- I -- my interpretation of the language on
18 the map, it's showing the overlap of the closures
19 depicted with the regulatory proposals. So, it's
20 referring to the analyses and not necessarily to the
21 regulations in place. That's a little bit confusing. So,
22 you're seeing a visual, a picture, of what's going on
23 in the closure review simultaneous with the proposal.
24 So, the blue hatch represents the proposal. You can see
25 the FP, fisheries proposal number-number. And then the
26 red areas are those are those closures. And I take that
27 back. Those are -- those refer to the State sportfish
28 regulations that the areas that would be closed under
29 the proposal. So, it's not a map that would be used for
30 regulatory purposes. It was a map that we hoped would
31 be helpful for understanding how all of these Unalaska
32 proposals fit together.

33
34 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. And
35 particularly -- Anna covered this yesterday. So, this
36 whole area, anything with a color is the Unalaska Bay
37 area. So, these specific proposal we're talking about
38 now is rescinding the closure for the pink area, except
39 the pink with the red stripes, Makushin river and the
40 Nateekin river, those would remain closed. So, under the
41 current proposal, those would remain closed. But the
42 other pink areas would be opened with the, you know, the
43 limited rod and reel with very strict, you know, two
44 fish limits. In addition, we are still going to be
45 talking about a separate proposal that deals with Morris
46 Lake and Summers Lake. So, right now, I believe this is
47 shown as though we choose to rescind those closures and
48 put in place the ability to use rod and reel in those
49 two systems, kind of the two small systems that have the
50 blue stripes. But we have the ability to maintain those

1 closures and not allow any fishing whatsoever. So, keep
2 in mind this first proposal is this bigger Unalaska Bay,
3 but we still have the ability to make special rules for
4 Morris Lake and Summers Lake. And then McLees will be a
5 separate proposal as well. And then -- and that's it.

6
7 MR. HOLMES: Excuse me, Madam Chair. That
8 also the Unalaska Lake closures, that's covered under
9 the -- our 27-06 that'd to be a separate discussion from
10 Summers and Morris? Because it doesn't show up on this
11 last summary sheet but it does show up on your -- a
12 couple of the other diagrams.

13
14 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Anna, go ahead.

15
16 MS. SENECA: Thank you, Madam Chair.
17 Through the Chair, member Holmes and all the Council
18 members and the Chair. So, there's lots of chat fiercely
19 happening in the background looking at this what we're
20 calling the umbrella proposal. This gets to the, I
21 believe the intent of your question member Holmes.
22 Thinking about the umbrella proposal and what it covers,
23 it would -- if the closure were rescinded, it would
24 specify limits that are in line with State sportfish
25 throughout the watershed. Specific watershed area
26 closures are called out that also match the State sport
27 fishing regulations. And those are the Makushin and the
28 Nateekin. It does not call out Summers and Morris. It
29 does not call out Unalaska specifically. So, there are
30 -- there is another proposal for Summers/Morris. If you
31 wish to include those area and seasonal restrictions for
32 Iliuliuk, Town Creek, Unalaska Lake drainage, you would
33 have to modify this proposal. And the maps are an
34 approximation, they're not exact. They were a discussion
35 aid, so.

36
37 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. And then to
38 specifically answer what I think Pat's question was he
39 was asking about the FCR27-06, which is the closure
40 review. Remember that we're pairing the fishery proposal
41 with the associated closure review. So, if we take --
42 whatever action we take on the proposal which is FP27-
43 02, that's what's -- that's what we're going through
44 right now. The action we take on that may mean that we
45 don't take separate action on the closure review. So,
46 in essence, we are right now kind of talking about FCR27-
47 06. Because you end up talking about both of them in the
48 same conversation. And then Coral, do you -- you had a
49 question for Anna?

1 MS. CHERNOFF: I did, but I think I
2 answered it. So, permits can be cultural permits for
3 gathering fish for elders, can take place like in a
4 separate a separate process? And then when they gather
5 can -- do they have to adhere to, like say they did a
6 elders camp and went to one of these -- we opened these
7 lakes for subsistence? Does the area, I guess, have to
8 be open for subsistence already? Or when they apply for
9 these cultural permits, can they apply for them in any
10 area that may have traditionally been used? I guess I'm
11 kind of wondering if these openings would affect that
12 if they apply for cultural and educational permits.
13

14 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: The anthropologist
15 is approaching the bench.
16

17 MS. CHERNOFF: And I guess to add to that
18 too, would they have to follow the methods and means?
19 Like if we did rod and reel only and they did a cultural
20 event at a lake, could they only catch by rod and reel,
21 or could they submit to put out a net?
22

23 DR. ROBERTS: Through the Chair, Jason
24 Roberts, anthropologist, OSM. Member Chernoff, so, you
25 know, the cultural and education permits are only
26 available for, in this particular circumstance, water
27 is under Federal jurisdiction. However, that permitting
28 process is separate. And so, you know, the gear that
29 would be used, the amount of harvest taken would be up
30 to what was written and approved in that permit
31 application. But by having a federal, you know,
32 subsistence fishery in this area that would enable
33 someone to apply for a cultural education permit in these
34 waters under Federal jurisdiction.
35

36 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat, go ahead.
37

38 MR. HOLMES: Yeah. To add on to that,
39 presently, the Q Tribe and the Unalaska Corporation do
40 -- regularly do an annual cultural permit for Humpy Cove
41 through the state. And they've been doing that for, oh,
42 at least 30-40 years. And so there, what they do is
43 being focusing on humpy's, is they use, oh, I forget
44 who's beach seine, but one of the local folks has a
45 beach seine. And so, they go down, set the seine with a
46 skiff, and then all the kids pull the seine in, pull the
47 fish out, and then learn traditional ways of killing
48 and, and processing the fish. And if anybody's here in
49 August for that, I'd really suggest you attend. It's
50 probably one of the finest get togethers as far as

1 exploring among this culture that there is. And I think
2 that would be going on regardless of whether this happens
3 or not.

4
5 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, I -- did that
6 get everyone's questions for Anna? I think we're good.
7 Okay, thank you, Anna. And you're free to sit there in
8 case we need you again, but -- or you can go back to the
9 table. Okay. We're continuing on through our list of
10 people to hear from. So, we've heard agency comments. I
11 had previously asked for advisory group comments. There
12 were none. We're on to number 5. Summary of written
13 public comments. Were there any written public comments?

14
15 MS. HONIG: No public comments were
16 received.

17
18 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, now we're on
19 to public testimony. And I'm going to start with the
20 blue card from Suzi Golodoff. If you want to come to the
21 table and give us your public comment.

22
23 MS. CHERNOFF: Thank you.

24
25 MS. GOLODOFF: Thank you everyone. I do
26 appreciate the opportunity to have a lot of this
27 explained to us and the opportunity to voice our
28 concerns. If I may, could I start with a few questions?
29 I feel like if I was -- had a few questions answered, I
30 could make better comments.

31
32 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. I think I'll
33 allow the latitude of the questions. And depending on
34 the question, we -- I may say that's -- but yeah, I
35 think that right now we are all trying to get our hands
36 around exactly what this means. So, I think this is
37 actually probably going to be very helpful to the
38 process. So, go ahead.

39
40 MS. GOLODOFF: Okay. Thank you. I think
41 the first question is about what you spoke of what, what
42 the Board spoke of as mirroring. So, my understanding
43 is, the proposal to open fresh water to subsistence
44 fishing would mirror the way the regulations are
45 presently, through -- at -- through sports fishing. That
46 wasn't said very clearly. So, to put it another way,
47 right now there's like a bag limit. So, if -- so, that
48 question about mirroring would be about what would the
49 bag limits be? Would they count on a subsistence permit?
50 And one of the important questions is whether proxy would

1 be allowed or disallowed?

2

3 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. So, at a high
4 level, what we're trying to do is not have a situation
5 where there's more sport fishing opportunity than there
6 is subsistence opportunity. So, that's why we're
7 mirroring the State sport regulations, is to ensure
8 subsistence is at lower and sport is higher. At least
9 it's equal. So, that's why we're mirroring the language.
10 And because we're mirroring the language and trying to
11 provide this floor, again, so that subsistence is not
12 less of an opportunity than sport, it would have the
13 same -- the existing bag limit. So, the sport bag limits
14 that exist today would be what are in the proposals. I
15 think that was two of your questions. And now I've
16 forgotten the third. Proxy, I'm not sure.

17

18 MS. GOLODOFF: That's kind of an
19 important issue for us. Because when you sportfish, you
20 have a bag limit. You have to catch those fish yourself,
21 if you choose to share your catch, that's one thing. But
22 proxy has been something that we're both grateful for
23 and has been badly abused. So, that's a concern because
24 I think most of us, the bottom line is, are the -- are
25 there enough fish just to sustain this? So, that would
26 be a question.

27

28 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. And it looks
29 like Anna's coming to the table. If she wants to add an
30 answer to the proxy question. And then I forgot your
31 other aspect was the fish you catch do those count
32 towards subsistence? Yes. If the Federal subsistence --
33 if we pass this to open a Federal subsistence fishery,
34 then yes, fish caught under that would be counted on
35 your list of subsistence harvest. And then, Anna, if you
36 can clarify on the proxy issue, that would be great. And
37 here comes phone a friend.

38

39 MS. SENEAL: Madam Chair, the federal
40 equivalent of the proxy system is designated harvester,
41 and it would exist under this framework. And I think
42 that -- yes. So, yes.

43

44 MS. GOLODOFF: Sorry, I don't -- still
45 don't understand. Like, in other words if I'm fishing
46 as a subsistence person and you don't have a boat or a
47 net, but you would like to catch fish, I could fish for
48 you as well. So, I could fish my 25 fish and then fish
49 your 25 fish too? So, would that still apply in fresh
50 water? Does that question make sense?

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: Yeah, I understand what you're asking. And then maybe a follow on, could we limit that? Do we have the ability to say we're going to open the federal fishery, this very limited ability to have a Federal subsistence fishery but there's no designated hunter/fisher? And then, Coral has her hand up. Coral, go ahead while we're waiting for information.

MS. CHERNOFF: Okay. I do have a question because immediately I'm not seeing in the book where you can have proxy for fishing. I do see where you can have -- designate another person to harvest shellfish. And so, I was wondering if you could let us know if there is a proxy for fish and where we might find it in regulation.

MR. HOLMES: I think it's in....

(Simultaneous speech)

MS. CHERNOFF: That's a question for Anna and Jason, please.

(Pause)

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Go ahead.

MS. SENEAL: Through the -- through the Chair, Anna Senecal, OSM. So, what we have in regulation, I'm just going to read it. In order to receive a Federal subsistence regulation permit or federal designated harvester permit, to -- or designate someone to harvest fish or wildlife for you under a federal designated harvest permit, you must be old enough to reasonably harvest that species yourself or under the guidance of an adult. And then it continues on to talk about you have to have the permit, you have to work within the authorities of the permit. You have to validate harvest tickets, tags permit. So just, you have to follow all of the laws. So, there's not a whole lot of specific detail that I'm seeing, but it -- the designated harvest system is the federal equivalent of the state side proxy system. So, what you understand what you're asking, is there a proxy? Yes, there is an option under the federal system. It's called designated harvester.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: And then a follow up. Since this activity is occurring under -- you're going to have a State subsistence permit. Does that

1 automatically allow the proxy, cause proxy is on the
2 state side? Does that automatically allow the proxy
3 fishing that would be provided under the state regs since
4 this is a -- you're getting the State subsistence permit?
5 And perhaps we can also revisit this. I know you wanted
6 answers to these questions. We may need to revisit this
7 after lunch, if that makes more sense. Cause I do think
8 this is a -- we're starting to get down into the kind
9 of the weeds of, what does this mean? How does this
10 work? Go, ahead.

11
12 DR. ROBERTS: So, through the Chair,
13 Jason Roberts. Yeah, we are kind of getting a little off
14 track here, but you know we should stop using different
15 terminology. Like the designated harvester is part of
16 the federal process. And that would exist if this fishery
17 were to be adopted and come into place, that would be
18 an option that people would have. And so, any species
19 of fish taken under -- in this particular fishery would
20 be eligible to be taken by designated harvester. And
21 that is just simply someone who cannot fish on their
22 own, ask someone to help them. And they become their
23 designated harvester. And so, that would be an option.
24 Now whether you could restrict, I think that would be
25 outside the scope of this proposal. Yeah.

26
27 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank
28 you for that. Suzi, if you'd like to continue your
29 testimony, that would be great.

30
31 MS. GOLODOFF: Okay, thanks. I have a lot
32 of notes. But these are the sorts of issues that are
33 making me a little nervous about doing this. I understand
34 that the intent is to level the playing field and not
35 have areas open to sport fishing that are not open to
36 subsistence. However, at the moment my inclination is
37 to go with this map that has everything closed, which
38 probably isn't going to please people. But I'm concerned
39 about the increased pressure on the resource and beg to
40 differ with the idea that that's not going to happen,
41 cause we kind of see a lot of increased pressure. We
42 have environmental conditions that we seem to be able
43 to do very little about. We -- sorry to say this, but
44 we already have a lot of poor behavior with some
45 subsistence fishers taking advantage. And I'm also
46 concerned about the inability to fund enforcement and
47 the new regulations about not having any closed hours
48 during the day. So, all those things for me, personally,
49 are adding up to a real nervousness about opening up the
50 area for more fishing. And I understand, I think I

1 understand the reasoning to do this. But again, hearing
2 that it's just one fellow up in Anchorage that's going
3 to oversee this doesn't give me a lot of confidence. So,
4 I think I'll just leave it at that because it's close
5 to lunchtime and I'm not sure if those are the sorts of
6 comments you really find helpful.

7
8 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Are you
9 open to taking any questions if there are questions? Are
10 there questions for Suzi? Brett, go ahead.

11
12 MR. RICHARDSON: Hi, Susie. Thanks for
13 coming. Just can you clarify a little bit what you mean
14 by poor behavior by subsistence users?

15
16 MS. GOLODOFF: Well, earlier I spoke
17 about the proxy fishing. And I did hear some people
18 express the understanding that it was for people that
19 couldn't fish by themselves but that's not really what's
20 been going on locally. We have some folks with boats and
21 nets who will fish for any and all people who simply go
22 to Fish and Game and get a permit. So -- and we've had
23 a lot of abuse of that. So, that we've had like one
24 particular -- fisherman in particular, would just fish
25 every day, every day, every day and just give all those
26 fish away. So, well beyond the scope of her permit or
27 her family's permit. But anybody, like people who didn't
28 have a net or skiff and had a full time job and a lot
29 of money, they could just go and get a permit for them
30 -- their selves. And I understand that everybody should
31 get fish, and I believe that, but that's kind of been
32 an issue. So, that's part of it.

33
34 Also, when I talk about poor behavior
35 you know, I live on the front beach, so there's a lot
36 of fishing that goes on and it's great, but like there's
37 this one guy with a jet ski and a boom box and the idea
38 that he's going to be able to do that 24 hours a day
39 now. That they've opened up the hours, that that kind
40 of thing is kind of hard on some people in the community.
41 So, every time we open up regulations, it frees us up
42 to fish more, but it also can cause troubles. I'm not
43 sure if that's, you know, with the sports fishing people
44 also, we've got some who have poor behavior. Or, I've
45 talked a lot about people snagging fish, like in the
46 little school outside Morris, the fish can't get up
47 Morris Creek because it's not deep enough so they school
48 up. And so, you have people with snag hooks and that's
49 legal but in my mind, that's poor behavior. So, I guess
50 that's what I mean.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. RICHARDSON: Yeah. Just a final comment. I agree and I understand what you're saying. So, I have more questions about the proxy issue myself. It's interesting. Have you ever talked to anybody in enforcement or local trooper about anything?

MS. GOLODOFF: Yes. But I think usually our fellow is up in Bristol Bay that -- all the guys that have or people that have been in that position usually spend the whole summer up in Bristol Bay and then just come back in the fall. But I have. I think they're aware of it and they are concerned, but they're just kind of, hands are tied with funding, I think. So, again, I, you know, I'm a subsistence user, I'm not a sports user, so I understand trying to address the discrepancy of the use. But I'm a little worried about taking all the regs away and then trying to patch them back together and how that's going to really work.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Are there any last questions for Suzi? And I'm just double checking if Daniel's hand was up, somebody would tell me. Right? Okay. All right, Pat, go ahead.

MR. HOLMES: Oh, Suzi just a brief thing. Same as I asked Vincent. The evolution of these closed waters came from local folks didn't?

MS. GOLODOFF: It did. In fact, I'm -- it's one of the things I'm most proud of about our community is that it was the locals that asked for that 10 red salmon limit on the Front Beach, and it passed. And we were really pleased about that. And it's helped.

MR. HOLMES: You know, I'd like to commend folks for that adjustment they made on Front Beach. I think that's probably the one thing responsible for the slight bumps up in -- up the Iliuliuk into the lake as people doing that. And then the whole closed water concept has evolved over at least 30-40 years. And where people locally would see basically non-resident processors coming in and crowding out the locals. And so, that's at least -- I guess what I'm asking reinforcement bond is -- that's why the -- they don't have a rod and reel in the Iliuliuk. And, you know, the other important red systems. So, thank you.

MS. GOLODOFF: Thank you. I'm going to add quickly one more thing. If you give -- if we went

1 with the proposal as you have it there, I think right
2 now there is a closed area in front of Summer Bay, like
3 the like around the mouth. And I would love to see that
4 put in place around Morris right now, there's no
5 protection of the saltwater mouth in front of Morris.
6 Thank you.

7
8 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank
9 you very much. Okay. Do we have any other public
10 testimony in the room or online?

11
12 (No response)

13
14 All right. I'm not seeing anyone else
15 who wants to offer public testimony. We're on to the
16 part where we would make a motion. So, would anyone like
17 to make a motion to support this proposal? And we will
18 have opportunity for Board discussion once the motion
19 is on the floor.

20
21 MR. HOLMES: Madam Chair, I would do that
22 to have the discussion, but personally I'm more inclined
23 to the proposal FCR27-06. And I don't know whether it
24 be acceptable to make a proposal not to take up this
25 one.

26
27 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: I have a feeling
28 Katya would prefer we make a motion and vote it down if
29 that's -- she's nodding her head. So, the motion should
30 be to support if -- now the risk is -- you may -- there
31 may be more members that vote to support the proposal
32 than vote it down. But to keep the motion and the
33 positive, the motion would be to support the proposal.
34 We would have discussion and then if the RAC, if enough
35 of them disagree, then it'll be voted down, at which
36 point we will need to take up the fishery closure.

37
38 MR. HOLMES: Madam, I would like to
39 propose that we discuss this for the sake of discussion,
40 bring the proposal up. Thank you.

41
42 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Pats made a
43 motion to support the proposal. Is there a second?

44
45 MR. RICHARDSON: Second.

46
47 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, thank
48 you. Motions on the floor. And I'll open it up for
49 discussion. Brett, go ahead.

50

1 MR. RICHARDSON: Can we move to amend the
2 proposal through this process?

3
4 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes, we can amend
5 the proposal. There may be limits on what we can amend,
6 but yeah, we -- go ahead and say what you want to amend
7 and we'll go from there.

8
9 (Pause)

10
11 And would it be helpful if I restated
12 what the proposal is first? Okay. So, this proposal
13 would, again, open up what's in -- maybe can you go to
14 the -- well, actually, no, leave this one up. This one's
15 better. Okay, so what it's going to do is rescind the
16 closure for the pink parts on the map. This is the
17 Unalaska big closure, but it is maintaining the closures
18 from a Makushin River on the left there and Nateekin
19 River also on the left, those are red striped. Those
20 would remain closed under the current proposal. Again,
21 there are blue striped areas. We will have future
22 opportunities to address those areas because they're
23 separate proposals for those. But generally, the
24 proposal is rescinding the closure. So, it would open
25 up a federal fishery with limits that match the sport
26 bag limit. So, it would be -- I was looking to see where
27 the -- oh, with rod and reel and a bag and possession
28 limit of 5 fish, of which no more than 2 may be coho
29 salmon and 2 fish may be sockeye salmon. But go ahead
30 with your proposed amendment.

31
32 MR. RICHARDSON: Brett Richardson,
33 Unalaska. This may be too much of a sweeping generalized
34 proposal. It may affect too much if we want to get into
35 more specific areas within the more detailed proposals
36 later, may be good to address them individually. Because
37 we're going to have to address them anyway because
38 they're on the table, right?

39
40 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. And I think
41 this would be good to get clarification. So, the
42 proposals that will be coming up for specific areas are
43 Summers and Morris Lake. So, that's one proposal and
44 that's the blue striped areas. Those are -- we will be
45 discussing that and discussing the proposal for those
46 areas. And I guess that's it for this map because we are
47 going to be discussing McLees, but that's not on this
48 map. So, if there's other specific areas that are beyond
49 Summers Lake and Morris Lake, I guess I'd look for
50 clarification, is that just -- can we do that within

1 this regulatory proposal or is that outside the bounds?
2 If we wanted to -- I'm assuming maintain closures for
3 other smaller waterways. Is that where you're going?

4
5 MR. RICHARDSON: Yeah. So, I'm looking
6 at FCR27-06 for the Unalaska Bay, specifically, the
7 freshwater systems the Nateekin and Makushin rivers. Is
8 this the only proposal where that's addressed?

9
10 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes, I believe so.

11
12 MR. RICHARDSON: Okay.

13
14 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: And again, those
15 would remain closed under the current proposal.

16
17 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat, go ahead.

18
19 MR. HOLMES: I'm kind of bumbling around
20 like Brett, but I think that it's important somewhere
21 in this process that we discuss the Unalaska Lake closed
22 areas. Because that's probably the most significant, in
23 effect, to local folks here that have fished it for
24 hundreds of years. And so, I think that would be somehow
25 or another, we need to get to where we're discussing
26 that in there. I can see on the suggestion in here of
27 the pink with the slash line of that being considered
28 to be dropped or deleted and keeping the ones with the
29 red slashes left to right and the ones from right to
30 left. But I'd like to somehow or another evolve all
31 these that would be including Unalaska Lake as it is.
32 And so, there is -- anyway, thank you.

33
34 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: There is a -- we
35 are going to be taking up a separate action that
36 specifically deals with Unalaska Lake. So, we will have
37 the opportunity to maintain the current closure for
38 Unalaska Lake, and that is a separate action we will be
39 getting to. So yes, there is a carve out for that. We
40 can maintain that closure.

41
42 MR. HOLMES: On that proposal, though it
43 includes the entire bay remaining the same and only
44 changing Morris, Summers and -- or maintaining Morris
45 Summers and Unalaska. And I'm thinking there is merit
46 of -- that OSM has suggested on easing up the pink area
47 with the blue slashes, easing up on those, with the
48 exception of the three lakes that show up on page 10,
49 the proposal -06, because the -06 leaves everything
50 in place. But I think that there's some merit as been

1 suggested by OSM of dropping that area.

2

3 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. And so, just
4 -- I want to make sure we're -- we are all on the same
5 page for what we're expecting here. We can take action
6 on the Unalaska Bay closure, which is the big pink area.
7 And again, Nateekin and the other one, I have already
8 forgotten the name of, those would remain closed. After
9 we finish this action. There are -- as we move down on
10 the agenda, there is a specific action related to
11 Unalaska Lake. So, we will have an option to maintain
12 that closure. And then there is an opportunity to review
13 Summers Lake and Morris Lake. Those are presented
14 together in both a new proposed regulation to open them
15 up on a limited basis, or we could choose to keep them
16 closed. So, when I say we're going to have an opportunity
17 to keep them closed or talk about them, what I mean is
18 they're already on our agenda. We will be talking about
19 it. It's a very low like zero lift to have that
20 discussion because we're already -- it's already on our
21 agenda to discuss it. If you are concerned about other
22 bodies of water or waterways that are not Unalaska Lake,
23 Summers Lake and Morris Lake or Nateekin and Makushin
24 River, we would want to call -- bring that up because
25 they're not currently on our agenda. Go ahead, Brett.

26

27 MR. RICHARDSON: I move to amend the
28 current motion to modify the closure.

29

30 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, but you need
31 to say how you want to modify it.

32

33 MR. RICHARDSON: I'm working to it.

34

35 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay.

36

37 MR. RICHARDSON: To modify the closure
38 with regard to Makushin and Nateekin freshwater river
39 systems, to open those to match sport regulations
40 currently and keep the others closed.

41

42 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Is there a
43 second?

44

45 MS. CHERNOFF: Second.

46

47 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Would
48 you like to explain your motion?

49

50

1 MR. RICHARDSON: Yeah. Thank you. So,
2 again, as I initially said, this is -- Unalaska Bay is
3 a large area. You know, this proposal covers the lakes
4 that we've discussed, which I think many of the members
5 of the community have, you know, made comments that they
6 would like to see the closures maintained. With regard
7 to the river systems, I think that's a different idea
8 in terms of -- it's off the road system, the access is
9 not easy. You do need a boat. You can get there in
10 skiffs. People subsist there regularly. I don't know,
11 one hundred percent, of course nobody does, if the people
12 subsisting there are subsisting legally, we assume that
13 they are. There's a hundred and some odd permits
14 subsisting separately from using a net to walking up the
15 river with the rod and reel, wouldn't add substantially
16 to any conservation issues. And I think having that
17 opportunity would be good to expand subsistence
18 capabilities to federally qualified users.

19
20 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. I'm
21 hoping Anna can answer this. These two river drainages
22 were not proposed to open. I'm assuming it's because
23 they are not currently open for State sport fishing. Is
24 that correct? And then I think we heard public comment,
25 well, I thought Vince, when he commented, it sounded
26 like maybe these were recently closed is what I inferred
27 from what he said. Do you have any knowledge of that?
28 So, are these currently open to State sport fishing? And
29 do you know when they were closed, if they were closed.

30
31 MS. SENECA: Through the Chair. The
32 closures do match the regulatory markers and State sport
33 fishing regulations. So, upstream no fishing and I don't
34 know when those regulations came to be.

35
36 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. So, these
37 areas are currently closed to State sport fishing? Okay.
38 So, if we opened it to subsistence that would in fact
39 be allowing additional opportunity that doesn't
40 currently exist in those drainages.

41
42 MR. RICHARDSON: From the mouth of the
43 river to the marker, it is open to State sports fishing.
44 You can see where the little red there is from that
45 marker back to like the watershed area where they're
46 spawning. That's their spawning grounds right there. So,
47 we're just again matching state in that we want that
48 ability.

49
50

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Are you asking to
2 open up the red striped area?

3
4 MR. RICHARDSON: No. The blue area you
5 can.....

6
7 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. So, the
8 proposal actually does open up the pink with the white,
9 blue stripes. That's what the proposal does. It opens
10 that area and it keeps the red striped area closed. Is
11 that basically what you want?

12
13 MR. RICHARDSON: Exactly.

14
15 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Oh, okay. So,
16 that's already what the proposal -- I feel like I want
17 to walk up there to actually point.

18
19 (Simultaneous Speech)

20
21 MR. RICHARDSON: Me too. I only want it
22 for the two river systems. I don't want it for anywhere
23 else though.

24
25 MS. SENECA: Yeah. So, a point of
26 clarification, perhaps through the Chair. My
27 interpretation, my understanding of this modification
28 is so, less the umbrella proposal, have it apply only
29 to the Makushin and Nateekin. So, you're putting forth
30 regulations in line with State sportfish for those two
31 drainages only within those watersheds. And then picking
32 up addressing the rest of the watershed in the closure
33 review. And so, it would be a modification of the closure
34 potentially to retain the rest of the closed area within
35 that bigger polygon.

36
37 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So, I do think
38 somebody needs to walk up to the screen and kind of show
39 where's the -- so, we're talking about modifying the
40 pink with the white, blue stripes.

41
42 (Talking)

43
44 (Pause)

45
46 Okay. That -- like would they be
47 connected the two open areas? Like would it be that or
48 would it be two corridors?

49
50 (Pause)

1
2 Wait. Yeah. Okay. Yeah, I'm just
3 thinking from the -- when Janel does the map, like what
4 would be easier? Okay, so how important is it to people
5 that this actually be -- say, written that we draw lines
6 on a piece of paper so we understand what it is we're
7 talking about before we vote on this? Coral, go ahead.

8
9 MS. CHERNOFF: I don't see it necessary
10 to draw lines. I would just adopt the language in here
11 where it says Makushin River upstream from the marker
12 located about two miles upstream, closed year-round,
13 just subsistence. I would use that same language, same
14 with Nateekin, upstream from an ADF&G marker located
15 about two miles upstream, closed year-round.

16
17 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: But isn't that the
18 closed area that's already demarcated on the map? And
19 you're not trying to open up the red stripe, right? You
20 want that closed what you're trying to do -- so, this
21 is my understanding of what Brett is proposing. The pink
22 area with the wide blue stripes is proposed to be opened.
23 Brett is saying, no, we don't want to open all of that.
24 We only want to open Makushin and Nateekin, not the red
25 stripe, but the part that's in the blue stripe. So, I
26 feel like having this marked on a piece of paper would
27 be very useful to our understanding.

28
29 (Pause)

30
31 MR. RICHARDSON: Well, there's -- it's
32 kind of a generalization. There are only a few rivers
33 in this area, and that may be a better way to look at
34 it. So, there's Makushin, Nateekin, there is Shaishnikof
35 at the end of Captains Bay. And then, yeah. And then the
36 other rivers would be affected by the other proposals.
37 They -- we're only talking about Makushin and Nateekin.

38
39 (Talking)

40
41 That may be a good idea. Yeah. If that's
42 what people want.

43
44 (Talking)

45
46 (Pause)

47
48 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: This is closed and
49 this would be closed. So, that's what Brett's motion is,
50 is to modify the proposal to only open from here and

1 that. This would remain closed. And this remains closed
2 as in the proposal. And I don't know if anyone online
3 could hear me, but. Coral, go ahead.

4

5 MS. CHERNOFF: So, we're talking about
6 that being open or closed? That area being open right,
7 with the wide lines?

8

9 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. The left-
10 hand side of it would be open and the right-hand side
11 from -- like if you drew a line down the middle where
12 it says Unalaska Bay Drainage Rod and Reel. If you drew
13 the line straight through there, right hand side would
14 be closed. Left-hand side would be open, of the pink
15 with the white, blue stripes.

16

17 MS. CHERNOFF: Okay. But I guess in my
18 mind the State regulations open about two miles
19 upstream. So, how -- so, this, if we leave this all
20 open, that whole stream all the way to the lake will
21 then be open, right? So, let's say the stream is six
22 miles. That would leave four extra miles open beyond
23 what's open for the state.

24

25 MR. RICHARDSON: Through the Chair. No,
26 I'm not asking for that.

27

28 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah, that's what I'm
29 saying. But if we draw a line and leave that open, that's
30 what we're getting. We're opening up the whole river to
31 the lake and then the lake being closed.

32

33 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: The red stripe area
34 would remain closed? Yeah.

35

36 MS. CHERNOFF: So, I guess I'd want to
37 see where -- so, originally you said the marker where
38 it's already open. So, where about would that two miles
39 end up. Does it go all the way to the red stripes?

40

41 MR. RICHARDSON: Through the Chair. I
42 think that is the demarcation line of the two-mile, no
43 fish zone, where that begins. Right?

44

45 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: And when you say
46 that, you mean the red striped area.

47

48 MR. RICHARSON: Yes, sorry. The red
49 striped area, yeah. And there is no lake. They don't
50 lead to lakes there. They're like snowfall, rainfall,

1 watershed, waterfall.

2

3 (Pause)

4

5 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. So, I think
6 we have a motion on the floor. We had a second. We're
7 now trying to understand what the motion is. I think
8 we're good. Pat, go ahead.

9

10 MR. HOLMES: Just for the clarification,
11 those areas that are marked as closed waters under state
12 regs, the reason they're closed is because the lower
13 parts of the river that go out to the bay are fairly
14 deep, maybe 4, 5, 6 feet deep. But once you get up to
15 that point, those are spawning grounds. And so,
16 particularly for silvers, the water is only about 3-4
17 inches deep. And so, they're very, very vulnerable. And
18 that's why the local folks ask those to be closed under
19 the state regs. I think another important clarification
20 is and I know this is Brett's permit, but the saltwaters
21 -- correct me if I'm wrong, the saltwater closures off
22 the mouth would be maintained because they're not going
23 to be on federal turf. Right? Because they have a, you
24 know, 500 -yard closures or whatever it is off the mouth
25 of -- let me bring this over.

26

27 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, thank
28 you. So, question for OSM. Is there enough specificity
29 between people gesturing to the map and then the drawing
30 that's on the map in front of Anna, to create language
31 and an official map that would go along with this
32 amendment if it passed, or do you need something more
33 specific like latitude, longitude or a street marker or
34 something like that? Okay. We're good. Okay. All right.
35 So, we -- the motion then is to pretend you have a line
36 that's drawn -- I'm just going to call it, kind of on
37 that skinny part, like through the words Unalaska Bay
38 drainage rod and reel in the white box. If you draw that
39 line, everything to the right that is pink with white,
40 blue stripes would be closed. And then to the left,
41 everything that's pink with white -- wide blue stripes
42 would be open. And the area, the Nateekin River and the
43 Makushin River drainage closures, which are in red
44 stripes, those would remain closed. So, really you're
45 just opening up half of the pink area with the blue
46 stripes. That is Brett's motion to amend this fishery
47 proposal. Is there a further discussion or questions on
48 Brett's amendment?

49

50

1 MR. SMITH: Yes, Madam Chair, I have
2 a.....

3
4 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yep, go ahead.

5
6 MR. SMITH: Yep. I have a question. And
7 so, I can't see exactly the -- oh, now I can the screen.
8 Okay. So, right in between Seward says Unalaska Bay
9 Drainage Rod and Reel, the halfway point, does that
10 include the Captains Bay drainage as well? I may have
11 missed that earlier.

12
13 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. Let me get -
14 - or Brett's going to need to clarify if he intended to
15 include that or not. Brett.

16
17 MR. RICHARDSON: Yeah. That is included
18 as well. Currently, I'm looking at the state special
19 regulations.....

20
21 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Did you just create
22 that? Oh, thank you, Janel.

23
24 MR. RICHARSON: And Shaishnikof River is
25 not listed, but we had talked about it in the March
26 meeting and it has the same sports regulations as the
27 other rivers, I believe, unless somebody can clarify
28 that I'm wrong.

29
30 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Daniel, does that
31 answer your question, or do you have any other questions?
32 And also, we should be sharing a map on screen where
33 Janel was able to demarcate the area we're talking about
34 to open. So, what would be opened is the yellow line and
35 ignore where it doesn't line up exactly with the land,
36 but it is intended to be the pink part with the blue
37 stripe, but it is now outlined in yellow. And that --
38 that's what we're talking about opening under Brett's
39 amendment. Pat, go ahead.

40
41 MR. SMITH: Okay.

42
43 MR. HOLMES: And that would be the
44 Federal jurisdiction because in the salt waters, the
45 State jurisdiction has closures just like off the mouth
46 of the Buskin or off the mouth of Unalaska. Just wanted
47 to have a little clarification that we're just talking
48 about what would fall under Federal regs. Thank you,
49 ma'am.

50

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Daniel, did you
2 have anything else?

3
4 MR. SMITH: Not specifically, but well,
5 I guess what would be the drawback? Because I can see
6 what the amended motion on the floor is in relation to
7 its circle with the yellow on the left side of the map.
8 But I guess what would be the drawback about just
9 expanding that? Or rescinding the closure since what I'm
10 hearing is the Makushin, the Nateekin and the Captains
11 Bay drainages, those are really the three major ones
12 other than, you know, the Summers Lake, Morris Cove and
13 then the Town Creek, which will go to those eventually
14 for separate closure of years or proposals. I guess what
15 would be the drawback about rescinding all of the
16 Unalaska Bay as is rather than making like a modification
17 or I guess this amended motion, if that makes sense?

18
19 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: It does. So, my
20 understanding and Brett can clarify if I don't capture
21 this. My understanding of why the yellow line proposal
22 is being put forward is that there's areas of concern
23 that are not going to be captured in proposals that are
24 going to come up before us. So, we're already going to
25 be talking about Morris Lake and Summers Lake. And then
26 we are going to be talking about Unalaska Lake, but that
27 there's other small areas of concern. And so, rather
28 than try to name those out separately -- we don't have,
29 you know, there were no regulatory proposals submitted
30 for those smaller areas. So, I think the idea is we're
31 -- we would be protecting those small areas by
32 maintaining the closures on the left-hand side of the
33 page, because the whole left-hand side, my impression
34 is, these are just smaller, shallower systems. The fish
35 are much more vulnerable and that we're -- and I do
36 think to some extent, we're trying to take a simplified
37 approach. So, we could try to go in for every single
38 river and waterway but my sense is we're maybe trying
39 to avoid that, but also we didn't have specific proposals
40 put forward for all of those sensitive waters. So, I
41 believe that -- that's why what's before us right now,
42 why that's being put on the table. And if Brett has
43 anything -- if I have misstated that or mischaracterized
44 or he wants to add anything else. Brett, feel free to
45 clarify or correct or add more.

46
47 MR. RICHARDSON: Yeah, I understand. I
48 mean, we could get really granular on this one and talk
49 about each system individually and have one proposal.
50 It would be very difficult when we're looking for changes

1 to one place but not another, and then additional changes
2 within that. I think addressing this issue is
3 simplifying it in terms of these river areas. This is
4 the only proposal that they're mentioned on so
5 addressing them. Now, one thing has just come up from
6 OSM staff. We may want to extend the yellow border to
7 include -- there's one more river system which I don't
8 know the name of, but.....
9

10 No. Where Westward is, along Captains
11 Bay road. Could be. It's a very shallow system, I think
12 pinks may run up it. I'm not sure. But if we're -- if
13 you know, if we're looking for somebody may object to
14 what's the reasoning for opening everything else and not
15 this one we could set that border there. I don't have
16 any objection to that. As I -- I'm looking at what the
17 permits are saying for catch there and there's zero catch
18 listed there, right? If you look at Shaishnikof in the
19 past few years, I think one fish has been listed as
20 being caught there. This is really zero effect. We could
21 do that at this time. But yeah, we're trying to simplify
22 by addressing just these systems and then addressing the
23 other more impactful lake systems in separate proposals.
24

25 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Daniel,
26 does that answer your question?
27

28 MR. SMITH: Yes, it does. Thanks for the
29 clarification.
30

31 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, thanks.
32 Pat and then Coral.
33

34 MR. HOLMES: Interesting discussion. But
35 I think the whole basic thing of this regulations for
36 the Unalaska area is based on the -- adopting the
37 existing State regulations, which would basically do the
38 same thing. And so, it's in my mind, not necessary to
39 even do this.
40

41 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Coral, go ahead.
42

43 MS. CHERNOFF: To clarify again, what's
44 in the yellow would be rescinding the closure? Okay.
45

46 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: And just it would
47 be rescinding the closure under the terms that are in
48 the current proposal, which would be rod and reel and
49 the limited...? Okay. So, the modification is just
50 changing the area, the other parts of the current

1 proposal -- just trying to get the proposal number.
2 Proposal FP27-02. The other terms of that proposal would
3 remain. We're just looking at changing the area over
4 which the proposal applies. Okay. So, are there any
5 further comments or questions on Brett's amendment?
6 Anna, go ahead.

7
8 MS. SENECA: Thank you. Through the
9 Chair. Madam Chair, if it's appropriate, I just want to
10 make sure that the Council -- that you understand that
11 by doing this, there's no opportunity to put regulations
12 in place for Unalaska Lake drainage, and maybe that's
13 the intent. Because it's not there is no proposal. It's
14 only a closure review. So, you can keep it, you can make
15 it smaller or you.....

16
17 (Simultaneous Speech)

18
19 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: For Unalaska Lake.

20
21 MS. SENECA: Correct.

22
23 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Yeah. So,
24 Anna was just clarifying that if we do this and we
25 maintain the closure on the left-hand side, Unalaska
26 Lake -- so we can't modify that closure? Okay. So
27 basically, if we do this and we leave out the left-hand
28 side, Unalaska Lake will essentially have to remain
29 closed because we will not have rescinded the closure
30 that impacted it. And I got the sense that there was
31 perhaps public support for keeping the Unalaska closure
32 in place anyway, is how I was thinking about it. So, I
33 don't see that as a huge loss, but good that it's called
34 out. Brett, go ahead.

35
36 MR. RICHARSON: Yeah, I don't think there
37 is public support to rescind the closure on Unalaska
38 Lake. So, if that keeps that in effect, that would be
39 fine for everybody.

40
41 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. I'm going to
42 go ahead and share my thoughts on this. So, I do intend
43 to support Brett's amendment. I think that it's a -- to
44 me, it reflects public comment and public concerns, but
45 it also recognizes and supports a subsistence priority.
46 So, it does open up areas to -- for -- it opens up the
47 opportunity or it's going to open up a Federal
48 subsistence fishery, it'll provide that opportunity. But
49 it still maintains a closure for areas where we heard
50 concern today because the streams are very small, very

1 shallow, very accessible. And there really is concern
2 about harvest pressure. So, there was -- that was stated
3 publicly, even though in the analysis it -- the analysis
4 indicated there wasn't a lot of -- there probably
5 wouldn't be increased pressure, we did hear concern from
6 members of the public that live in the area. So, I am
7 giving that weight. I think that's all I have to say on
8 this one.

9
10 And then we are going to be addressing
11 Morris Lake and Summers Lake separately. And then I think
12 that's it, because we -- well, we still have to address
13 the Unalaska Lake closure review. We still have to do
14 that. Okay. So, if there's no other comments, we're ready
15 to vote on the amendment. And again, the amendment is
16 to rescind the closure for the part that's outlined in
17 yellow. Makushin and Nateekin would remain closed, the
18 drainage systems that are striped in red. And then on
19 the left-hand side everything in pink with wide blue
20 stripes would -- the closure would remain. But then we
21 are going to have opportunity to talk about the other
22 specific drainages I just mentioned or the waterways I
23 just mentioned.

24
25 MS. SENECA: Just a point of
26 clarification. The action is on the proposal, not the
27 closure review. It's super confusing because we're
28 talking about geographic closures, but where -- you're
29 voting on the proposal.

30
31 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. We're voting
32 on the amendment to FP27-02. So, this is providing
33 guidance and parameters on harvest within that -- the
34 area that's outlined in yellow. Okay. I'm not
35 seeing..... What's that?

36
37 MS. GREDIAGIN: Lisa Grediagin for the
38 record. So, we need to be able to write your -- I mean,
39 assuming you guys go ahead with this modification as
40 part of the main proposal, we need to be able to write
41 it in regulation. And right now, we -- I mean, we can't
42 put a yellow circle in regulation. So, if you -- I know
43 we're all probably getting tired in [sic] lunch. So, I
44 mean, we could figure out the exact regulatory language
45 over lunch and come back. But that's pretty important
46 to make sure when we leave this meeting, we know how to
47 write it in regulation, and we're not questioning
48 exactly where that boundary is and that yellow line.

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So just to clarify,
2 I specifically asked this question about ten minutes
3 ago. Was there enough clarity, so?

4
5 MS. SENECA: Yeah. For the record, Anna
6 Senecal. If the Council member could -- we have enough
7 geographic clarity for sure for the Makushin and the
8 Nateekin, if the Council member could give a landmark,
9 a watershed, for the cut off that splits the Unalaska
10 Bay Drainage Rod and Reel text box. What's that landmark?
11 What's the name of the drainage? And that's enough for
12 us to go on.

13
14 MR. RICHARDSON: What time do you need
15 that by?

16
17 MS. SENECA: Email is great. No.

18
19 MR. RICHARDSON: Can do.

20
21 MS. GREDIAGIN: We need to have it in
22 this meeting. It's a Council obligation.

23
24 MR. RICHARDSON: I can get it before the
25 meeting is over.

26
27 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. So for the
28 purposes of voting on this amendment, is the Council
29 comfortable with -- we have this general pictorial
30 representation, Brett will provide these specific
31 demarcation language to Anna sometime today. So, are
32 Council members comfortable voting on that and basically
33 deferring to Brett to provide that specific detail? Or
34 is anyone opposed to that?

35
36 (No response)

37
38 Okay. I'm not seeing any opposition. I
39 think -- we're recognizing that Brett does live here.
40 He does -- he's going to have the access to the specific
41 knowledge to get the specificity that they're going to
42 need for the regulations. And I'm not sure for Council
43 purposes that it's -- I don't think it's going to make
44 that much difference what -- if it's six yards to the
45 left or six yards to the right. So, I feel comfortable
46 proceeding with the vote. And I'm not seeing any Council
47 member objection to Brett providing that later. Okay.
48 So, I think we're ready to vote on Brett's amendment to
49 FP27-02. Is there any objection to Brett's amendment?

50

1 (No response)

2
3 Okay. I'm not seeing any objections to
4 that, amendment passes. And we will now go back to the
5 -- okay. Now we'll vote on the main motion. So, this is
6 the final vote on this. What we're voting on is adopting
7 FP27-02 as amended. So, we just amended it to basically
8 allow subsistence fishing on just the left-hand side
9 outlined in yellow and maintain the -- there is no
10 Federal subsistence fishery on the left-hand side of the
11 area. So, is there any further discussion on the main
12 motion? Or is there any confusion on -- we just did the
13 amendment, now we're doing the main motion. Okay. I'm
14 not..... Okay. Pat, go ahead.

15
16 MR. HOLMES: What this means then is on
17 that side Makushin and Nateekin river people will be
18 able to use sport fish gear to do subsistence fishing
19 on those streams?

20
21 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes. Provided the
22 streams are inside of the yellow lines. And there's the
23 limit. It's a 5 fish. It's a fairly conservative limit.
24 Yes. Okay. So, we're going to now vote on the main motion
25 again which is adopting FP27-02, as amended. And I
26 apologize that we have this visual here. I keep referring
27 to, but I think it's really the clearest way to do this
28 for purposes of the Council. The fisheries -- it would
29 open up a Federal subsistence fishery in the area
30 outlined in yellow. Is there any objection?

31
32 (No response)

33
34 All right. Seeing and hearing none. That
35 motion passes. And let's go ahead and take care of the
36 -- I would love to take care of the closure review part.
37 It is 12-40. Do we want to go ahead and push? Let me
38 back up. Let me ask a question for Anna. Anna for the
39 closure review. Do we actually need -- because we only
40 got rid of half of it. What -- are you going to need an
41 amendment to modify the closure? Or no? Or how on that?

42
43 MS. SENEAL: Madam Chair. So my
44 understanding is -- so, what the Council just did, you
45 recommended that the closure essentially be rescinded
46 for that left-hand side and sportfish regs apply. The
47 rest of the closure would stay in place if you took no
48 action, but it doesn't apply to the whole thing. So, I
49 think you still do need to take it up and modify it to
50 keep it -- to keep the rest of that area closed.

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

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, so to cover our bases then for -- oh, but we're going to have to go through all of that.

MS. SENEAL: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. We're not going to do the closure review, because we have to take all the comments in order to complete that action. So, I think we're going to do lunch first and come back and do the closure review. What I hope or expect will happen is that that should be fairly brief. We're just going to be modifying the closure to maintain the closure on the left-hand side of the area. But we do have to go through taking input and comments from all of the different groups. So, I don't want to keep us longer through that. So, let's go ahead and do a lunch break. Coming back at 1:45.

(Off Record)

(On record)

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. If we could have Council members head back toward their seats, we'll go ahead and reconvene the meeting.

(Pause)

Okay. All right. It looks like we have all the Council members at the table and Daniel online. So, we'll go ahead and continue moving through our fishery closure reviews and fishery proposals. We ended lunch after taking action on FP27-02. And over lunch there was some discussion and workshopping. So, where I would like to go next is to skip down to Fishery Closure Review 27-04 and take this one up. And Anna, if you want to introduce the proposal and present the analysis.

MS. SENEAL: Certainly. Okay. Thank you, Madam Chair, Council members. For the record, my name is Anna and I'm a fisheries biologist with the Office of Subsistence Management. We're currently discussing Federal Fisheries Closure Review 27-04 to Unalaska Lake. It is paired with a fisheries proposal 27-02, but the action requested of the Council currently is on the closure review, correct?

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: I'm sorry, can you
2 repeat that?

3
4 MS. SENEAL: Your -- the agenda has been
5 shifted such that the Council is currently being asked
6 to provide recommendation and action for the closure
7 review, not the proposal. Is that correct?

8
9 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: There is no -- I
10 do not see a proposal associated with FCR 27-04.....

11
12 (Simultaneous speech)

13
14 MS. SENEAL: Oh. You're right. Man, what
15 a day. You're right. You're totally right. Okay, so we
16 are discussing a standalone closure review here. And
17 this is because the Council's recommendation at your
18 previous meeting in winter 2026 was to keep the Unalaska
19 closure to federally qualified subsistence users in
20 place, despite that area being open to fishing under
21 State sport fishing regulations.

22
23 So, the Unalaska closure to federally
24 qualified subsistence users is a routine review of
25 existing closures, as we've discussed. This one has been
26 in place, however, for almost 50 years. 47 years on the
27 State side. So, way before the Federal Management
28 Program was in place and this was for conservation
29 concerns. However, the area is open to limited fishing
30 under State sportfish regulations. This closure was also
31 reviewed by the Board in 2021 and deferred for community
32 input, and in 2023 taken up and retained as status quo.
33 We discussed this closure again last March and
34 recommended at that time to keep it in place. So again,
35 no proposal. The Unalaska Lake drainage. The Iliuliuk
36 drainage, that includes the lake and Town Creek, support
37 coho, pink, and sockeye salmon, and Dolly Varden. We've
38 discussed the limited survey information available. One
39 of the most robust data sets we have to lean on is again,
40 that aerial drone survey, which don't [sic] provide
41 escapement estimates and also don't [sic] provide real
42 time in-season management. It's a postseason look back
43 and provides a high-level course overview of run
44 strength.

45
46 Recent and historical surveys indicate
47 poor sockeye salmon run strength most years, although
48 that may be changing and there are some ideas as to why.
49 And as such, State sportfish regulations do not permit
50 the harvest of sockeye salmon within the drainage. So,

1 since 2018, drone counts have averaged around 500
2 sockeye salmon. However, the Qawalangin Tribe did run
3 that weir at the mouth of Town Creek in 2024 and counted
4 2,441 sockeye salmon. We know that the drones
5 underestimate escapement. We also know that there have
6 been management changes in the marine fishery. And those
7 could both potentially be contributing to that trend.
8 The tribe has applied for funding to run the weir. It
9 sounds like they were successful. And so there may be
10 additional information on this population.

11
12 Alternatives considered. So, rescinding
13 the closure and considering area-wide subsistence
14 regulations. So that again, is 25 salmon per permit
15 holder, plus an additional 25 per household member. We
16 also considered matching State sportfish regulations
17 under Fisheries Proposal 27-02, the umbrella Unalaska
18 Bay proposal, if it were adopted. We understand granted
19 that there are -- conservation concerns do exist. It is
20 a small population. It is easily accessible. However,
21 the State sport fishery -- the state sportfish limits
22 are quite conservative. We did anticipate that Unalaska
23 Bay umbrella proposal providing regulatory coverage for
24 this area. And we're leaning on the assumption of a
25 redistribution of fishing effort as opposed to adding
26 more pressure to the harvest. We also understand that
27 if a Federal fishery is in place, we have the option of
28 an in-season manager who has the authority to close or
29 modify the fishery or access to that fishery based on
30 three things: safety, conservation concern, and
31 continuation of subsistence.

32
33 In-season data have historically been
34 limited. However, maybe that tide is turning a little
35 early to say, but it is encouraging that funding has
36 been secured for additional weir surveys. So, our OSM
37 preliminary conclusion was to rescind this closure. And
38 the justification again being that distribution of
39 pressure, not adding more, upholding the rural
40 subsistence priority under ANILCA meeting that the
41 rescission of that closure with conservative regulations
42 under the area proposal and understanding the levers
43 that -- the tools you have at your disposal if in-season
44 management delegated authority are an option. So, that
45 is my presentation on the Unalaska Lake Closure Review.
46 I'm happy to take questions.

47
48 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Great. Thank you.
49 Are there any questions on the analysis?
50

1 (No response)

2

3 I'm not seeing any. We will go on to
4 report on Board consultation with tribes and ANCSA
5 corporations.

6

7 MS. HONIG: No comments were received.

8

9 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Agency
10 comments from Fish and Game, Federal agencies, and
11 Tribal entities.

12

13 (No comments)

14

15 Okay. Sounds like we're not seeing or
16 hearing any. Advisory group comments, including other
17 Regional Councils, Fish and Game Advisory Committees,
18 and Subsistence Resource Commissions.

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 Not seeing or hearing any. Summary of
23 written public comments.

24

25 MS. HONIG: No public comments were
26 received.

27

28 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. We're up
29 to public testimony. Is there any public in the room
30 wishing to give testimony on Fishery Closure Review 27-
31 04, Unalaska Lake? Elizabeth Hinkle, online.

32

33 MS. HINKLE: Hi. Thanks. So, I do not
34 have an official statement or -- sorry, I should clarify
35 who I am. I'm Elizabeth Hinkle, I'm the fisheries
36 biologist with the Qawalangin Tribe, and I do not have
37 an official statement as a representative for the Q Tribe
38 on this. But I wanted to just add to Anna's statement
39 about our escapement numbers. So, in 2025, we had 2,441
40 fish that went through the weir. And this past year,
41 2026, we had about 2,900. And that might be off by like
42 50 fish, but it's about 2,900. And we also have
43 continuation of funds at least through next year for the
44 weir, for 2027. And we plan to apply for ongoing
45 continuation of that weir. So, there's reason to assume
46 that we should be able to continue getting some funding,
47 at least occasionally, to understand how that population
48 is looking through weir enumeration. And that's all.

49

50

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Great. Thank you.
2 Can you take a question from Pat? Pat. Go ahead.

3
4 MR. HOLMES: Yeah. I was wondering -- I
5 assume that the tribe in the community will want to
6 continue with the creative closures that came up a few
7 years ago for Town Beach. That probably is one of the
8 most significant actions to improve the returning
9 spawning stock.

10
11 MS. HINKLE: I'm sorry, what was the
12 question? Could you repeat that?

13
14 MR. HOLMES: Oh, I'm wondering -- I
15 assume that you folks are going to still continue on or
16 endorse the change in the subsistence closures on Town
17 Beach. I think you have -- because you've provided for
18 that, they're having a little pulse of escapements to
19 allow it to happen. I think that's probably a significant
20 thing in relation to the returning spawners increasing.
21 I hope that -- I guess I'm asking if -- I assume folks
22 are going to continue doing that.

23
24 MS. HINKLE: I think that is reasonable
25 to assume. But as a representative of Q Tribe, I'm just
26 going to sideline that for now. The only official
27 statement I have in support of any proposals to Q Tribe
28 is on the McLees Lake rescission. So, I've kind of
29 reserved most of my feedback for that.

30
31 MR. HOLMES: Thank you.

32
33 MS. HINKLE: Yeah. Thank you.

34
35 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Is there
36 any further public comment?

37
38 (No comments)

39
40 I'm not seeing any online. Okay. We're
41 done with public or public testimony. We're now on to
42 Regional Council Recommendation. So, if somebody could
43 make a -- well, let's revisit. We have these yellow
44 cards on the table. So, this is a fishery closure review.
45 The options we have are the second set of bullets. We
46 can retain the closure, rescind the closure, or modify
47 the closure. So, I would entertain a motion to do one
48 of those three things. Go ahead, Brett.

1 MR. RICHARDSON: I move to retain the
2 closure.

3
4 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Is there a second?

5
6 MR. HOLMES: Second.

7
8 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, Pat.
9 Brett, would you like to speak to your motion?

10
11 MR. RICHARDSON: Yeah. Very simply, I
12 don't see any public support for any increased fishing,
13 be it subsistence or not within the river or the lake
14 system at all. I think people want to see better numbers
15 before that could be considered in the future.

16
17 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Any
18 additional comment? Pat, go ahead.

19
20 MR. HOLMES: I agree with Brett. I -- the
21 comments that we got from elder Vince Tutiakoff, and I
22 believe from Ms. Golodoff and just talking with folks
23 in town, I'm certain that that's the case of maintaining
24 it the way it is to keep it safe. Thank you.

25
26 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Daniel or
27 Coral, would either of you like to make any comments?

28
29 (No comments)

30
31 Okay. I'll just say that I am in support
32 of the motion. I am giving particular weight to the
33 concerns we've heard in public comment from people from
34 the community with rescinding the closure and opening
35 up the Unalaska Lake to any sort of harvest. There is
36 concern with the -- just the survival of the salmon in
37 that very small system. And also, it's very accessible
38 to town. And so, I will be supporting the motion. Any
39 other comments before we vote.

40
41 MR. HOLMES: Call for question.

42
43 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. We are
44 going to vote on this. Is there any objection to the
45 motion to retain the closure for Unalaska Lake?

46
47 (No response)

48
49 Hearing and seeing none. That motion
50 passes. All right. If we could now move on to Fishery

1 Proposal 27-03, Summer Lake Subsistence Salmon Harvest
2 Regulations. Is there -- unless you have a different
3 suggested order. Okay. Go ahead, Anna.

4
5 MS. SENECA: Thank you, Madam Chair,
6 Council members. Again, my name is Anna Senecal, for the
7 record, and I'm a fisheries biologist with the Office
8 of Subsistence Management. So, we're considering FP27-
9 03, that's Summers Lake Rod and Reel. It's located on
10 page 63 of your RAC book, and the corresponding closure
11 reviews, page 91. And just as a reminder, we are acting
12 on the proposal. So, the intent is to remove at least a
13 portion of a 25-year-old standing closure to Federal
14 subsistence fishing, while keeping Morris Lake and
15 Summers Lake outlet stream closed. The proponent further
16 proposes to institute a single hook restriction for
17 federally qualified subsistence users. You, again, are
18 the proponent, the Kodiak Aleutians Regional Advisory
19 Council.

20
21 So, this area has been closed to Federal
22 subsistence fishing, again, since 2001. And at the same
23 time, also opened to harvest through State sport fishing
24 regulations, which, again, runs counter to the
25 subsistence priority we're required to uphold under
26 Title VII of ANILCA. The proponent seeks to limit any
27 conservation concerns associated with reducing the
28 closed area currently covered under the Summers and
29 Morris Lake drainage closure by limiting allowable gear
30 types to rod and reel, matching seasons and areas to
31 State sportfish regulations and applying that additional
32 terminal tackle restriction. So, they're the same
33 regulatory history here as previously discussed. The
34 Board took this up in 2021 and deferred. And then in
35 2023 went with a status quo per RAC recommendations. You
36 reviewed this at your previous meeting and came with
37 this recommendation that is reflected both in the
38 closure review and the proposal. The cultural and
39 harvest background is the same as was presented in FP27-
40 02, Unalaska Bay Rod and Reel. And the biological
41 background, again, is very similar. The Summers and
42 Morris Lakes drainages support runs of coho, pink, and
43 sockeye salmon. We know that data are limited. They're
44 hard to access -- these sites from offices and they're
45 not indexed annually. Summers and Morris have had
46 escapement estimates generated for 8 of the past 20
47 years. The aerial drone surveys began in 2018. And while
48 the Department of Fish and Game and partners are working
49 on developing escapement monitoring methodologies based
50 on these drone surveys for McLees, site specific

1 investigations are required to make them applicable for
2 other areas, and they just have not been conducted. So
3 again, more encouraging tidbits for future days, but we
4 don't have a lot to go on right now.

5
6 The drones provide that high-level
7 coarse information. They don't provide escapement and
8 they don't provide in-season numbers. These estimates
9 range from 760 in 2022 to over 4,500 in 2020, with an
10 average of about 2,400. Summers Lake supports a small
11 but stable population of sockeye salmon. Morris Lake
12 supports a very small range -- very small run, ranging
13 from 41 to 375 fish by drone estimates. We viewed the
14 creek. We've discussed the creek. The outlet is very
15 shallow. There may be physical barriers to upstream fish
16 passage. No current biological escapement goals exist.
17 Old Summers Lake goals are documented of 600 to 1,600
18 sockeye salmon. And this has been exceeded for all years
19 since 2018.

20
21 So, alternatives considered included
22 dropping that single hook requirement, rescinding the
23 closure, and considering two things. So, all the
24 alternatives included dropping the single hook
25 requirement, and in addition, considering area-wide
26 subsistence regulations. So again, that's 25 salmon per
27 permit holder plus an additional 25 per household, or
28 matching State sportfish regulations as described under
29 the Unalaska Bay proposal, if it were adopted. So, the
30 Morris Lake population is very small. The Summers
31 sockeye population is larger; it's more stable. And
32 these systems are road accessible. They are close to
33 town. That's good and that's bad. Sportfishing
34 regulations are in place. So, there is a conflict between
35 what's currently happening and what we're charged with
36 under ANILCA. We assumed that fishing pressure is
37 unlikely to change given the State sport fishery that
38 is in place. We've heard community testimony to the
39 contrary of that. We still see opening of Federal fishery
40 as an opportunity to allow the harvesters to choose the
41 management system they wish to participate in and
42 recognize the opportunities that in-season management
43 actions can have regarding conservation.

44
45 Considering the terminal tackle
46 restrictions, we were not comfortable moving or
47 promoting, recommending Federal regulations that are
48 more restrictive than State regulations and did not see
49 this as providing a meaningful priority for rural users.
50 So, our preliminary conclusion was to support the

1 proposal with the OSM modification to remove that single
2 hook restriction and match State sportfish regulations,
3 which would also open Morris Lake. And the
4 justifications were all previously stated. So, with
5 that, that concludes my presentation on this analysis,
6 FP27-03. And I am ready for questions. Thank you, Madam
7 Chair.

8
9 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Are
10 there questions for Anna on the analysis? Daniel, you
11 have your hand up. Go ahead.

12
13 MR. SMITH: Yeah. Thank you, Madam Chair.
14 I had a question about the tackle restriction that we
15 proposed on the single hooks. I'm just trying to remember
16 from the March meeting, was that based on the concern
17 of snagging at Summers Lake and the outlet stream?

18
19 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat, go ahead.

20
21 MR. HOLMES: Yeah, I believe that was a
22 discussion that occurred. And personally, what I've
23 heard from local folks.

24
25 MR. SMITH: Great. Thanks.

26
27 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Are
28 there any further questions on the analysis?

29
30 (No response)

31
32 Okay, we're going to start walking
33 through the -- our process report on Board consultation
34 from tribes and ANCSA corporations.

35
36 MS. HONIG: No comments were received.

37
38 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Agency comments
39 including Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Federal
40 agencies, and Tribal entities.

41
42 (No comments)

43
44 Seeing and hearing none. Comments from
45 advisory groups, including other Regional Councils, Fish
46 and Game Advisory Committees, and Subsistence Resource
47 Commissions.

48
49 (No comments)

1 Seeing and hearing none. Summary of
2 written public comments.

3
4 MS. HONIG: No public comments were
5 received.

6
7 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. We're up
8 to the public testimony portion. Does anyone in the room
9 wish to give public testimony on proposal FP27-03 Summer
10 Lake Subsistence Salmon Harvest Regulations?

11
12 MS. GOLODOFF: Thank you. I just wanted
13 to speak on the single issue. I'm not sure I'm
14 understanding it right. But I just want to go on the
15 record of not being a proponent of snagging. And then I
16 heard something said by Anna about opening Morris Lake.
17 Somehow it was tied with that. And I would not support
18 that in any way, shape, or form. Thanks.

19
20 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank
21 you. Is there anyone online who wishes to give public
22 testimony on proposal FP27-03?

23
24 (No response)

25
26 Okay. We're not -- I'm not seeing
27 anyone. We're up to the Regional Council Recommendation.
28 So, I'd be looking for a motion and to keep things in
29 the positive. The motion would be to support the
30 proposal. And then if we disagree with it, we would all
31 vote no on the motion. Pat, go ahead.

32
33 MR. HOLMES: I'd like to move to bring a
34 proposal onto the table.

35
36 MR. RICHARDSON: Second.

37
38 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. What -- which
39 proposal are you bringing up onto the table.

40
41 MR. HOLMES: The one we were just
42 discussing.

43
44 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Oh, you're making
45 a motion to support. Sorry.

46
47 MR. HOLMES: Yes.

48
49 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Thanks. I
50 thought you were trying to do something else right now.

1 Okay, we have a motion and a second. Pat, would you like
2 to speak to your motion? And if you intend to support
3 your motion, might be helpful.

4
5 MR. HOLMES: Oh, yeah. Madam Chair, I'll
6 probably like to amend it. Particularly from the
7 discussions I've had with local folks on treble hooks
8 and snagging. They could see that following up and as
9 we went up there and looked at the bridge and how shallow
10 the water is, I think that would expose the returning
11 fish to considerable mortalities. And it's been years
12 since I've read fisheries journals, but I recall that
13 places where they do allow snagging, that you can lose
14 20% of your returning fish, if not more, because of
15 bacterial infection and fungus infection, and it doesn't
16 really show up until they've been in fresh water and get
17 towards spawning, but you get a significant death rates.
18 And Morris Lake is so small a run that would be a
19 proposal that I would like to have modified is to leave
20 the single hook. And then, I'm also reticent about
21 opening up the lake itself because it's so small and the
22 fish would be very vulnerable. But I just -- that's my
23 philosophy at the moment.

24
25 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Are there
26 additional comments, additional discussion on this
27 proposal -- on the motion? Sorry.

28
29 (Pause)

30
31 Brett, go ahead.

32
33 MR. RICHARDSON: Yeah. I remember the
34 winter meeting, we went through this quite a bit and all
35 were in agreement about the Morris closure remaining and
36 opening up Summer Lake with the recommendation to change
37 the gear to be a single hook. But I think that would
38 match State sport regs anyway that -- unless I'm wrong,
39 which, maybe, we can get clarification on that. It being
40 a lake and not a river, snagging is not allowed anyway.
41 Is that correct?

42
43 MS. SENECA: Through the Chair. That is
44 my understanding.

45
46 MR. RICHARDSON: But a hook -- a treble
47 hook which is typically used for snagging would still
48 be allowed. Correct? So, theoretically no snagging is
49 allowed. However, the gear to snag would still be used,
50 which kind of brings the whole thing into question. I'm

1 not feeling a lot of community support for opening
2 either. Heard Vince say that and Suzi say that, and I
3 haven't really heard from anybody else in town, so we're
4 kind of up in the air as far as discussion goes. I know
5 there's questions with regard to pressure on the fishing
6 in the bay at this area and the potential for, you know,
7 getting into the creek. That creek moves. Are people
8 fishing in the mouth within 250 yards during the time
9 when it's shut down after August 15th and even before?
10 And then, what kind of pressure does that put on fish
11 that escape into the lake itself? While I supported this
12 in the winter, I'm leaning towards not supporting it at
13 this point.

14
15 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Are there
16 additional comments, discussion? For myself, I am
17 inclined to vote no on the motion. So, the motion is to
18 support the proposal. Based on public comment from
19 community members, I am getting the very strong sense
20 that there's high concern with both Summer Lake and
21 Morris Lake. I think at our -- when we originally put
22 forward the regulatory proposal, it made sense to me at
23 that point. But now we have the benefit of more direct
24 input from the community. So, I'm going to be voting no
25 on the motion. Is there any further discussion before
26 we vote? Coral, go ahead.

27
28 MS. CHERNOFF: (Distortion) I guess.....
29

30 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Coral, go ahead.
31

32 MS. CHERNOFF: I guess I'm just going to
33 say I would be inclined to support this end because I
34 really believe in that subsistence priority. And I think
35 it gives us other options. And I think with -- we should
36 exercise the option to have that subsistence priority -
37 - Federal subsistence priority. And I keep hearing that
38 this is an opening and the community has spoken about
39 that, but I also, in part of that conversation,
40 understand that it's already open there. We are just
41 calling it something else. And we're calling it -- what
42 it really is, is that subsistence -- Federal subsistence
43 opportunity. And so, I guess that's why I would support
44 it. Because I do support that Federal subsistence
45 priority. And I think that if there -- the community
46 should look at wanting some closure, submit a proposal
47 to the State for closure, I think would be a better
48 option. But yes, I believe in the subsistence priority
49 all the way, 100%.

50

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Daniel, you have
2 your hand up.

3
4 MR. SMITH: Yeah. Thank you, Madam Chair.
5 Yeah, I'm kind of going back and forth about this. To
6 me, it sounds like the issue kind of at hand, at least
7 from the concerns that we've heard, is relating to the
8 sport fishery, as Coral had mentioned. And if we were
9 to take this proposal up and it does go through, it does
10 allow subsistence opportunity. And I guess since we're
11 a board that only, you know, manages in Federal
12 fisheries, it seems that the State here is -- at least
13 the regulations with the State are the issue at this
14 point. And so, I would probably be in support of this
15 proposal. To allow subsistence opportunity.

16
17 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank
18 you, Daniel. Is there any further discussion? Pat, go
19 ahead.

20
21 MR. HOLMES: Under the State subsistence
22 regs, the lake is closed. And I was trying to look here
23 and see what's in the sport regs on that one or not. Oh,
24 yeah. On that -- okay, I beg your pardon. I stand
25 corrected.

26
27 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So, just to
28 clarify. Under State sport regs, the lake is not closed?
29 Okay. Thank you. All right. Any further discussion
30 before we vote?

31
32 (No response)

33
34 Okay. I'm not seeing any further
35 discussion. Is there any objection to the motion? And I
36 am objecting.

37
38 MR. HOLMES: Move to adopt.

39
40 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes. The motion was
41 to support. And we're at the voting phase. And I'm voting
42 no. I don't -- or not to adopt, but to support. So, I'm
43 voting no. I don't support it. Go ahead, Coral.

44
45 MS. CHERNOFF: Okay. That's what I was
46 just wondering. Are we going to do -- can we do a roll
47 call?

48
49 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes, we can do a
50 roll call. Leigh, can you walk us through roll call?

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. HONIG: Okay, so for FP27-03, a motion to support. Daniel, how do you vote?

MR. SMITH: I'll vote to support.

MS. HONIG: Brett.

MR. RICHARDSON: No.

MS. HONIG: Pat.

MR. HOLMES: No.

MS. HONIG: Coral.

MS. CHERNOFF: Support.

MS. HONIG: And Rebecca, you voted no.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: No.

MS. HONIG: Okay. So, the motion to support that did not pass with three noes and two yeses.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank you, Leigh. So, that takes care of Fishery Proposal 20-03. Now we will discuss the Fishery Closure Review 27-05. And this is the closure that currently applies to Summers and Morris Lakes. Anna, can you walk us through this analysis?

MS. SENECA: Yeah, Madam Chair. There isn't a separate analysis for the closure review. It is the same. I can provide -- I can repeat highlights. I can respond to questions. What do you find the most useful?

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: I think -- let's try responding to questions. I will look around as the Council comfortable with all of the information that we've already received on Summers and Morris Lake. And what we will be voting on is whether to retain the closure, rescind the closure, or modify the closure. And again, the closure applies to both Summer Lake and Morris Lake. Does anyone have any questions? Anna, go ahead.

MS. SENECA: A brief point of clarification that -- the closure applies to the waters of Summer and Morris Lakes or tributaries and outlet

1 streams. So, that's inlet and outlet.

2

3 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Okay.
4 I'm not -- Pat, do you have a question or -- go ahead.

5

6 MR. HOLMES: Just trying to figure out
7 how to do the motion to bring it up.

8

9 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: We're not to that
10 point yet. Okay. We will walk through the process. The
11 proposal or the closure review has been introduced.
12 Report on Board consultation with tribes and ANCSA
13 corporations.

14

15 MS. HONIG: No comments were submitted.

16

17 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Agency
18 comments. This includes Fish and Game, Federal agencies
19 and Tribal entities.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 Seeing and hearing none. Advisory group
24 comments. This includes other Regional Councils, Fish
25 and Game Advisory Committees, and Subsistence Resource
26 Commissions.

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 Seeing and hearing none. Summary of
31 written public comments.

32

33 MS. HONIG: No comments were submitted.

34

35 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. We're up
36 to the point of public testimony. Is there any public
37 testimony in the room for Fishery Closure Review 27-05,
38 Summers and Morris Lakes.

39

40 (No response)

41

42 I am not seeing anything in the room.
43 Is there anyone online who wishes to give public
44 testimony?

45

46 (No response)

47

48 Okay. I'm not seeing any. We are up to
49 the point of Regional Council Recommendation, and here
50 I would be looking for a motion to either retain the

1 closure, rescind the closure, or modify the closure.
2 Pat, go ahead.

3
4 MR. HOLMES: Madam Chair, I'd like to
5 move that we retain the closure.

6
7 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Is there
8 a second?

9
10 MR. RICHARDSON: Second.

11
12 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Brett.
13 Pat, would you like to speak to your motion?

14
15 MR. HOLMES: I think that we've discussed
16 this all around and gotten some, I know myself, comments
17 walking around town and listening to Suzi and Vincent.
18 I think that the decision of the community to have those
19 areas closed in the past was pretty valid because of the
20 nature of the returns. So, I would like to go with the
21 community and retain the closures as they exist now.

22
23 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Any
24 additional discussion?

25
26 (No response)

27
28 All right. So, for myself, I intend to
29 support the motion similarly to my previous comments. I
30 am giving a lot of weight to public testimony we got
31 from members of the community and their concern about
32 these particular systems. They are very small and pretty
33 accessible to town. Coral, go ahead.

34
35 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah. I will not be
36 supporting to retain this closure because of reasons I
37 previously stated that I believe in using the
38 opportunity of the Federal subsistence priority rights,
39 and I believe that if we have the closure, we do not
40 have the opportunity to take advantage and use our
41 customary and traditional use determination. So, that's
42 why I will be voting no on retaining the closure.

43
44 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Is there
45 any further discussion before we vote?

46
47 (No response)

48
49 Okay. Seeing and hearing none. Leigh,
50 can you walk us through a roll call vote?

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. HONIG: Yes, Madam Chair. So, for FC27-05, the motion is to retain the closure. Daniel, how do you vote?

MR. SMITH: To not or, no.

MS. HONIG: Okay. Brett.

MR. RICHARDSON: Retain the closure.

MS. HONIG: Pat.

MR. HOLMES: Retain.

MS. HONIG: Coral.

MS. CHERNOFF: No.

MS. HONIG: And Rebecca.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes.

MS. HONIG: Okay. The motion to retain the closure carries with three yeses to two noes.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. That takes care of Fishery Closure Review 27-05. Before I move on to the McLees Lake, we do have to go back and finish dealing with Unalaska Bay. So, we had -- my mind just went blank. We had adopted an -- a modified proposal to basically open half of the area to Federal subsistence fishery and leaving the other half closed. We still need to deal with the closure review or if there's interest in revisiting the motion or the action on the regulations. So, if I don't hear anything, I'm going to go ahead with the closure review.

(Pause)

Brett, go ahead.

MR. RICHARDSON: Yeah. We had some consultation over lunch that reconsidering FP27-02 in a different way, which staff will explain, would actually simplify the process greatly, the closure review process. If we can revisit that, that would be a good thing.

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. So, you're
2 moving to reconsider.

3
4 MR. RICHARDSON: Yes.

5
6 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. And do
7 we have a second?

8
9 MS. CHERNOFF: Second.

10
11 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Can I
12 just hand it over to you, Anna? Okay, thanks.

13
14 MS. SENECA: Okay. Thank you, Madam
15 Chair, Council members. Yes. We -- staff came to the
16 deeper understanding of what we believe Council member
17 intent was behind the motion for FP27-02, which was to
18 retain protections for the easily accessible, vulnerable
19 road system adjacent systems, so Unalaska Lake and
20 Summers and Morris Lakes drainages. The administrative
21 nature of these superimposed closures is very confusing.
22 We'll admit that it's confusing to staff, it's confusing
23 to the public, and it's confusing for you all and for
24 good right. So, administratively simpler -- more simple,
25 achieving the same end result would be to adopt the OSM
26 recommendation for FP27-02 in full. So, that would be
27 applied to the entire watershed area draining to
28 Unalaska Bay. Granted the closed areas that you just
29 supported would stay in place. So, you're still
30 protecting Unalaska Lake drainage; you're still
31 protecting Summers, Morris Lakes drainages. Why does
32 this matter? The way things currently stand will we will
33 be coming back to you in four years with an oddly shaped,
34 double covered closure area of a part -- a portion of
35 the watershed, we understand, does not support fish and
36 does not see any harvest pressure. So, that takes a
37 great deal of our time and yours. Reconsidering FP27-02
38 and supporting it would remove that administrative
39 hurdle.

40
41 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Leigh,
42 do you have any clarifications you want to give us?
43 Okay. Are there any questions or...?

44
45 (Pause)

46
47 Okay. So, I'm just checking what exactly
48 the procedure is. So, because we've already gone through
49 the whole process of asking for feedback from different
50 groups, we're not going to repeat that. And when -- now

1 that this has been put back on the table, the guidance
2 I'm getting is that we will just proceed to vote. And
3 it is as though we're voting on the proposal for the
4 first time. So, we're just going to vote once, and you
5 can vote up the proposal or vote down the proposal. That
6 is the guidance I'm getting. Or amend the proposal again,
7 but I don't think that's the recommendation. So, is there
8 any further discussion before we move to a vote?

9

10 (No response)

11

12 Okay, so I want to clarify that.....

13

14 (Pause)

15

16 Okay. So, I had to clarify again. So,
17 the motion was to reconsider what we are voting on when
18 we vote yes or no is the original OSM recommendation as
19 written. So, it's rescinding the closure, as Anna just
20 walked through. Except for the parts that were red
21 striped before, and also the closures we just voted on
22 will be maintained. So, the ones we just did in the last
23 45 minutes. So, is everyone clear what we're voting on?
24 Yes. Go ahead.

25

26 (Pause)

27

28 All right. I think we're going to be
29 getting some more clarification.

30

31 MS. WESSELS: Katya Wessels, for the
32 record. So, Brett made the motion to reconsider your
33 previous vote and Coral seconded it. So, now you just
34 vote on the motion to reconsider. So, you're agreeing
35 that basically you leaving the other vote off the record.
36 And then another motion. You make a motion on the
37 closure.

38

39 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. That
40 makes a lot more sense to me. Okay, so what we're voting
41 on now -- I take it all back. We're voting on the motion
42 to reconsider. So, what we're -- if you vote yes, that
43 means you agree with going back and reconsidering this
44 fishery proposal. So, now is everyone clear what we're
45 voting on? Pat, go ahead.

46

47 MR. HOLMES: Madam, I move that we
48 reconsider.....

49

50 (Simultaneous speech)

1
2 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: We already -- no,
3 we already have a motion and a second. We're to the
4 point of voting. I think I'm going to try -- does anybody
5 object to the motion to reconsider?
6

7 (No response)
8

9 Okay. Seeing or hearing none. That
10 motion passes. We are now back at a point where somebody
11 can make a motion in regard to Fishery Proposal 27-02
12 and your options -- your option is to support the
13 proposal.
14

15 MR. RICHARDSON: I move to support
16 proposal FP27-02.
17

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

21 MS. CHERNOFF: Second.
22

23 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Is there
24 discussion? Brett, go ahead.
25

26 MR. RICHARDSON: Just for clarification
27 purposes, what was explained to me was that by splitting
28 up this area, it would create additional closure reviews
29 for areas that have no take at all, no salmon runs
30 whatsoever for areas that were just included in the
31 initial closure. So, basically north of Morris Lake,
32 there's no substantial run and nothing that's measured
33 whatsoever. But there would have a four -- every four
34 years of review on that area. And, you know -- and then
35 in between Shaishnikof and Unalaska Lake, there would
36 also have to be another one. So given that redundancy,
37 we decided to go ahead and simplify things -- actually
38 simplify things rather than think we're just doing it.
39 So, hopefully that clarifies.
40

41 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Is there
42 any further discussion?
43

44 (No response)
45

46 Okay. And I do intend to support the
47 motion. My understanding is that the systems of
48 particular concern have now been covered with the
49 closures that we maintained within the last hour. Those
50 were the sensitive areas. And that rescinding this

1 closure over the larger area is -- does -- I -- my
2 understanding is, is not raising concerns within the
3 community. It will provide more opportunity for
4 subsistence and having that -- the Federal subsistence
5 fishery does provide that extra option for the in-season
6 manager to close all other fisheries, but allow
7 federally qualified users to fish under Federal
8 subsistence in the areas with the appropriate
9 jurisdictions. Okay. Is there any further comment before
10 we vote?

11
12 (No response)

13
14 Okay, I'm going to try this. Is there
15 any objection?

16
17 (No response)

18
19 Okay. Seeing and hearing none. Fishery
20 Proposal 27-02 passes. In light of that, do we actually
21 need to take up the Fishery Closure Review 27-06?

22
23 (Pause)

24
25 MS. GREDIAGIN: Lisa Grediagin. Voting -
26 - making a motion to take no action. Voting on that. And
27 then your rationale is because of action just taken on
28 FP27-02.

29
30 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. All
31 right. A lot of clarifications today. Okay. Because of
32 the action we just took on the fishery regulatory
33 proposal, I'm looking for a motion to take no action on
34 Fishery Closure Review 27-06. So, this would be a motion
35 to take no action.

36
37 MR. RICHARDSON: I move to take no action
38 on FCR27-06.

39
40 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Is there
41 a second?

42
43 MS. CHERNOFF: Second.

44
45 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. And just
46 for the record, I will be voting in support of the motion
47 given the action we took to establish Federal
48 subsistence regulations for this area. I am in agreement
49 that we don't need to take action on the actual Fishery
50 Closure Review. Is there any further discussion?

1

2

(No response)

3

4

Okay. I'm going to try this. Is there any objection to the motion?

6

7

(No response)

8

9

All right. Seeing and hearing none. That motion passes. Okay. Moving on to our next fishery proposal, FP27-01 McLees Lake Subsistence Salmon Harvest Regulations. Anna.

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. SENECA: Thank you, Madam Chair, Council members. For the record, I am Anna Senecal. I'm a fisheries biologist with the Office of Subsistence Management. We are moving out of Unalaska Bay. Well done, you. Okay. McLees Rod and Reel. This is located on page 135, the proposal of your books, and the corresponding closure review is page 163. So, the McLees drainage drains to Reese Bay, not Unalaska Bay. Actions taken on this proposal and closure review do not affect any others. We don't need to think about those others right now. Given the proximity to these other areas however, you'll find that a lot of the background information is still pretty familiar. So, the proponent statement regulatory history, cultural, and biological sections should sound similar to the previous presentations. The issue presented in this proposal 27-01 -- the intent again is to pick up, dust off that 25-year-old standing closure review and really think about, is this relevant to the community today and how does it match with the intent behind ANILCA.

So, the proposal seeks to set harvest limits for rod and reel subsistence salmon fishing that are in line with State sport fishing regulations. This proposal was submitted by your RAC, the Kodiak Aleutians Regional Advisory Council. So, this area, again, has been closed to Federal subsistence fishing since 2001. But during this time, it has remained open to sport fishing, which runs counter to the subsistence priority required in Title VII of ANILCA. The proponent seeks to limit any conservation concerns associated with rescinding the McLees Lake closure by reducing allowable gear types to rod and reel, and matching seasons and areas to State sport fishing regulations. The regulatory history is the same. Closed since early 2000s. Reviewed by the Federal Subsistence Board in 2021 and deferred and taken up again and maintained in 2023. You review

1 this at your previous meeting in the form of a closure
2 review and came up with this proposal.

3
4 So, according to a recent Alaska
5 Department of Fish and Game subsistence study, Reese
6 Bay, which receives the fresh waters of the McLees Lake
7 drainage, is the primary off-road system. Referenced by
8 Unalaska residents as being important for State
9 subsistence salmon fishing. So again, that's the marine
10 waters off of the fresh waters that's outside of Federal
11 jurisdiction. But we know that this area -- the streams
12 that support that fishery, the spawning and rearing
13 habitat are very important to this subsistence users of
14 Unalaska. The study documented that nearly two thirds
15 of Unalaska households report using salmon, with an
16 average harvest of 12 pounds per person. There's no
17 permitted subsistence harvest from McLees Lake drainage
18 fresh waters under either state or Federal subsistence
19 management systems. State sport fishing is, however,
20 permitted. The McLees Lake drainage supports populations
21 of sockeye salmon as well as coho and pink, and
22 occasionally, steelhead. As discussed, sockeye salmon
23 are the primary species targeted by subsistence users.

24
25 A combination of weir and aerial drone
26 data exists to track McLees Lake salmon escapement over
27 time, and the lake has an escapement goal of 10,000
28 sockeye salmon, which is exceeded most years for which
29 monitoring data are available. Sockeye salmon
30 escapements have ranged from a high of over 100,000 in
31 202 -- in 2002 rather, to a low of about 5,000 in 2020,
32 with a recent three-year average, that's 2021 through
33 2024 of around 19,000 fish. The FRMP funding lapses have
34 been a barrier to continuous weir operation. We've
35 discussed this. It is a barrier. It's a serious one. And
36 the Qawalangin Tribe is pursuing outside funding to run
37 the weir in 2027. The Tribe has also been working closely
38 with the State to invest in drone survey refinement, as
39 previously discussed. And a recent study by ADF&G shows
40 promise for developing ways to estimate escapement based
41 on drone survey data, which could reduce the cost
42 associated with escapement monitoring to the tune of
43 around 30%.

44
45 So, some alternatives considered were
46 the adopting general area-wide regulations. So that
47 harvest of 25 salmon per permit holder plus an additional
48 25 per each household member. That was considered
49 concerning in conservation issues, the lack of regular
50 in-season management. Data rod and reel also considered

1 was -- were -- was a rod and reel fishery with a more
2 liberal harvest limit for federally qualified
3 subsistence users. Although it may change, the current
4 inconsistency of funding for weir operations doesn't
5 leave much for in-season managers to work with,
6 unfortunately. So, increasing the limits didn't seem
7 tenable at this time.

8
9 So again, we know the majority of
10 subsistence sockeye harvest takes place in those marine
11 waters. And that this is a place where people go; it's
12 an important place. So, it would likely be appreciated,
13 this additional Federal fishery. The inconsistency of
14 weir funding is notable. But the data that we do have are
15 promising, with that three-year average of about 19,000
16 fish and the fact that we do have escapement goal for the
17 area. There has been encouraging progress on those drone
18 surveys and outside diversifying funding approaches to
19 maintain the weir operations. Again, all the information
20 we had access to led us to believe that fishing pressure
21 was unlikely to change, given that there is a State sport
22 fishery and that folks engaging in that fishery tend to
23 be local residents, and they tend to be -- so would in
24 fact be federally qualified subsistence users that would
25 -- under this system, if this were to pass, they would
26 have the ability to choose which management system they
27 want to fish under. And again, it would give the
28 opportunity for an in-season manager to use their
29 delegated authority to provide some of that priority on
30 an -- under ANILCA during times of conservation concerns
31 for public safety or the continuation of subsistence. And
32 so, given all of that, our preliminary conclusion was to
33 support this proposal. And that concludes my presentation,
34 Madam Chair. I'm happy to entertain questions.

35
36 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Great. Thank you.
37 Are there any questions on the analysis?

38
39 (No response)

40
41 Okay. I'm not seeing any. So, I will
42 proceed down our process report on Board consultation
43 from tribes and ANCSA corporations.

44
45 MS. HONIG: No comments were received.

46
47 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Next, we
48 have any agency comments. This includes Alaska
49 Department of Fish and Game, Federal agencies, and
50 Tribal entities.

1

2

(No comments)

3

4

5

Seeing and hearing none. Advisory group comments. This includes other Regional Councils, Fish and Game Advisory Committees, and Subsistence Resource Commissions.

6

7

8

9

(No comments)

10

11

Seeing and hearing none. Summary of written public comments.

12

13

MS. HONIG: No comments were received.

14

15

16

17

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. This brings us to the public testimony portion. Is there anyone in the room who wishes to give public testimony on Fishery Proposal 20-01, McLees Lake Subsistence Salmon Harvest Regulations?

18

19

20

(No response)

21

22

Not seeing anyone in the room. Is there anyone online who wishes to give public testimony? Elizabeth Hinkle, go ahead.

23

24

25

26

MS. HINKLE: Hi. Thanks. I'm Elizabeth Hinkle, I'm the fisheries biologist with the Qawalangin Tribe, and it is apparent that I have not gone through the right avenues to ensure we have official statements. So, I will work on that in the future. This is my first RAC that I've attended. So, I guess as a member of the public, but also as a representative of the tribe, I do have a statement that I'd like to provide.

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

So, I first became involved with the McLees Lake closure in January of this year when I learned that the Federal subsistence closure was being reconsidered. I brought the issue to the Q Tribe Council and recommended that the tribe support rescission of the closure. The Council agreed and approved that position. The current closure prohibits federally qualified subsistence users from fishing at McLees Lake, while State sportfishing remains open, despite the Federal subsistence priority established under ANILCA. Rescinding the closure would also give federal managers greater flexibility to establish a conservative subsistence fishery with appropriate harvest limits, gear restrictions, and in-season management.

1
2 Historically, a salmon weir has been
3 operated at McLees Lake under the guides of the Q Tribe,
4 and it's provided direct information on run timing and
5 escapement, and the tribe hopes to reestablish weir
6 operations in the near future. With the weir in place
7 in-season, management of a limited subsistence fishery
8 should be more feasible because managers would have
9 current run information to guide harvest decisions and
10 respond to conservation concerns. Federal subsistence
11 management could also create additional opportunities
12 for tribal involvement and monitoring research and
13 future management decisions in the area. To keep things
14 on balance, however, I'd also like to note that although
15 we are hopeful about securing funding against -- again
16 for the weir, we do not have those funds currently on
17 hand. I'd also like to note that secondly, since the
18 discussion has arisen within the tribal community,
19 several people have anecdotally told me that they feel
20 like regulating the area would be difficult due to its
21 remoteness. And so, there are concerns that even if this
22 area were to open again to Federal subsistence users,
23 they -- tribal members are concerned about the
24 regulatory capacity in the area. That's all. Thank you.

25
26 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank
27 you. Let's see if there's any questions for you. Pat,
28 go ahead.

29
30 MR. HOLMES: This is Pat. Just a comment
31 you might want to consider. I know in the past, on
32 McLees, local folks have called up to the South Peninsula
33 Aleutians salmon management biologist up at -- believe
34 it's at Cold Bay now and express their concerns. And I
35 think they've been fairly responsive. They had a [sic]
36 assistant biologist that was down here quite frequently
37 when we were able to get funding for McLees. And so, I
38 think that just by continuing that correspondence and
39 contact with those folks, I think they'll really respond
40 in a positive way for you. And I know that they also
41 worked hard to try to find funding. So, even though
42 that's not their job but a couple of them did that, so.
43 I suggest that you establish some conversations with
44 them.

45
46 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Coral, go ahead.

47
48 MS. HINKLE: Yeah. Thank you.....

49
50 (Simultaneous speech)

1
2 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Oh, sorry. Go -- I
3 forgot that was a question. Okay. Go ahead, Elizabeth.

4
5 MS. HINKLE: Oh, I was just going to say
6 I appreciate that. That is encouraging. And to follow
7 up, you said that these are individuals out at Cold Bay.
8 Are these State or Federal folks?

9
10 MR. HOLMES: Yeah, that's the State. I'm
11 retired State. So, my -- advocate for them. But also,
12 there's going to be a federal biologist based up in
13 Anchorage. And so, that would get you your Federal side.
14 The State side would be probably more rapid than in-
15 season, but you would probably be good to contact both
16 of them.

17
18 MS. HINKLE: Thank you for that. I wasn't
19 aware that there was going to be a new federal
20 representative in the Anchorage area. I'll keep that in
21 mind. Thanks.

22
23 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Coral, go ahead.

24
25 MS. CHERNOFF: Thank you, Madam Chair.
26 Could I have you repeat like the first three sentences
27 of what you read? I don't know why it's all blurred
28 together in my mind.

29
30 MS. HINKLE: Oh, sure. I wrote down most
31 of it, so I think I can just read it to you. I said I
32 first became involved with the McLees Lake closure in
33 January, when I learned that the Federal subsistence
34 closure was being reconsidered. I brought the issue to
35 the Q Tribe Council, and I recommended that the tribe
36 support rescission of the closure. The Council agreed
37 and we -- they approved that position. And then I went
38 on to say that the current closure prohibits federally
39 qualified subsistence users from fishing at McLees Lake
40 while State sportfishing remains open despite the
41 Federal subsistence priority established under ANILCA.
42 Does that clarify anything?

43
44 MS. CHERNOFF: Yes. So, I guess I wanted
45 to clarify because you spoke about rescinding the
46 closure, and we are currently talking about a fishing
47 proposal.....

48
49 (Simultaneous speech)

100

1 MS. HINKLE: Regulation? Oh.

2

3 MS. CHERNOFF: I -- I'm just wondering
4 if then -- I mean, it sounds like you would be in support
5 of opening this fishery by rod and reel and implementing
6 far -- harvest limits. Would I be correct in that
7 assumption?

8

9 (Simultaneous speech)

10

11 MS. HINKLE: For subsistence users. Yes.

12

13 MS. CHERNOFF: Yes. Okay.

14

15 MS. HINKLE: Okay.

16

17 MS. CHERNOFF: Thank you.

18

19 MS. HINKLE: Yes. Sorry for the
20 confusion. Thank you for clarifying that.

21

22 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. And just to
23 be extra sure that I understand, is the tribe in support
24 of the proposal? So, the proposal does limit harvest to
25 rod and reel and then salmon, a bag limit of 5 and
26 possession limit of 10 if it's 20in or greater, and if
27 it's less than 20in, bag and possession limit of 10
28 fish. So, I guess my view on that is those are fairly
29 conservative method, and means, and limits. Does the
30 tribe support that, or do you have any additional
31 comments on those details with the proposed regulation?

32

33 MS. HINKLE: Right. Officially, no. I
34 agree that those are conservative numbers, but the Q
35 Tribe does not have an official stance on the proposed
36 specific regulations, only that we should consider
37 opening the area for subsistence purposes.

38

39 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Thank you.
40 Are there any further questions for Elizabeth Hinkle?

41

42 (No response)

43

44 Okay. Thank you very much. Is there
45 anyone else online who wants to give public testimony?

46

47 (No response)

48

49 I am not seeing any. So, we are up to
50 the Regional Council Recommendation. Here, we'd be -- I'd

101

1 be looking for a motion to support the proposal.

2

3 MR. RICHARDSON: I move to support
4 proposal FP27-01.

5

6 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Is there
7 a second?

8

9 MR. HOLMES: Second.

10

11 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Brett,
12 would you like to speak to your motion?

13

14 MR. RICHARDSON: Yes. This is about
15 expanding subsistence opportunity for qualified federal
16 users in an area that already allows sports fishing. I
17 haven't heard of any community resistance against this.
18 This is outside the Unalaska district. Takes quite a bit
19 of effort to get out there considering the vessel
20 required, the weather to agree, the wind to be favorable,
21 the currents to be in good order, and then you would
22 need multiple people to do this. You can't just leave
23 your boat on the shore there. The shores are -- can be
24 treacherous. And then, as Vince stated out during his
25 public commentary, getting on shore is one huge
26 challenge. Then the hike to the lake itself is another
27 huge challenge. And then there's the fishing. So,
28 there's not going to be a lot of options for people to
29 abuse this should it be put forward. So, I support it.

30

31 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Is there
32 any further discussion on the motion?

33

34 (No response)

35

36 All right. Are we ready to proceed to a
37 vote?

38

39 (No response)

40

41 I will try this. Is there any objection?

42

43 (No response)

44

45 Okay. Seeing and hearing none. Fishery
46 Proposal 27-01 passes. Based on the action we just took,
47 I would then look for a motion to take no action on
48 Fishery Closure Review 27-07.

49

50

1 MR. HOLMES: Yes, ma'am. I'd like to make
2 that motion.

3
4 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank
5 you. Is there a second?

6
7 MS. CHERNOFF: Second.

8
9 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Coral.
10 So, I do intend to support the motion. Given that we
11 just voted to support fisheries regulations allowing
12 Federal subsistence -- or limited conservative Federal
13 subsistence harvest in the McLees Lake area, I agree
14 that we don't need to take further action on the fishery
15 closure review. Is there any further discussion from
16 other Council members?

17
18 (No response)

19
20 Okay. Hearing and seeing none. Is there
21 any objection to the motion?

22
23 (No response)

24
25 Seeing and hearing no objection. The
26 motion to take no action passes. All right. We're moving
27 -- well, let me check in. Do Council members want to
28 take a break or keep going?

29
30 (No audible response)

31
32 Okay. We're looking at a short break.
33 Let's take a 7-minute break. You get half or -- yeah. 7
34 minutes.

35
36 (Off record)

37
38 (On record)

39
40 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right, so we're
41 just waiting for Council members to make their way back
42 to the table, and then we will resume.

43
44 (Pause)

45
46 And then before we get started, just to
47 remind everyone, we have to finish these fishery
48 proposals and closure reviews. So, we have two more
49 fishery proposals, one closure review. And then we have
50 to finish our annual report item. So, we do need to vote

1 on the suggested topics for our annual report. And if
2 we have time, my understanding is we have a report from
3 Alaska Department of Fish and Game Subsistence Division.
4 And then we'll have item 15, Other Business, Closing
5 Comments and Adjourning. So, we still do have at least
6 four action items we need to finish, but it looks like
7 we're all back at the table. Dr. Jason Roberts, take it
8 away.
9

10 DR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Madam Chair. My
11 name is Jason Roberts. I'm an anthropologist at OSM, and
12 I'll be presenting a summary of the analysis for
13 Fisheries Proposal FP27-04. This proposal was submitted
14 by your Council, and it requests that the Board revise
15 the customary and traditional use determination for
16 salmon in the Kodiak area to exclude Kodiak Station
17 census designated place. The analysis starts on page 179
18 of your meeting book, and there's also a map of the
19 proposed C&T area on page 182. So, in this proposal, the
20 Council notes that Kodiak Station should be excluded
21 from the C&T area -- from the C&T. Because it includes
22 the Coast Guard base as well as surrounding military
23 lands and off base military housing communities, like
24 Aviation Hill, Lake Louise, and Nimitz. Currently, only
25 the Coast Guard base proper is excluded from this
26 customary and traditional use determination. You all
27 noted this change would more appropriately meet the
28 original intent of that customary and traditional use
29 determination, while also simplifying regulations by
30 mirroring language recently adopted for a different C&T
31 for Kodiak brown bear.
32

33 Lastly, you noted that the Kodiak
34 National Wildlife Refuge facilities are also located
35 within Kodiak Station, but that long-term residents of
36 refuge housing should also qualify for this salmon
37 customary and traditional use determination. So, this
38 customary and traditional use determination was carried
39 over from State regulations when the Federal government
40 first assumed management of the subsistence program in
41 the early 90s. And like I said, it only excludes the
42 Coast Guard base proper, but there are now several off-
43 base military housing communities within the broader
44 Kodiak Station CDP. These communities are listed in
45 Table 4 of your meeting book. Coast Guard service members
46 could technically live anywhere within the road
47 connected zone of Kodiak Island. But the vast majority
48 likely reside in Kodiak Station. And as noted
49 previously, there is a bit of refuge housing also located
50 within Kodiak Station.

1
2 So, research conducted in the early 90s
3 and 2021 both show that Coast Guard base and/or Kodiak
4 Station residents, this is recognized as a distinct
5 community, and that residents of this community
6 generally exhibit important differences between
7 residents of the rest of the Kodiak road zone. Residents
8 at Kodiak Station are generally younger, with a much
9 shorter average length of residence. Generally, have a
10 greater percentage of adults employed year-round, but
11 lower average household income. And local subsistence
12 knowledge, harvest and use of resources by Kodiak
13 station residents is also generally less than the
14 average resident of other road zone areas, and this is
15 likely due to their relatively short length of
16 residence. Right, the typical Coast Guard tour of duty
17 is about three years.

18
19 So, Kodiak Station households harvested
20 less salmon and less total subsistence resources than
21 other road zone households in the studies conducted in
22 the 90s and in 2021. Kodiak Station households also
23 harvested salmon exclusively with rod and reel in both
24 studies. Also, Kodiak Station households generally
25 exhibited less sharing of salmon and other subsistence
26 resources in both studies. But it's also important to
27 keep in mind that the average salmon and subsistence
28 harvests have decreased considerably for all road zone
29 communities between the early 90s and 2021. And on
30 average, there appears to be a more distinct difference
31 between the subsistence practices of road connected
32 communities and off-road communities in between Kodiak
33 Station CDP and the rest of the road zone. But there is
34 a history of strong social relationships involving
35 sharing of subsistence resources and knowledge between
36 residents of road connected and off-road communities.
37 And the population of off-road communities have also
38 declined dramatically since 2000. With many residents
39 of off-road communities have been moving to the road
40 zone or elsewhere in recent years due to declines in
41 fishing -- the fishing industry, advancing age, and
42 increasing costs of living in these more remote
43 communities.

44
45 And so, one of the alternatives that we
46 considered in looking at this proposal was, you know,
47 whether to maintain this distinction between, basically,
48 Coast Guard residents of Kodiak Station and then
49 National Wildlife Refuge housing. Also in Kodiak
50 Station, under the general idea that most residents of

1 refuge housing -- I know in the past there may have been
2 1 or 2 long term residents of refuge housing, but this
3 isn't typical. And so, if the typical refuge housing
4 resident isn't there for more than a few years, then
5 they're probably pretty similar in many respects to
6 residents of broader Kodiak Station. And so, for that
7 reason, the OSM conclusion is to support proposal FP27-
8 04 with modification to revise the customary and
9 traditional use determination for salmon in the Kodiak
10 area to exclude all residents of Kodiak Station CDP,
11 including those residing in Kodiak National Wildlife
12 Refuge housing.

13
14 And so, the justification here is that
15 salmon have been customarily and traditionally harvested
16 and used by residents of the Kodiak archipelago for
17 generations. These harvest use and preservation
18 practices are based on knowledge and beliefs that have
19 been passed down through generations. Today, residents
20 of off-road communities typically harvest and use more
21 salmon and other subsistence resources than Kodiak road
22 system residents on average. However, the long-term
23 importance and pattern of salmon use are clear
24 throughout the Kodiak area. Available subsistence survey
25 and harvest permit data from the past several decades
26 also indicate that salmon continue to account for the
27 majority of all Kodiak Island residents subsistence
28 harvests. But it does seem appropriate to exclude
29 residents of the U.S. Coast Guard base on an off-base
30 military housing located within Kodiak Station CDP for
31 reasons previously stated. Right, the idea that they're
32 typically stationed in the area for relatively short
33 periods of time, and primarily for these reasons, do not
34 show the same sort of subsistence harvesting practices
35 as longer term residents. And similarly, it seems
36 appropriate to exclude residents of Kodiak National
37 Wildlife Refuge housing for similar reasons.

38
39 And so, the original customary and
40 traditional use determination here was carried over from
41 State regulations in 1992, at a time when several of the
42 current off-base military housing communities in Kodiak
43 Station likely did not exist. And so, it doesn't make a
44 lot of sense right now to maintain different regulations
45 for on-base and off-base military housing communities.
46 And we also didn't think, again, that it made sense --
47 was equitable to maintain different regulations for
48 Kodiak Station military communities and then residents
49 of Kodiak Wildlife Refuge housing. And that's what I
50 got. And I'll try to answer any questions. Yeah.

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: Great. Thank you.
Are there any questions for Jason? Pat, go ahead.

MR. HOLMES: No questions. But that was
an excellent support -- report. I think it very well
covers the thought process of our RAC and also the local
subsistence community (indiscernible). Great job.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Daniel, your hands
up. Go ahead.

MR. SMITH: Yeah. Thank you, Madam Chair.
And thanks, Dr. Roberts, for that analysis. I do have
one question about your alternatives considered. I was
wondering where you got that -- the information on that
first sentence. The average resident of Kodiak National
Wildlife Refuge housing likely does not reside in these
units for more than a few years. It's from my
understanding, there has been maybe more in the past
long-term staff, like you had mentioned, but it still
seems to me like there are at least four long-term refuge
staff there that do subsist under Federal regulations.
And I guess, where was that information from?

DR. ROBERTS: Through the Chair. This is
from my understanding of the situation involving refuge
or Federal housing in general as well as the situation
previously. I know there was a previous long-term
resident of refuge housing there. But I was not familiar
with anyone who was residing in refuge housing now that
was a long-term resident.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. And
Coral, go ahead.

MS. CHERNOFF: I'm definitely in support
of this proposal. But I do have to make a comment on the
part where it says, though generally food secure Kodiak
City was the only road zone community. I think that if
you see our Facebook pages in the winter, if we miss one
boat, our -- like, we are not food secure. I think we
are far from it. And so, I'm in support of this because
we do have food security problems for sure. We get ships
in once a week. If those ships are missed, we've had to
have groceries flown in. And a whole nother thousand or
two putting pressure onto our system is -- this can get
to be drastic situation. So, I'm in support of this.

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. And I
2 wanted to clarify that -- and I -- you're sitting here,
3 you may not be the exact right person for this, but if
4 the RAC wanted to keep the language of our original
5 proposal to allow residents of -- at the refuge to
6 qualify for C&T. Sorry, I was just completely -- if
7 that's not what we're doing, I -- yeah. Customary --
8 C&T. If we wanted to keep that original language, we
9 have that option or we can go with the OSM modification.
10 Is that correct?

11
12 DR. ROBERTS: Yeah. Through the Chair.
13 Yes, you can support the proposal as written by the
14 Council. You can support the OSM modification or any
15 other modification that seems reasonable.

16
17 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. And when we
18 get to the point of making a motion, I would just ask
19 that whoever makes the motion be clear in what you're
20 supporting. If you're supporting the original language
21 or the OSM modification, that would not allow people
22 living in refuge housing to qualify for the C&T -- the
23 salmon C&T. Are there additional questions on the
24 analysis? Pat, go ahead.

25
26 MR. HOLMES: Less a question but a couple
27 of comments. What was it? 20 years ago, when we had the
28 big discussion of rural/non-rural? I know Becky was one
29 of our facilitators that really helped the arguments
30 from our community, but that was one of the criteria
31 that was presented as to why we were not rural. It was
32 because of the 3,000 people on the base. And so, I think
33 that this is a really important thing because it's
34 truthful and they really don't participate all that
35 much. On the exclusion of the Fish and Wildlife folks.
36 I can see both sides of the argument, but I know two
37 families that basically lived there for more than 20
38 years, maybe 3. And so, that fluctuates on their
39 staffing. And so, there are -- and some of those folks
40 are very serious about getting out and doing the
41 gillnetting and subsistence. So, I can understand your
42 perspective. But I would myself suggest that we go back
43 to our original wording, Madam Chair.

44
45 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Are
46 there any questions for Jason on the analysis?

47
48 (No response)

49
50

1 Okay. Seeing and hearing none. We will
2 walk through our process. Do we have a report on Board
3 consultations from Tribes and ANCSA corporations?
4

5 MS. HONIG: No comments were received.
6

7 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Do we
8 have any agency comments? This would include Alaska
9 Department of Fish and Game, Federal agencies and Tribal
10 entities. Jill Klein, go ahead.
11

12 MS. KLEIN: Hi. Thank you. Yeah, this is
13 Jill Klein. And I just want to acknowledge -- so, I'm
14 the regional subsistence coordinator based in Anchorage.
15 And we don't have anybody participating from the Kodiak
16 National Wildlife Refuge. And some of you may be aware
17 we've had transitions and staffing happening there for
18 a couple of years now. And that -- and the hiring freeze
19 has made us -- we've had a series of actings at the
20 refuge. So, just want to apologize that we don't have
21 someone there who can speak firsthand to some of these
22 proposals, but I am listening in and I'm happy to, you
23 know, take any questions if you feel like you need
24 information. I know we won't have it, maybe, right now.
25 And yeah, if you could just clarify for this proposal
26 sounds like there's been some different comments at the
27 table, but yeah, and maybe it'll be that way when it
28 comes time for voting, but clarify which version you
29 will be voting on, if it would or would not include
30 refuge housing. And yeah, I can't speak to the length
31 of years that any of the current employees have been
32 there. And if that's, you know, what the -- what's the
33 crux of the issue, I guess, would be a question for the
34 Council in terms of if you do or don't include the refuge
35 housing. So, thanks.
36

37 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Jill.
38 All right. I'm not seeing any other hands up for agency
39 comments. Moving on to advisory group comments. This
40 includes other Regional Councils, Fish and Game Advisory
41 Committees, and Subsistence Resource Commissions.
42

43 (No comments)
44

45 Seeing and hearing none. Summary of
46 written public comments.
47

48 MS. HONIG: No comments were received.
49
50

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. This
2 takes us to the public testimony section. Is there anyone
3 online? Because at the moment, we have no members of the
4 public in the room. Is there anyone online that wants
5 to give public testimony?

6
7 MR. VAN DAELE: I would like to. Can you
8 hear me?

9
10 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes. Go ahead,
11 Matt.

12
13 MR. VAN DAELE: Yep. This is Matt Van
14 Daele, Sun'aq Tribe of Kodiak. And regarding the
15 exclusion -- potential exclusion of refuge staff living
16 in the refuge compound seems somewhat potentially
17 incongruous and counterproductive to exclude your on-
18 site managers for subsistence in this proposal. Thank
19 you.

20
21 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Matt.
22 All right. Is -- are there any other -- is there anyone
23 else who wishes to give public testimony online?

24
25 (No response)

26
27 Okay. I'm not seeing any hands. This
28 takes us to the Regional Council Recommendation. And
29 here, I would look for a motion to support the proposal.
30 And again, whoever makes the motion, if you could clarify
31 whether you're supporting our RAC's original language
32 or if you are supporting the suggested modification by
33 OSM. And this relates to refuge housing. And we have
34 Daniel. Go ahead.

35
36 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'd
37 like to make a motion to support Fisheries Proposal 27-
38 04 on the original language.

39
40 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Is there
41 a second?

42
43 MR. HOLMES: Second.

44
45 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank
46 you, Pat. Daniel, would you like to speak to your motion?

47
48 MR. SMITH: Yes. I think we've had this
49 discussion at least in the last couple RAC meetings with
50 the bear proposal as well as when we originally formatted

1 this proposal at the spring meeting or the winter meeting
2 this year. I think the Kodiak Station CDP, having it
3 expanded outside of Coast Guard Kodiak, Coast Guard base
4 housing, including Aviation Hill, Lake Louise, and
5 Nimitz. Even with the expansion of areas with house
6 construction, especially in the Nimitz area, two
7 encompass Coast Guard base residents that live outside
8 of the Coast Guard Base. I do believe that excluding the
9 refuge housing from the exemption would also be very
10 appropriate. Had discussions with -- or heard from the
11 biologist at the refuge who is a resident out there at
12 the refuge housing and she's been there at least 6 years.
13 And from our understanding or from what she spoke, 3 or
14 4 other -- I guess, tenants or people that reside out
15 there are also -- not short staffed, but long-term staff.
16 And I did get that information from the biologist out
17 there. And so yeah, those are a little bit of my
18 thoughts.

19
20 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Great. Thank you,
21 Daniel. Coral.

22
23 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah. I will be supporting
24 this to include the residents of the National Wildlife
25 Refuge housing. And my reasoning is because they do not
26 have the benefits that the Coast Guard has. We had a
27 discussion last time about how the Coast Guard has their
28 own grocery stores. They have access to planes, and
29 helicopters, and boats to get stuff in and get things
30 they need. They have many things at a lower cost. So,
31 the National Wildlife Refuge housing benefits do not
32 include any of those things. So, for that reason I would
33 support including them in.

34
35 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Great. Thank you.
36 Is there any further comments?

37
38 (No response)

39
40 Okay. I myself plan to support the
41 motion. I agree with the original language that the RAC
42 came up with. And I agree with the comments that Coral
43 just made about the extra support and benefits that Coast
44 Guard families get. I think they should get that support,
45 but at the same time I think that is their -- the short-
46 term nature of most Coast Guard people being in Kodiak
47 is part of it, and then their access to resources and
48 shopping on the base is also another consideration. All
49 right. If there's no further comment, is there any
50 objection to the motion?

111

1

2

(No response)

3

4

5

Okay. Seeing and hearing none. The motion to support FP27-04 passes. Our next item is Fishery Proposal 27-05. This is a Kazakof (Danger) Bay Rod and Reel Only. And this will be Anna Senecal again.

8

9

MR. HOLMES: Excuse me, Becky.....

10

11

(Simultaneous speech)

12

13

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yes, go ahead.

14

15

16

17

MR. HOLMES: On your summary of the last vote, you said that the proposal passed, but you didn't say in the original language. Or maybe I'm.....

18

19

20

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: No. Yeah. When Daniel made his motion, he specified that he wanted the original language that we came up with.....

21

22

23

24

MR. HOLMES: Oh, splendid. Thank you. Splendid.

25

26

27

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you.

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MS. SENECA: Thank you, Madam Chair, Council members. For the record, I'm Anna Senecal, fisheries biologist with the Office of Subsistence Management. Before you is the final proposal, you'll take up this meeting. Yay. Fisheries Proposal 27-05, Kazakof (Danger) Bay Rod and Reel that's located on page -- you can be -- can be found on page 219 of your RAC book. So, the intent is to limit method and means to rod and reel upstream of regulatory markers in Kazakof, also known as Danger Bay, for coho salmon spawning conservation and to match State sportfish regulations in this area. The proponent here is an individual, Mr. Andy Christofferson. So, this proposal seeks to more closely align State and Federal regulations for the protection of coho salmon endangered bay. A State subsistence fishing closure was approved by the Alaska Board of Fisheries in 2024, and the proponent requests comparable restrictions for federally qualified subsistence users to safeguard coho salmon spawning runs in Danger and Cascade Creeks, which feed into the bay by prohibiting the use of gillnets and beach seines.

1 The regulatory history is a little
2 interesting for this one, and pertinent because the
3 Federal jurisdiction here does extend into marine
4 waters. That's what we're talking about, potentially
5 limiting methods and means in marine waters. So, Federal
6 jurisdiction over marine waters surrounding Afognak
7 Island date back to 1892. A presidential proclamation
8 under Benjamin Harrison, the island and marine waters
9 were set aside as public and Fish Culture Reservation.
10 More recently, in 1992, the Board announced regulations
11 for subsistence fishing in navigable waters, and many
12 of those regulations were carried over from the State,
13 as discussed. This included the closures of Afognak Bay,
14 neighbor bay to Kazakof, and fresh waters of Afognak
15 Island. Danger Bay, however, has been open to salmon
16 harvest by federally qualified subsistence users since
17 the beginning of our dual management systems. Afognak
18 Bay closed waters were rescinded during the 2023-25
19 regulatory cycle, allowing harvest under area-wide
20 restrictions for one cycle. During the next cycle,
21 regulations were put in place limiting harvest methods
22 to rod and reel for conservation purposes. And this --
23 that fishery is targeting sockeye; Kazakof Bay is coho.

24
25 For current events, the Board of Fish
26 took up proposal 58. The previously referenced proposal
27 submitted by the same individual, Mr. Christofferson,
28 in January of 2024, and the intent there was to close
29 the inlet of Danger Bay to State subsistence fishing.
30 So, use of nets and beach seines to proactively protect
31 and conserve coho salmon spawning habitat in freshwater
32 inlets. This proposal was initially opposed by the
33 Ouzinkie Tribe, which then reversed their opposition and
34 supported the subsistence fishery closure. I will also
35 note that Council Member Hayden, speaking on her own
36 behalf, also supported the closure, citing cautionary
37 tales of increased fishing pressure and decreased run
38 sizes in other Kodiak area fisheries, such as the Buskin.
39 So, these measures taken on the State side all were from
40 what is available -- the information available. We're
41 all proactive measures.

42
43 Kazakof or Danger Bay is located, again,
44 adjacent to and just west of Afognak Bay on Afognak
45 Island, and it is not accessible by road. The marine
46 waters support an important coho salmon fishery.
47 Communities of Port Lions and Ouzinkie have subsistence
48 fishing ties to Danger Bay. Sockeye and coho salmon have
49 been the primary salmon species harvested by households
50 from both communities since the Alaska Department of

1 Fish and Game began surveying subsistence users in the
2 early 1980s. Subsistence harvest of salmon has declined
3 across both communities over the previous two decades,
4 most notably in Port Lions. The only time reported salmon
5 harvest was lower was in 1989, following the Exxon Valdez
6 oil spill. Declining salmon harvest has been tied to a
7 number of potential drivers, including aging
8 populations, reduced runs, and the loss of commercial
9 fishing in associated home pack opportunities. While
10 most subsistence fishers harvest under State subsistence
11 regulations, some do harvest under Federal regulations.
12 After sockeye, coho salmon are the second most
13 frequently harvest fish by federally qualified
14 subsistence users reporting under the Federal program,
15 with the most recent three-year average harvest rate of
16 50 fish per year. The average number of Danger Bay coho
17 salmon harvested by federally qualified subsistence
18 users for the same time frame was about 15 fish per
19 year. So, not a particularly targeted fishery. OSM
20 permit records show that all Danger Bay coho salmon were
21 taken by rod and reel, even though nets are permitted.
22 Federally qualified fishers seem to also target chinook
23 salmon in Danger Bay, again, with rod and reel. So, the
24 freshwater tributaries feeding into Danger Bay support
25 coho salmon spawning and rearing life stages. The
26 closest available monitoring, information comes from a
27 weir on Afognak or Litnik River, and it's used primarily
28 as a sockeye weir, but data are also collected on coho
29 salmon. Although the period of record is inconsistent.
30 Coho counts are available for 7 of 23 years and the
31 weir, as is often the case, is pulled before the peak
32 of coho movement due to weather or funding constraints.
33 While the information is inconsistent, the data point
34 to highly variable coho population, ranging from around
35 400 in 2022 to almost 12,000 in 2001, averaging just
36 over 7,000 per year based on the seven-year period of
37 record. Population swings are also reflected in the
38 history of your testimonies and area in-season
39 management actions.

40
41 So, what to consider? The Board of Fish
42 preemptively closed the State subsistence fishery to
43 conserve coho. Not something typically done under our
44 framework. The ANILCA mandate is to provide a priority
45 for rural Alaskans supporting maintaining open
46 subsistence harvest access where possible and employing
47 in-season management conservation tools first before
48 restricting harvest. The closures are tools to provide
49 for three things, again, right? Public safety,
50 continuation of subsistence practices, and the

1 conservation of populations. And at this point, it does
2 not seem like any of those three areas of concern are
3 triggered. The Federal Subsistence Management Program
4 in-season managers have tools at their disposal in the
5 form of special actions that can mitigate concerns
6 related to these three areas safety, conservation,
7 continuation of subsistence in the case that they should
8 arise. In-season management is available as an
9 intermediate step to consider before limiting
10 opportunity for subsistence harvest.

11
12 Federal permit holders report harvest of
13 Chinook salmon, predominantly for the data that we have.
14 And there was an uptick in 2025, interestingly enough,
15 following the Federal rod-and-reel restrictions in
16 Afognak/Litnik Bay adjacent to Danger Bay. So, we could
17 have seen a redistribution of fishing pressure there for
18 that time period. But again, based on the permit
19 reporting, the Federal harvest is taking place with rod
20 and reel, which is what this proposal would seek to do,
21 limit methods and means to rod and reel. So, given that
22 the proposal would not seem to change the existing
23 patterns of harvest behavior, it would remove potential
24 harvest opportunities that could provide a meaningful
25 Federal preference. And so, our preliminary conclusion
26 is to oppose the proposal for the reasons stated. And
27 so, that concludes my presentation on FP27-05. And I'm
28 happy to take questions. Thank you.

29
30 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. I have two
31 questions. Let me write them down before I forget. All
32 right. I already forgot one of them. So, you talked
33 about the three criteria that relate to closures. Are
34 you viewing this as a closure?

35
36 MS. SENECA: Through the Chair. No, I'm
37 not viewing this as a closure. Well.....

38
39 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: And the only reason
40 I ask is because you went through the criteria that
41 relate to closure. So, it seemed like you were applying
42 that or suggesting we should apply. So, I just wanted
43 to.....

44
45 (Simultaneous speech)

46
47 MS. SENECA: Yeah, that's a good point.

48
49 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: make sure I
50 understood what you were saying.

1

2

3 MS. SENEAL: It's misleading. I missed
4 a step. So, the point was that there's an intermediate
5 step, and that's in-season management to take before
6 restricting access to a resource for federally qualified
7 users. And the justification for employing those in-
8 season management actions are those three criteria. None
9 of them seem to have been triggered. No in-season
10 management, thus it should -- is it timely? Is it
11 necessary to entertain restricting methods and means at
12 this time?

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. And it's
possible I might remember my other question. Does anyone
else have questions for Anna on the analysis? Coral, go
ahead.

MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah. And I guess I'll
refer to Table 2 on page 226. Unfortunately, we only
have ADF&G escapement monitoring up until 2022. But in
that time period, we can see that there's been a huge
decline, which is kind of interesting in what you say.
And I guess I am in support of this and I will be
supporting it because from 2001, there's -- not all the
years are shown. And because we don't seem to have more
recent information showing what the escapement is, it
looks like there's definitely been a decline since 2001.
Quite a sizable decline, really. And I do here locally
how many -- well, at this -- like, we see a lot more
recreational boats and fishing coming out of Kodiak, I
would say in the last ten years than we've ever seen
before. So, I think we do see an increase where people
are, you know, they here where, you know, there's runs
that are easy to get and, you know, it's fun. And so,
people do end up going. And so, I think for people who
go to Litnik -- you know, we do have a lot of -- there's
small streams and small areas to fish. So, when people
start coming there like it makes an impact on people who
have been fishing there. So, I guess for those reasons,
I would support this. I think it's not taking away
subsistence rights. I think it's just reducing those
that tend to maybe abuse it and leave the ability to
fish still in place for others.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Daniel,
your hand is up. Go ahead.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Madam Chair. And
thanks Anna for the presentation. Just so I have this
right, with the proposed changes would enact methods and

1 means in line with State sportfishing regulations. And
2 on the page 221, with the proposed Federal regulation,
3 I'm not seeing in there that the methods and means were
4 with State sportfishing regulations. And so, if this
5 proposal was to go through, would it be 5 salmon per day
6 to mirror sportfishing regulations?
7

8 MS. SENEAL: Through the Chair, the
9 proposal is to restrict the federally qualified users
10 to rod and reel. So, it addresses methods and means
11 only. So, on page 221, the Roman numeral three, you may
12 subsistence fish for salmon with rod and reel only in
13 the following locations. And then the new addition is
14 in bold D. Describes the area that corresponds to the
15 State regulations. So, it would not impose State limits.
16 That's an excellent question. It addresses methods and
17 means and area.
18

19 MR. SMITH: Okay, so there would be the
20 25 fish and then plus 25 per member of a household?
21

22 MS. SENEAL: Through the Chair. That's
23 correct.
24

25 MR. SMITH: Okay. Thank you.
26

27 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Are
28 there any other questions on the analysis?
29

30 (No response)
31

32 Okay. Seeing none. We will walk through
33 our process. Do we have a report on Board consultation,
34 including Tribes and ANCSA corporations?
35

36 MS. HONIG: No comments were received.
37

38 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Do we
39 have any agency comments? And this includes the Alaska
40 Department of Fish and Game, Federal agencies, and
41 Tribal entities.
42

43 (No comments)
44

45 Seeing and hearing none. Do we have any
46 advisory group comments? This includes other Regional
47 Councils, Fish and Game Advisory Committees, and
48 Subsistence Resource Commissions.
49

50 (No comments)

117

1
2 Seeing and hearing none. Is there a
3 summary of written public comments?

4
5 MS. HONIG: No public comments were
6 received.

7
8 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. We are at the
9 public testimony section. Again, we have no public in
10 the room here. Do we have any public online wishing to
11 give testimony?

12
13 (No response)

14
15 Okay. I'm not seeing any hands. We are
16 now at the Regional Council Recommendation stage. And
17 what I would look for is a motion to support. And then
18 we can vote it up or vote it down. Pat, go ahead.

19
20 MR. HOLMES: I'd like to make a motion
21 to support this.

22
23 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Is there
24 a second?

25
26 MR. SMITH: Second.

27
28 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Daniel.
29 All right. Pat, would you like to speak to your motion?

30
31 MR. HOLMES: I'm torn. I understand
32 different ways of looking at this because it's a small
33 area and easily overharvested. But then I've known Andy
34 Christofferson and lots of the Native Village of Afognak
35 folks, and so I can have a great deal of empathy with
36 them. And so, I think I would go with the original part
37 of the proposal.

38
39 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you, Pat. Is
40 there additional discussion on the motion and the
41 proposal? Daniel, go ahead.

42
43 MR. SMITH: Yeah. Thank you, Madam Chair.
44 I would be in support of the original proposal. Seems
45 to be a very localized concern for coho salmon discussing
46 with Andy C. and others as well, even hearing about this
47 a couple of years ago at the Board of Fish and then just
48 recently. There's been a concern about seiners and
49 gillnetters overharvesting some coho salmon close to Big
50 Danger Creek, kind of inside that boundary area. And it

1 does seem appropriate to limit that in this case as
2 well. Kind of almost mirroring what happened in the Board
3 of Fish.

4
5 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank
6 you, Daniel. Is there any additional discussion?

7
8 (No response)

9
10 Okay. I do intend to support the motion.
11 This particular concern -- Andy, has been voicing this
12 concern for a number of years, at least 2 years, maybe
13 3 or 4 years. So, this is not a new issue. He did take
14 it through the Board of Fish. I think that his proposal
15 strikes a good balance between allowing Federal
16 subsistence harvest but also slowing down the effort in
17 the area. So, the difference between using a gillnet
18 versus using rod and reel. So, I intend to support the
19 proposal. Is there any other discussion before we vote?
20 Coral, go ahead.

21
22 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah. And I just want to
23 say, I think sometimes for -- I just want to, I guess,
24 give a little explanation of -- you may think, well, the
25 amount that you can catch is the same one way or another.
26 It's just -- now, if I'm a subsistence user, it's going
27 to take me a lot longer with rod and reel, but I want
28 people to understand too. I think -- I don't know if
29 Rebecca was out at the time, but one time we went out
30 fishing, we barely got a quarter of the net out. We're
31 slammed with so many fish, and that could happen. And
32 that's how you can over fish. Like we were thinking we
33 might catch 10 or 15 salmon, and we ended up with like
34 70, like -- and we hadn't even had our net out. So,
35 those kinds of things can happen and they're very real.
36 So, I just wanted to explain that. Because I think a lot
37 of times we don't explain a lot of things just because
38 we know them in our head, you know, we see them in our
39 head. So, I would just like to mention that it's a very
40 real thing.

41
42 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. If
43 there's no further discussion, we'll go to a vote. Is
44 there any objection to the motion?

45
46 (No response)

47
48 Okay. Seeing and hearing none. That
49 motion passes to support Fishery Proposal 27-05. And our
50 last proposal/closure review is FCR27-08 Kodiak and

1 Afognak Area King Crab Closure Review. And this will be
2 Dr. Jason Roberts.

3
4 DR. ROBERTS: All right. Hello again,
5 Madam Chair, members of the Council. I'm Jason Roberts.
6 So, I'm presenting hopefully a quite brief summary of
7 Fisheries Closure Review FCR27-08. This is a standard
8 review of a Federal fishery closure to king crab harvest
9 by non-federally qualified users in the Kodiak and
10 Afognak areas. And so, this is one of those that comes
11 up at least every four years by Board policy to determine
12 if the closure is still necessary. And so, as many of
13 you know, the Board first closed Kodiak king crab
14 fisheries to non-federally qualified users in 1995
15 following significant conservation concerns amidst the
16 crash of the king crab population in the 80s. And so,
17 since relatively few red king crabs are captured in the
18 State trawl survey each year, it's not possible to
19 accurately determine population trends, since small
20 differences in catches result in large differences in
21 population estimates. However, these surveys do show
22 that king crab stock in the Kodiak area has remained at
23 quite low abundance and doesn't show indication of
24 rebuilding. So, no specific management objective has
25 been set for either the Federal or State king crab
26 subsistence fisheries in the Kodiak area, but the State
27 does set a total threshold abundance of fertilized
28 females for determining when or if to reopen the
29 commercial fishery. And trawl survey estimates have
30 continued to be well below this threshold level.

31
32 So, commercial production of king crab
33 peaked in the 1960s, but the fishery was essentially
34 exhausted by the early 80s and hasn't recovered. As Bruce
35 Short explained at a previous Council meeting,
36 overharvesting and the emergence of sea otters played
37 key roles in the decline of the king crab fishery in
38 this area. The annual subsistence harvest for the king
39 crab vicinity, or the Kodiak vicinity, was estimated at
40 just under 18,000 king crabs in 1982 but had declined
41 to less than 6,000 by the 1990s. Subsistence king crab
42 harvest in the Chiniak Bay area has steadily declined
43 since the mid-1990s, and recent annual harvests
44 documented through subsistence permits have often been
45 well under 100 crabs per year. However, residents
46 throughout the area still depend upon many types of
47 shellfish and other marine invertebrates as key
48 components of their subsistence base. A 2018 study found
49 that king crab were one of the most regularly used
50 subsistence shellfish species in several Kodiak

1 communities, but that they had not composed a
2 significant portion of local diets in these communities
3 for many years. And during the most recent subsistence
4 survey conducted in 2021, Tanner crab accounted for the
5 greatest proportion of marine invertebrate harvest.

6
7 And so, the OSM preliminary conclusion
8 on this is to retain the status quo. So, to retain this
9 closure to non-federally qualified users. There
10 continues to be significant conservation concern for
11 king crab populations in the Kodiak area, which includes
12 the Federal public waters of Womens Bay, Gibson Cove,
13 and nearshore waters around the Karluk River mouth and
14 Afognak Island. Kodiak Area King crab stock remains
15 consistently low. Marine waters under Federal
16 jurisdiction in Women's Bay are known nursery area for
17 the larger Chiniak Bay, and these waters are easy to
18 access from the Kodiak road system. Restricting the
19 harvest of king crab in these Federal waters for
20 subsistence uses is necessary for the conservation of
21 the king crab resource and to help ensure some
22 opportunity for the continuation of Federal subsistence
23 uses of this resource. Because about 98% of the mature
24 king crab caught in the State's annual trawl survey were
25 caught outside of Federal marine waters, it's unlikely
26 that a continued limited harvest by federally qualified
27 users in the closure area will detrimentally impact the
28 overall population of king crab. And that's what I have.
29 And I can answer any questions if you have them.

30
31 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Great. Thank you.
32 Coral.

33
34 MS. CHERNOFF: I have a question in the
35 subsistence taking of king crab currently. Are those
36 recorded on the fish or crab tickets? I haven't taken
37 any because, you know, they've been so low for so many
38 years that we just don't go. But is the take actually
39 recorded somewhere?

40
41 (Pause)

42
43 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: So, I'm laughing
44 because when Anna is sitting there and she gets a
45 question, Jason comes over with the book. "Here, Anna.
46 Here's where it is." This one, he's sitting there and
47 she's like, "Jason, you're on your own." Sorry. Go ahead,
48 Jason. We also have -- Jackie Keating might want to help
49 you out if you want.

1 DR. ROBERTS: Sure.

2

3 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Jackie, do
4 you want to go ahead?

5

6 MS. KEATING: Thank you, Madam Chair.
7 This is for the record, Jackie Keating, Division of
8 Subsistence. If I understood the question correctly. And
9 please correct me if I'm wrong. I think it was, are the
10 harvests of crab recorded on a subsistence permit? And
11 if that was the question, then yes, they are. It's on
12 the back of the regular salmon permit. It's all in one
13 place. Thank you.

14

15 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thanks.
16 Pat, go ahead.

17

18 MR. HOLMES: Oh, again, I'd like to
19 compliment you on your report. It's just interesting.
20 It's too bad we can't have an integrated sea otter
21 program with crab. And particularly one spot that really
22 strikes my memory is Womens Bay. And I used to go and
23 dive there, and you do one, two, three strokes, grab
24 one. You know, they're everywhere. And that ended up
25 being the last refuge anywhere close to Kodiak for king
26 crab. And -- oh, two years ago, three years ago, Carol?
27 When did that group of sea otters move around from Marmot
28 into Womens bay? But I mean, just within a matter of
29 weeks, it went zip. And talking to the NOAA divers out
30 there, it's pretty rare thing for them to even find a
31 crab. I guess they found 1 or 2 that were in some old,
32 abandoned crab pots because the otters couldn't get at
33 them in there. But that's such a tremendous change from
34 early 70s, 60s when I got my canoe with two ring nets
35 and paddled the length of the building and fill [sic]
36 up my canoe. You know, it's just totally different. And
37 so, I think leaving status quo is an important thing to
38 do.

39

40 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Carol, you have a
41 question?

42

43 MS. CHERNOFF: Yes. I just wanted to
44 clarify with Ms. Keating is -- were you talking about
45 king crab are recorded on the back of the Federal
46 subsistence permit? Because that's what we're talking
47 about, federal. And where is that information, or is it
48 all in -- or do we have a -- do we get a State permit
49 that we keep track of our crab?

50

1 MS. KEATING: Thank you. Through the
2 Chair. I cannot speak to the Federal permit. I believe
3 some of the numbers presented were referring to some of
4 the State harvest numbers, too. And if I'm -- I might
5 be wrong on that, but I know for the State permit, that
6 is where the subsistence crab, including king crab, is
7 recorded. Thanks.

8
9 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Jason, did you want
10 to add anything?

11
12 DR. ROBERTS: Yeah. So, the harvest is
13 reported on a State permit, but you're fishing under
14 Federal regulations.

15
16 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank
17 you. Okay. Are there any additional questions on the
18 analysis before we go through our process?

19
20 (No response)

21
22 Okay. So, we have heard the introduction
23 of the proposal and presentation of analysis. Next, we
24 have report on Board consultation with Tribes and ANCSA
25 corporations.

26
27 MS. HONIG: No comments were received.

28
29 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Next is agency
30 comments, including from the Alaska Department of Fish
31 and Game, Federal agencies and Tribal entities.

32
33 (No comments)

34
35 Seeing and hearing none. Next would be
36 advisory group comments, including other Regional
37 Councils, Fish and Game Advisory Committees, and
38 Subsistence Resource Commissions.

39
40 (No comments)

41
42 Seeing and hearing none. Next is summary
43 of written public comments.

44
45 MS. HONIG: No comments were received.

46
47 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: And last would be
48 public testimony. There's no public in the room here.
49 Is there any public online that wishes to give testimony?

50

1 (No response)

2

3 Okay. I'm not seeing any hands there.
4 We're to the point of Regional Council Recommendation.
5 And this is a fishery closure review, so I am looking
6 for a motion to retain the closure, rescind the closure,
7 or modify the closure. Pat, go ahead.

8

9 MR. HOLMES: Madam Chairman, I'd like to
10 make a motion that we retain the closure.

11

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

14

15 MS. CHERNOFF: Second.

16

17 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Pat,
18 would you like to speak to your motion?

19

20 MR. HOLMES: Oh, I think we've got it
21 pretty well covered. The problem still exists, and it's
22 unlikely that things are going to change in the next few
23 years. And so, I think that we need to continue to
24 provide as much protection for the few crabs that are
25 left.

26

27 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank
28 you, Pat. Are there any additional comments before we
29 vote? Coral, go ahead.

30

31 MS. CHERNOFF: I guess I just have a
32 comment in the OSM's analysis. Do we check into bycatch
33 numbers also? I do notice there's a lot of talk about
34 that amongst the States. I personally have seen pictures
35 of lots and lots of crab on decks. And so, I would ask
36 maybe that that become a part of analysis in the future.

37

38 (No audible response)

39

40 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. You're
41 getting nods of heads from staff. Okay. If there's no
42 further comments, is there any objection to the motion?

43

44 (No response)

45

46 Seeing and hearing none. That motion
47 passes to retain the fishery closure -- or to retain the
48 closure under FCR27-08. Okay, that concludes our
49 regional proposals and closure reviews. Would the
50 Council like a short break before we move into confirming

1 our annual report topics? Okay. Let's go ahead and take
2 a short break, 5 minutes. So, resuming at 4:15. Thanks.

3

4 (Off record)

5

6 (On record)

7

8 CHAIRPESON SKINNER: Okay. We have
9 Council members back at the table and we are working on
10 getting the potential annual report topics up on the
11 screen, so that -- I think it'll be easier if we're all
12 looking at the same thing. In terms of where we are on
13 the agenda, we are at 11.b Annual Report. And that's
14 Roman numeral little three, Identify Issues for FY2026
15 Annual Report. And what is up on the screen are topics
16 that came up yesterday with the exception of King Cove
17 Road. I added that in with a question mark just because
18 King Cove Road is something we've spoken to before,
19 whether in letters or annual report, and there is current
20 activity kind of happening on King Cove Road. So, it's
21 there as a question mark. We don't have to leave it
22 there. So, I guess I'll go through for each of these
23 what I recall the discussion. So, this is for the benefit
24 of Leigh when she types these up. Subsistence priority
25 in general, this is speaking to the general lack of
26 clarity about what does subsistence priority mean? How
27 is it implemented? And just, you know, there are sets
28 of notes on these already, but. And that both on the
29 State and Federal side, there is a stated preference or
30 preference for subsistence, but it doesn't -- sometimes
31 it doesn't look like that's what's happening. So, it
32 seems like there's decisions are being made, but it's
33 not clear how they're being made. What criteria are they
34 looking at? What are they weighing and balancing to come
35 to the decisions around subsistence. So, that
36 subsistence priority. And then, just so you know, my
37 intent is to keep all of these on the screen at the same
38 time. So, if you're -- just be careful. Okay, great.
39 Thank you. Okay. Thank you. Yeah.

40

41 And then consultation prior to closure.
42 This has to do with in-season closures. The reason I
43 pulled this out separately is because at the last -- I
44 think it was the Federal Subsistence Board work session
45 the Board adopted, or at least it was presented a more
46 clear policy on how consultations with Fish and Game
47 will happen before an in-season closure. And so, the
48 suggestion -- what I would suggest is that we ask --
49 because this consultation prior to closure has been an
50 issue, that the language of that policy just be adopted

1 for RACs because it's the same requirement. There's a
2 requirement to consult with RACs and with Fish and Game.
3 And so, there's this clear language on the State side,
4 it could just be rolled over onto the RAC side.

5
6 Subsistence access and fishery closures
7 during commercial fisheries. This topic was discussed
8 yesterday. I do understand that there is -- everyone on
9 the RAC may not be in complete agreement that commercial
10 fisheries are occurring on the exact same fishery that
11 is being closed for subsistence. However, I do think
12 there is definitely a perception concern, and I'm
13 thinking specifically about Kodiak this summer because
14 you had seine vessels operating right outside of Buskin
15 that had a closure. So, I think regardless of whether
16 it's actually happening or not, there's definitely a
17 perception issue or education issue that can go on there.
18 Next, coordination and transparency in Federal and State
19 fisheries management decisions. I think it seemed like
20 this kind of came up in two aspects, but there was the
21 question if the State is going to close a fishery or
22 open a commercial fishery, are they communicating with
23 the -- they're kind of corresponding Federal in-season
24 manager before they do that. And so, maybe part of it
25 is a question. Are they coordinating? How do they
26 coordinate? And then part would be the recommendation
27 to increase transparency so that we're not having to ask
28 the question, how does this work? And then, that it'd
29 be more -- yeah, it'd be more clear in general.

30
31 Enforcement capacity and seasonal
32 enforcement presence. This is something we've brought
33 up before in our annual reports. It came up again at
34 this meeting. I think enforcement may be an issue
35 throughout our region, but it seems like it is definitely
36 a bigger issue in Unalaska. So, I think it's worth --
37 again, my stance is if these issues are important to the
38 RAC, we should keep putting it in even if we've put it
39 in before. FRMP. For this, I would -- what I was thinking
40 is touching on some of the concerns and suggestions that
41 came up with -- from the discussions yesterday with
42 people who have applied for FRMP, to the grants. There
43 were issues around the timing so that awards aren't
44 announced until pretty late in the year. So, if you're
45 working with salmon, you're probably going to need to
46 be ready to go by May. And so, getting an award notice
47 in May or in April is pretty late. So, whatever
48 opportunities there are to make that the timing of the
49 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program align better with
50 when summertime salmon work might be done. I think I had

1 a couple other things with FRMP.

2

3 And then, if it's possible to shorten
4 the entire process, we heard that it can take as long
5 as 14 months, whereas other grants and granted their
6 different programs, but those ones might be a little bit
7 shorter, of 6 or 7 a month. So, is there an opportunity
8 to shorten up the -- from application to time of award
9 to tighten that up? The weir funding and data continuity.
10 We have brought this up before. The importance of weirs
11 in our region, the importance of having the ability to
12 maintain these weirs and then having the data
13 continuity. So, we're not seeing, you know, gaps every
14 so many years because we had weir funding and then we
15 lost weir funding. And then King Cove Road, I think that
16 probably speaks for itself. In the past when we've
17 commented, we've commented in support of the road.
18 Again, I -- and this is literally asking the Council,
19 do we want to comment on this because we've commented
20 before. And I'm perfectly fine if it drops off. So,
21 those are the items, again, aside from King Cove Road
22 that came up yesterday. Does this look about right? Do
23 we want to add anything else or does anything need to
24 come off?

25

26 Yeah, I think -- let's go ahead and do
27 discussion. And then, hopefully we'll arrive at a list
28 that then we can vote on to adopt as our list of items.
29 But you need to turn your mic on when you're ready. Go
30 ahead, Pat.

31

32 MR. HOLMES: Well, I think the
33 subsistence priority is very, very important. And then,
34 when you have consulting prior to closures in relation
35 to subsistence harvest, you need to be understanding
36 timing on that. I don't know that even getting a timing
37 between the State government and the Federal government
38 on closures. Because some items -- I mean, it's a matter
39 of hours to make a decision whether to open up the west
40 side of the island or not for Karluk. And so, then that
41 indirectly affects the subsistence on that side. So,
42 some of these things might be good, but they need to be
43 clarified in how they can be achieved or not. Because
44 some things like annual review of closures is entirely
45 different than what's going on in-season in response to
46 what's happening to the critters. Because by the time
47 you even sit down and phone all the different people,
48 the problem could be worse. And particularly, when it
49 turns to escapement.

50

1 Subsistence access and Federal closures
2 or fisheries closures during commercial fisheries. You
3 can, I think, ask for clarification on that. But then
4 again, from my experience, they really try to avoid
5 causing conflicts when it comes to salmon or crab.
6 Coordinating and transparency and Federal and State
7 fisheries management decisions. I think that that is
8 very good. And, you know, that's something I'm sure from
9 what I've heard is being discussed right now. How do
10 they communicate with each other? Enforcement capacity,
11 seasonal enforcement, that to me -- that and the FRMP
12 is -- are probably those things relating to weir funding.
13 Those are the really, really, really important items on
14 there. And at least in my mind, you might want to think
15 possibly put those up at the top of the list.

16
17 The King Cove Road is such a political
18 nightmare, but I think we were on a good track, and it's
19 gotten lost in the recent months of how that road is
20 important to the indigenous folks on the peninsula to
21 get their subsistence. And particularly King Cove, with
22 the loss of their processing plant, they're not being
23 able to get -- there aren't any red systems over on that
24 side of the bay at all. Same was caribou hunting,
25 waterfowl; it's all over on the refuge side. And so,
26 that's really, really important for people to get there.
27 To get to Mortensens Lagoon for salmon. And so, I think
28 that that's something that's been totally overlooked.
29 And if the different -- particularly, this whole
30 argument on the -- in the courts. That's been left out,
31 and also, I believe that as far as subsistence in the
32 bay folks down there, you know, when they had those five
33 cabins that they used traditionally for their hunting
34 cabins burnt and nobody told them. I mean, that's a
35 catastrophe. And it -- all things are done, you know.
36 Yeah. We're cleaning up and make it nice and neat. But
37 I think that King Cove folks and their subsistence users
38 have gotten lost in this whole argument. Thank you, Madam
39 Chair.

40
41 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, Pat. Yeah.
42 If the King Cove Road issue stays, I think the letter
43 that we generated for the -- was it EIS comments? But
44 we generated a letter a couple of years ago that had a
45 lot of that detail that you're talking about. So, I
46 think it'd be pretty easy to pull some of that out to
47 make a paragraph. So, basically, we already have a letter
48 covering all of that. Okay. Is -- are there any -- and
49 is there any other discussion or comments on these items?
50 So, if I'm not hearing anybody say pull it off, I'm

1 assuming it's staying on there and it'll be fleshed out.
2 And then we vote on the final report at the next meeting.
3 So, this is just identifying what we're going to talk
4 about. We will have a final chance to review and refine
5 at our next meeting. Pat, go ahead.

6
7 MR. HOLMES: I would like to commend you.
8 And I'd like everybody to give you an applause because
9 the letters that you put together that go to the Federal
10 Board and other agencies are so well written and so well
11 thought out. And I want you to blush. So, good for you.

12
13 (Applause)

14
15 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. Thanks. And
16 I have to -- you know, sometimes it's going to be a lot
17 of Leigh's work as well. But yeah, I think we both
18 appreciate that. Brett, go ahead.

19
20 MR. RICHARDSON: I would basically agree
21 with all of these being in the letter. I would reorder
22 them. I would put the weir funding as number one and
23 FRMP right there as well. Enforcement Capacity is
24 important; should be on the list. I feel -- we're at
25 kind of a standstill on that one after talking to
26 enforcement in the room. It's like it's not a hiring
27 freeze, it's a lack of quality applicants. Right? So,
28 that was interesting to hear. They can hire, but nobody
29 worth hiring is applying, apparently. So, I'm not sure
30 what the Board could do about that necessarily, right?
31 But it should be stated as something that locals are
32 talking about. Go ahead.

33
34 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. So, one of
35 the suggestions that came up in discussions,
36 particularly with enforcement, was identifying -- I
37 would say, either particular locations or particular
38 times of year where we really want the extra enforcement.
39 So, instead of just saying we want more enforcement,
40 being more specific. My assumption with enforcement is
41 that we would emphasize, like, I don't know -- say,
42 Unalaska in summertime or in June and July. Are there
43 particular months? So, any extra detail you can share
44 about that would be helpful.

45
46 MR. RICHARDSON: Yeah, exactly. The time
47 when he's needed most in Bristol Bay, right? That's the
48 whale in the State versus us out here, which we don't
49 even have a, you know, fishery for salmon out here. So,
50 we're not going to get recognized just due to that. If

1 they can't afford or -- sorry, find people worth pushing
2 out here for a couple months a year, you know?

3
4 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. And that
5 also, when you say Bristol Bay, it might be nice to put
6 a potential joint meeting with Bristol Bay RAC. That
7 seems like an appropriate thing to put in our annual
8 report. But I saw Coral. Did you have your hand -- oh,
9 Pat and then Coral. Sorry. Let's take Pat and then coral.
10 Go ahead.

11
12 MR. HOLMES: Spending all my colleagues'
13 comments here on the enforcement. Something just struck
14 me. And I'm wondering if we can't -- I don't know that
15 -- yes, we need to say that this is going to be an
16 ongoing problem. But I think, potentially one way to
17 help solve it for Unalaska, for this road system, 30
18 miles, would be to talk with Mayor Tukiakoff, and also
19 with the Q Tribe and the Ounalaska Corporation and see
20 if between the three of them, they might be able to
21 provide a little bit of support during those critical
22 red salmon returning months in the summer when, you know,
23 the State enforcement folks are up in Bristol Bay. They
24 did that several -- many years ago, but that might be a
25 way for locally for them to solve a local problem that
26 can't be solved in a State or Federal level. And if it's
27 okay with you folks, I could ask them or if you want to
28 get formal, do that too.

29
30 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: I'm okay if you
31 want to talk to Vince and put the bug in his ear. Coral
32 and then we'll go to Lisa.

33
34 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah. I guess I just want
35 to emphasize what we talked about before is asking for
36 a specific thing. And talking about -- with the trooper
37 not being here asking for a Fish and Wildlife trooper,
38 which is -- falls under what we do federal, to come out
39 here during six weeks. Like, I think we should ask for
40 like a specific time period. And I would just emphasize
41 that we have a specific ask and try going down that road
42 instead of generally saying we have these issues.

43
44 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Sorry. Lisa, go
45 ahead.

46
47 MS. GREDIAGIN: Okay. Lisa Grediagin, for
48 the record. And just to the point yesterday that OSM is
49 trying to help answer some Council questions, you know,
50 in the moment versus just putting them in the annual

1 report and waiting for months from the Board. I mean, I
2 just want -- it's -- you guys are welcome to put whatever
3 you want in your report. But just with the understanding,
4 the Board obviously has no jurisdiction over anything
5 dealing with State regulations or the State troopers.
6 So, I think you kind of got -- where I was trying to go,
7 Coral, at maybe putting a specific ask about a Federal
8 officer. But then again, if there's no Federal fishery,
9 I'm not real clear what a Federal officer -- like,
10 motivation would be to come out here to try and enforce
11 State regulations, you know? But even though they're on
12 Federal lands or Federal waters. And so, just trying to
13 temper your expectations with what you might -- you know,
14 it's one thing to just inform the Board, but to actually
15 put request, you know, to just temper your expectations
16 or requests on what you could really expect the Board
17 to do with this information.

18
19 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Coral, go ahead.
20

21 MS. CHERNOFF: Well, I guess just along
22 that note too, I just might make a little note that as
23 a member of the Subsistence Advisory Committee, that we
24 just be a little more precise about knowing when we're
25 talking about State subsistence, State support, and then
26 just Federal -- because I do hear a lot of sort of mix
27 up, and confusion, and language. And so, I would just
28 ask maybe that on top of thinking about this and asking
29 for a very specific thing from the very specific Federal
30 resources, that we also take home some homework and just
31 become really clear about what we're doing, supporting
32 Federal subsistence here and not getting confused about
33 Federal and State.

34
35 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thanks.
36 Oh, whoever -- Katya, go ahead.
37

38 MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
39 Well, I just want to say that if you have some requests
40 for Federal agencies, even though they are on Federal
41 Subsistence Board, you would be better off writing a
42 letter directly to them instead of putting that in the
43 annual report. Like, if you want Fish and Wildlife to
44 be involved in some way and actually receive a reply to
45 your request, you can write a letter to the agency, copy
46 the Board that you put that request forward, and it will
47 bring this letter up during the Board meeting. Because
48 we usually do when we do the correspondence review, we
49 bring letters to the agencies that Council send.
50

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Lisa, go ahead.

2
3 MS. GREDIAGIN: Lisa. And just kind of
4 similar to Katya's point, other Councils have written
5 letters directly to State troopers with requests. And
6 they got a response, like really quickly, directly from
7 the State troopers. So again, just trying -- it's so
8 confusing, all these overlapping jurisdictions and
9 everything. But yeah, to inform the Board versus trying
10 to expect actions, you know, to direct that to the
11 appropriate entity that actually could take action. So
12 again, I mean, Councils have written letters to State
13 troopers.

14
15 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Pat, go ahead.

16
17 MR. HOLMES: Yeah, I think that's the
18 correct perspective. I mean, when we're supposed to
19 listen to you as Federal management people and how we
20 should be interacting. But that's a key point that the
21 direct letter to them, those things get solved. And I
22 see -- I've seen that happen on other issues in Kodiak
23 where the Fish and Game Advisory Committee is having
24 some problems, the State one, and they directly sent
25 their comments off to your shop in Anchorage about
26 certain issues to that Board, and also times where,
27 basically, they just sit down together and drag in the
28 people from the refuge, drag in the State people, and
29 the local folks that are concerned, and they just sit
30 down and have coffee and talk about it and say, "Well,
31 we're -- how can this be solved?" Sometimes it can be
32 able to do that with allocations on mountain goats and
33 just kind of found a way to do it without getting
34 somebody upset, but to say, "Okay, well, this can be
35 accomplished by this side and that can be accomplished
36 there." And then there's the goal. And so, I think if
37 we spend a little bit of time and think about it and do
38 some direct communications as suggested to the troopers,
39 it's not going to solve it right away, obviously, because
40 there's not people, but at least continuing to let them
41 know it's a problem. And I will talk to Vincent and some
42 of his advisors and local folks and see what they can
43 do. Because if the city also tosses in that to the State
44 or to the Fish and Wildlife enforcement folks, doing
45 both that and then saying, "Well, we'll try and get this
46 done ourselves if you guys can't do it." And maybe it'll
47 happen.

48
49 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thanks,
50 Pat. Can you hit your mic?

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

MR. HOLMES: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. All right. Is there additional discussion on this list of topics? And then, do you have an additional comment? Go ahead, Coral.

MS. CHERNOFF: Yes. I have a question about the King Cove Road. So, if we comment, then it will go into our letter to the Board. And then where -- just to mention it because I don't really know, like where is that King Cove situation now? Like, as far as I know, it's been shut down so the Board could get this, but there -- doesn't have any place to go. Because I guess at this point, I would say -- you know, I'd always support the King Cove Road, but at this point, I feel like it's kind of -- doesn't have anywhere to go. And so, I would not necessarily recommend putting it on there, but I would support if other people wanted to put it on.

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: I'll go to Pat and then Brett.

MR. HOLMES: I guess I would toss this to a young high school girl I know that's now a lawyer, as this is all in a big legal debate and whatnot. But I'm wondering if there's somewhere where we can't get our two bits worth into the current discussions on one legal group saying the other legal group, and pointing fingers, and arguing on the merits of things to just say, "Well, here's a point that's gotten lost." And toss in a letter that we had on subsistence in relationship to the role. It might be a little something that might swing the pendulum a tad. Who knows?

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. Brett, go ahead.

MR. RICHARDSON: Personally, I feel not overloading the letter with too much information while being specific about the topics and the requests for each topic is a good thing. I think that the King Cove Road was approved. Now it's in litigation. It's kind of a political thing. I feel like we can scratch that one, go with the top seven, and have a good strong letter that won't last 5 pages, 6 pages, you know. Lost a lot of that later information at the bottom might get -- they're going to answer everything, but it might not be

1 top of their minds. So, I would look to go that
2 direction.

3

4 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Can I see a
5 nod of heads or people generally okay with dropping King
6 Cove Road off of here?

7

8 (No audible response)

9

10 Okay. So as far as the suggestion to
11 generate letters, I personally don't like generating
12 letters in the last 15 minutes of a meeting, except for
13 the one Daniel is going to generate. So, unless there's
14 something -- anything on here where you feel like we
15 absolutely need to do a letter now, I'd be comfortable
16 having this go away, getting written up. So, there's
17 more context for each of these. And then if we want to
18 generate letters at the next meeting, we'll have more
19 time to think about it and be more -- I think more
20 thoughtful in our letters because, again, I'm not in --
21 generally, don't like generating detailed things at the
22 last minute on the fly. I'm not seeing anybody object
23 to that. Are we at a point where we can make a motion
24 to have this as our list of topics?

25

26 MR. HOLMES: Move that we use this list
27 of topics.

28

29 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Oh, yeah. And also,
30 adding Bristol -- to a joint meeting with Bristol Bay
31 RAC. Are people okay with that? Before we get to Lisa,
32 are people okay with the joint...?

33

34 (No audible response)

35

36 Okay. Thank you. Lisa, go ahead.

37

38 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, I -- again, to the
39 point of putting the joint meeting with Bristol Bay, I
40 think OSM can just do that without bringing it to the
41 attention of the Board. I mean, Eastern and Western
42 Interior have joint meetings. And I mean, they -- we --
43 they just say they want to -- OSM makes it happen. It
44 doesn't have to be put in an annual report. So, I mean,
45 I think it's good to say you want that joint meeting,
46 but it's just kind of extra administrative work to write
47 it up in a report, have people review it versus just say
48 you want it, and then Leigh -- and others make it happen,
49 so.

50

1 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah, I feel like
2 there's an opportunity to put a little bit more context
3 and also reflecting back on to the outcome of the salmon
4 working group that -- yeah, it'd be great to work
5 together, but this is a baby step toward working in
6 conjunction with at least one other RAC. So, I personally
7 see value in putting it in there because it relates to
8 other things. Coral, go ahead.

9
10 MS. CHERNOFF: So, are you talking about
11 putting it as separate or under the enforcement
12 capacity? Like, saying we need these things, therefore,
13 we're working with.....

14
15 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: It could go
16 either.....

17
18 (Simultaneous speech)

19
20 MS. CHERNOFF: And then get through it
21 to figure it out.

22
23 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: I was thinking of
24 it being separate, just to note that we did talk about
25 or mention that it'd be great to have a joint meeting
26 with Bristol Bay RAC, but I do think it can -- I mean,
27 it doesn't relate directly to enforcement in the sense
28 of the two RACs are going to solve it. But the reality
29 is enforcement can't be here because they have to be in
30 Bristol Bay. So, it's an example of another issue where
31 there's only so many resources. And, you know, we're
32 trying to share resources with Bristol Bay, again. Okay.
33 And I keep looking to see if Daniel's hand is up. All
34 right. So, if we're okay with this, does somebody want
35 to make a motion that this is our list of topics? And
36 again, we have the chance to approve the final annual
37 report at the winter meeting.

38
39 MR. SMITH: I'll make a motion to approve
40 those.

41
42 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thanks,
43 Daniel. Is there a second?

44
45 MR. RICHARDSON: Second.

46
47 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Thank you. Is
48 there any further discussion? Pat, go ahead.

49
50

1 MR. HOLMES: Would there be any problem
2 if I could get the letter that we did before on the
3 subsistence relationship for King Cove Road? And not
4 necessarily do it for the Council, but if I could get
5 that information, would anybody get in a snit if I were
6 to try to send it to whoever just to get that question
7 in the discussion somehow? I don't know if it would make
8 a difference to change, but it's gotten lost.

9
10 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. I think
11 that's a matter of public record. So, yeah, we can make
12 your life easier by probably emailing -- or we can make
13 your life easier by emailing a copy, but it's public
14 record. So, you'd have -- you can -- as a member of the
15 public, you can do what you want with it.

16
17 Okay. Is there any objection to the
18 motion to choose these as the topics for our annual
19 report?

20
21 (No response)

22
23 Okay. Hearing and seeing none, that
24 passes. And yesterday, in relation to the data -- where
25 did the data one go? We had something that related to
26 data and commercial fisheries. I think it was the --
27 maybe related to number three. Daniel suggested we send
28 a letter to Fish and Game asking for what I interpreted
29 as the harvest report, but that would be at the bottom.
30 There's KARAC letter. That'd be to Fish and Game
31 commercial fisheries side of things. And the bullet
32 points would be what would -- what he's suggesting be
33 in the letter. So, Daniel, if you want to make a motion
34 to generate a letter, and then you can speak -- if you
35 get a second, you can speak to it.

36
37 MR. SMITH: Yeah. I'd like to make a
38 motion to send a letter to Comm Fish.

39
40 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Is there a
41 second?

42
43 MR. RICHARDSON: Second.

44
45 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Daniel, do
46 you want to speak to your motion?

47
48 MR. SMITH: Yeah. This kind of goes off
49 the discussion we had yesterday with the commercial
50 fisheries and specifically the Buskin sockeye salmon

1 subsistence closure. And just the -- what the bullet
2 points say right there. There's -- just to add a little
3 bit more transparency about what was actually caught in
4 those emergency commercial fishing openers. Once the
5 fish tickets come in, I guess the request would be to
6 provide the RAC with the -- with salmon harvest estimates
7 and then composition of those, and just a little bit
8 more -- yeah, I guess again, just transparency with those
9 given the closures. But also, recognizing that given
10 such an unprecedented even year pink salmon run
11 returning to the Buskin, it does seem like, you know,
12 they did make the right decision. At least, that's the
13 way I feel about this with those commercial fishing
14 openers and let -- so that, you know, the rivers wouldn't
15 have -- I don't know, maybe 50,000 or more pink salmon,
16 which could in turn really devastate the spawning
17 grounds for salmon, especially with silvers, and maybe
18 to a lesser extent, sockeye since they're lake spawners.
19 But just a little bit more transparency in that I think
20 would be helpful. And that's why I wanted to request a
21 letter to Comm Fish.

22
23 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. Thanks. Pat,
24 go ahead.

25
26 MR. HOLMES: I would suggest you address
27 that to James Jackson. He's the regional commercial
28 fisheries management biologist for salmon. And then his
29 assistant is Geoff Spalinger, and that's G, E, O, F, F,
30 Spalinger. And he's the Kodiak area salmon management
31 biologist.

32
33 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay, we're just
34 having a side conversation to get clarification on if
35 we can address it to James Jackson or if it's going to
36 need to be addressed to DVL, to the commissioner. Okay.
37 It has to be addressed to the commissioner. But I think
38 in -- you know, in the letter, we can be very clear that
39 we're asking for information specific to the Buskin
40 openers.

41
42 MR. HOLMES: Yeah. I think.....

43
44 (Simultaneous speech)

45
46 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Go ahead, Pat.

47
48 MR. HOLMES:if you were to ask that
49 you would like to get the input from the local staff.
50 Because if you're getting a comment from the

1 commissioner's office, some of those folks even have the
2 most vague notion of where the Buskin is, or even in
3 relation to Kodiak. Whereas your area and regional
4 management biologists, the salmon management biologists,
5 they're the ones that make the decision and try to avoid
6 the problem. And it's just like some of the questions
7 on trying to get those other communications that we
8 wanted to have. If there's some way to get it direct to
9 where the problem solver is, because just like the whole
10 question of a lot of these proposals, I know that the
11 local staff had a lot of things to say about these things
12 for our area on the salmon problems, all of these
13 proposal we have to discuss. But the decision was made
14 in headquarters that it's going to be done through
15 headquarters, and we still haven't seen it. And so, we've
16 made our decisions. And that's an unfortunate thing.

17
18 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. Thanks, Pat.
19 Yeah. I look at this letter as an opportunity to increase
20 transparency. So, I think you -- one could look at this
21 request and say -- and think, wow, that -- you know,
22 maybe that's not combative because I don't think
23 Daniel's combative. But, you know, are we pushing the
24 limits and asking for this, and are we trying to make
25 Comm Fish look bad? I don't look at it that way. I think,
26 you know, it probably was a good idea. The data might
27 come back that they caught zero sockeye, incidentally.
28 And all this is going to do is help increase transparency
29 and answer some of the questions that, you know, I'm
30 hearing from the public and hopefully -- because like I
31 said, there's a perception here when subsistence is
32 closed at Buskin and you see the seiners right out front
33 of Buskin, that is going to get an emotional reaction
34 from people. And I think getting the accurate
35 information out there can only help the situation. I
36 think. And Daniel, I saw your hand go up or did you take
37 it down again?

38
39 MR. SMITH: I did take it down, but I'll
40 just add, I agree with Pat if it's, you know, if it
41 specifically has to be addressed to the commissioner, I
42 think having some bit of words or verbiage in that letter
43 to address that to the local folks like James Jackson
44 or Geoff Spalinger would be probably the way to go. And
45 then, you know, I'm just looking at the bullet points,
46 and I think we've already had some discussion about this.
47 Is not a way to poke at, let's say, a commercial fish.
48 That's not the intention of mine or our Council, but
49 it's, you know, it -- at least saying, you know, given
50 the concern and about even -- you know, it kind of just

1 relates it back to the unprecedented even your pink
2 salmon run. And I think they probably even made the
3 right decision there for putting up those -- or creating
4 those emergency commercial fishing openers. But
5 hopefully, that's has been addressed in this discussion.

6

7 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. Thank you,
8 Daniel. Pat, go ahead.

9

10 MR. HOLMES: On the Buskin issue there,
11 I was just thinking what Daniel's comments there and
12 there was -- the closure for red salmon was in second
13 week of June, and I don't think the pink fisheries starts
14 until July. So, there was some weeks difference in
15 between there. And so, the way run timing, one could go
16 and look and see what the run timing is. And I think
17 probably by the time the pink fishery was open, there
18 probably would not be many fish. I think Coral was --
19 be correct in asking for the fish to get data to see if
20 it might have been some incidental harvest or some
21 harvest. But that's the question of finding out whether
22 it was a significant portion or not. Because those folks,
23 they don't want to argue and fight with folks, and they
24 really try to make it work for all parties. So, thank
25 you, Madam Chair.

26

27 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. If
28 there's no further comments or questions on these
29 bullets, is there any objection to the motion to generate
30 a letter and send to Alaska Department of Fish and Game
31 Comm Fish asking for more information about this
32 summer's emergency openings at Buskin? Is there any
33 objection?

34

35 (No response)

36

37 Okay, I'm seeing and hearing none. That
38 motion passes. Okay, so we have concluded the annual
39 report topic item. We have generated a letter. The next
40 thing -- we had the Alaska Department of Fish and Game
41 Subsistence Division had a report that we didn't realize
42 that when we did the reports earlier. I'm assuming that's
43 Jackie. Jackie, did you want to share your report or
44 share your information?

45

46 MS. KEATING: Thank you, Madam Chair. And
47 can you all hear me okay?

48

49 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yep. You're coming
50 through.

1
2 MS. KEATING: Great. Well, thank you,
3 Madam Chair and members of the Council. I will keep this
4 brief at the end of the day here. But again, for the
5 record, my name is Jackie Keating. I'm the lead
6 researcher for the Division of Subsistence in the South-
7 Central Region. And for us, that also includes the Kodiak
8 area. So, in addition to myself, we've also had Greg
9 Russell and Maddie Christiansen online. They are our
10 research staff for the southwest region. And we just
11 have a brief verbal update for you all today on a few
12 projects relevant to your region. For the Kodiak area,
13 we have fully completed FRMP project 22-454. This was
14 the Subsistence Harvest and Use Update for Ouzinkie and
15 Port Lions. And you heard some of this information
16 presented in OSM reports today. This was published as
17 Technical Paper 518 this May. We sent hard copies out
18 to both communities, and then summaries of the study
19 results were sent to every P.O. Box in both communities.
20 And anybody can download this full report on the ADF&G
21 publications page. And then, for the Southwest region,
22 we also have FRMP project 22-452. This is the Subsistence
23 Harvest Monitoring and Traditional Ecological Knowledge
24 Project for False Pass and Nelson Lagoon. This project
25 was slightly delayed due to staff vacancies in the
26 Southwest region, but we are thrilled to have Greg and
27 Maddie onboard, and they are picking this project up
28 again. They traveled to False Pass in June to complete
29 the final interviews, and then we are in the final data
30 analysis and writing stages. So, this report will be
31 published over the coming year.

32
33 And then, I wanted to share one other
34 project in your region. Even though it's not an FRMP
35 project. We had funding from the Alaska Sustainable
36 Salmon Fund to conduct household salmon surveys in
37 Unalaska for the 2022 study year, as well as drone
38 surveys of the McLees system in 2022 and 2023. This was
39 a collaboration with the Q Tribe and the Division of
40 Commercial Fisheries, specifically Annie Brewster, and
41 this full technical paper is number 525. We published
42 it this June. Hard copies were sent to the Q Tribe and
43 the local ADF&G office out where you all are today. And
44 like all of our other publications, anybody can download
45 that full report from the ADF&G publications page. And
46 then lastly, on the State side, we have Board of Fish
47 coming up in Kodiak from January 5th through 8th. We
48 will be giving our standard subsistence overview
49 presentation at that. And then, I believe the Board
50 should be continuing to offer the traditional knowledge

1 testimony that was actually first introduced at the last
2 Kodiak meeting in 2024. If you're not familiar with this,
3 it's an opportunity for traditional knowledge holders
4 to present to the Board after ADF&G staff presentations
5 and before public testimony. The details for how to sign
6 up are usually included in the pre-meeting
7 announcements, and I would encourage folks in the Kodiak
8 area to share the information and consider who might
9 like to participate. And if you have specific questions
10 one of your own Council members, Daniel Smith, was one
11 of the participants last time and can share what that
12 experience was like. So, I hope to see some of you there.
13 If anybody has questions on proposals or the comment
14 process, you can reach out to me anytime. And that's all
15 we have for you today, but I'm happy to take any
16 questions. Thank you, Madam Chair.

17
18 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Great. Thanks,
19 Jackie. Are there any questions for -- on Jackie's
20 report? Pat, go ahead.

21
22 MR. HOLMES: Yeah. Good job. I'm glad
23 that these things are getting worked out. And because
24 you folks work really hard, and it's such important
25 information to have. And I guess in closing, say hi to
26 Jim if he stumbles through the office for coffee.

27
28 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Are
29 there any further questions or comments for Jackie?

30
31 (No response)

32
33 All right. I'm not seeing any. Jackie,
34 thank you so much. Okay. So, that includes -- that was
35 the last thing under agenda item 14 reports. We're now
36 on agenda item 15, Other Business. A is the 805(c) Report
37 Summary. And this -- Leigh will give us this.

38
39 MS. HONIG: All right. Thanks, Madam
40 Chair. Leigh Honig, for the record. The 805(c) report
41 is on page 267. So, this provides the Council with a
42 summary of its recommendations from the previous
43 regulatory cycle and the Board's actions on those
44 recommendations. As a reminder, Section 805(c) of ANILCA
45 provides that the Board is to consider the
46 recommendations of the Councils concerning the take of
47 fish and wildlife for subsistence uses. The Board
48 generally defers to Council recommendations, but it may
49 choose not to follow a recommendation if it determines
50 that the recommendation is not supported by substantial

1 evidence, violates recognized principles of fish and
2 wildlife conservation, or would be detrimental to the
3 satisfaction of subsistence needs.

4
5 There were three proposals addressed in
6 the 805(c) report. I'll give you those highlights. The
7 first two are the Kodiak brown bear proposals WP26-32.
8 The Board adopted the Council's recommendation to expand
9 the C&T use determination but clarified the geographic
10 area. WP26-33. The Council supported up to four brown
11 bear permits for Kodiak, and the Board adopted that
12 recommendation with the same geographic definition. The
13 Board also delegated authority to the Kodiak National
14 Wildlife Refuge manager to determine the annual permit
15 allocation system. The third proposal, 26-34, dealt with
16 handicrafts made from non-edible brown bear products.
17 The Council supported allowing limited sale of those
18 handicrafts with several modifications. The Board
19 adopted the proposal with an OSM modification but
20 specifically excluded bear gallbladders because of
21 concerns about illegal trade and existing State and
22 international restrictions. So, in general, the Board
23 adopted the Council's recommendation on these proposals
24 but made some modifications to the final regulatory
25 language. And the enclosed 805(c) report provides the
26 explanation for those. That is all I have for this one.
27 Thank you.

28
29 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Great, thanks. Are
30 there any questions for Leigh on the 805(c) report? Pat,
31 go ahead.

32
33 MR. HOLMES: Oh, yeah, Madam Chair. Yeah,
34 that's really important. And I think it was a good thing
35 to accomplish this. Allowing sales (distortion) far
36 away. And I was also wondering about things like
37 intestines. We had some comments in the past when the
38 Alutiiq Center was able to get through the State law
39 enforcement folks and ability for one of the local ladies
40 to make the reindeer out of the intestine. So, I assume
41 that those that need to be salvaged or not. And then I
42 wonder about, you know, the sort of the traditional ways
43 of -- oh, I just think of all the old timers that are
44 gone, but they used to say, well, when they go out and
45 take a bear, they hunt it at a certain time of the year
46 so that the meat could be salvaged, heart, liver, all
47 the flesh. And so, you know, this is, I think, an
48 excellent opportunity not only to gather materials for
49 handicraft, but also to share the meat, share almost the
50 whole bear with the rest of the subsistence community.

1 So anyway, just a comment. Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thank
4 you for that comment, Pat. Okay. If there's nothing else
5 on the 805(c) report, the last thing before closing
6 comments would be Update on Deferred WP26-01.

7

8 MS. GREDIAGIN: All right. Thank you,
9 Madam Chair, members of the Council. For the record, my
10 name is Lisa Grediagin, and I'll be updating you on the
11 Deferred Wildlife Proposal WP26-01. This is an update
12 and not an action item. WP26-01 requested to move
13 authority for managing Federal hunts out of delegation
14 of authority letters and into unit-specific regulations
15 for many hunts across Alaska, and to rescind the
16 associated letters. Additionally, it proposed a number
17 of regulatory cleanup items in the hunting regulations
18 across the State. In April 2026, at the request of OSM,
19 the proponent, the Federal Subsistence Board deferred
20 26-01 to their February 2027 regulatory meeting. Since
21 April, OSM has confirmed, in consultation with the
22 solicitor, that delegated authority is an
23 administrative, not regulatory function. And that all
24 in-season management actions are subject to special
25 action regulatory requirements such as holding public
26 hearings regardless of where they appear, whether in
27 codified regulations, or in a letter. Because of this,
28 OSM is no longer proposing to transfer delegated
29 authority into codified regulation as originally
30 requested by WP26-01. Instead, after much thought and
31 legal review, OSM proposing [sic] a new system to
32 streamline delegated authority actions for wildlife.
33 This new approach will not change the delegations, but
34 will improve consistency of implementation,
35 accountability, public transparency, and tracking of
36 actions. OSM has incorporated the Council's
37 recommendations on WP26-01 into the new approach. The
38 new approach will be fully laid out to the Board at
39 their February fisheries meeting.

40

41 Briefly, the new approach is the
42 development of a single comprehensive table that
43 includes all the wildlife authorities currently
44 delegated in over 60 letters, as well as associated
45 guidance that will apply to all in-season wildlife
46 managers. This will allow updates to guidance to be made
47 in a single document that can be quickly distributed to
48 all managers. Both the table and associated guidance
49 will be published on the program's website providing
50 transparency. OSM also plans to provide annual training

1 to all in-season managers and associated staff.
2 Initially, OSM considered asking to withdraw WP26-01,
3 but realized a lot of regulatory cleanup was also
4 achieved through this proposal. This includes
5 housekeeping items such as combining hunt areas with
6 identical regulations, deleting duplicative delegated
7 authority language already in regulation, and changing
8 "to be" announced seasons to "may be" announced seasons.
9 Because of this, OSM is revising its recommendation to
10 retain all the regulatory cleanup proposed by WP26-01,
11 but not to transfer delegated authority into codified
12 regulations. Everything is currently on track for the
13 Board to act on this proposal at their February meeting.
14 All Council supported the regulatory housekeeping
15 portions of WP26-01 when they took up this proposal last
16 fall while delegated authority is an administrative and
17 legal issue that is not subject to Council deference.
18 Therefore, Councils are not being asked to reconsider
19 this deferred proposal. That concludes this update, and
20 I'd be happy to answer any questions.

21
22 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Yeah. Thanks,
23 Lisa. So, it's at the end of the second day. So, I just
24 wanted to make sure I got the meat of what you're saying.
25 So, instead of -- there used to be letter -- delegation
26 letters. Instead of that -- or the proposal was to put
27 it into regulation. That's no longer a good idea. Are
28 you still keeping the letters? But then I was
29 understanding whether you're keeping the letters or not,
30 you're creating a table where everything is listed
31 altogether. So, if something needs to be changed, you're
32 just going to that one place to change it. Does that
33 kind of -- is that what you said?

34
35 MS. GREDIAGIN: Lisa Grediagin. Yes,
36 Madam Chair. Essentially, yes. We are proposing to do
37 away with the 60 different letters, and then just kind
38 of have one letter that applies to everyone, and then
39 have kind of the unique parts, the specific delegations
40 in a comprehensive table.

41
42 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Okay. That sounds
43 great to me. All right. So, that was an update. Are
44 there any questions?

45
46 (No response)

47
48 Not seeing any questions. Thank you for
49 that update. Yes. So, it is time for closing comments.
50 I know it's been -- we've done a lot in the last two

1 days, so don't feel obligated to make a closing comment,
2 but I definitely want to provide the opportunity. So,
3 I'll just start with Coral and go around. Coral, do you
4 have any closing comments you'd like to share?

5

6 MS. CHERNOFF: Was that encouragement to
7 not talk and wrap it up?

8

9 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: I was trying to
10 provide options.

11

12 MS. CHERNOFF: Okay. I guess -- thanks
13 for the meeting. I appreciate everyone who showed up and
14 testified and put their time in. I appreciate this Board
15 and Chair's ability to sort of go outside, have a little
16 leniency for the public to comment and for us to interact
17 and ask questions of the public. I think that's
18 important. That doesn't always happen.

19

20 And I guess just talking about these
21 proposal and proposals that got passed about the Unit 8
22 brown bear at this past meeting, it just brings up again
23 -- I testified at the meeting, I mentioned that, you
24 know, we just passed this, meaning it was previously
25 illegal to buy and sell brown bear handicraft. I've
26 brought this up with enforcement for State. I brought
27 it up -- I mentioned it during the Federal Subsistence
28 Board meeting when I testified. I personally called the
29 Alaska State Troopers. I personally called Federal
30 enforcement. This piece of handicraft sits in a public
31 place currently. It was paid for. It was illegal. And
32 so, I guess I have an issue with enforcement. I don't
33 think enforcement should be optional. And if it is
34 optional, I would like that option to do things illegal
35 however I please. I think it sets a bad precedent what
36 is happening right now. The last word I heard was from
37 a Federal agency that said likely the bear, that the
38 guts were used from, was taken in a Federal season, and
39 then it still hangs in a public place and was still paid
40 for -- bought and paid for. So, I'll just say again,
41 that upsets me. I think it sets a bad precedent when we
42 are not enforcing laws and what was a very important
43 regulation on the table. The bears are specific to
44 Kodiak, that region. They're very important to our
45 region. It was illegal to do this. And I think it's
46 unfortunate that so far nothing has happened with that.
47 So, I would just like to leave that as a comment.

48

49 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thanks.
50 We'll go to Pat next. You need to turn your mic on.

1

2

MR. HOLMES: Excuse me, Coral.

3

4

(Simultaneous speech)

5

6

MS. CHERNOFF: And point of order. I would also like to ask that -- I guess my point of order is during Robert's Rules of Order that we may comment and not respond or attack other people's comments on the record. Thank you.

11

12

13

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thanks. Go ahead, Pat.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks, Pat. Brett.

MR. RICHARDSON: Yeah. I'd like to thank everybody for their efforts the last couple days. And, and beyond that, I know these -- a lot goes into these

1 meetings. Leigh probably works for a long time on this
2 is, OSM staff and everybody else. And the Federal
3 government appreciate the microphone's working so well.
4 Try to get a smile out of him is tough. And all the
5 equipment and everybody's good attitudes and, you know,
6 fun personalities and willingness to get windy and
7 dirty, and cold, and take pictures to recruit more talent
8 and all that, you know, it's a great thing. As long as
9 it keeps being a learning process, as far as I'm
10 concerned, it's good for me. I hope people may consider
11 that. Like, I feel like I learned something during every
12 one of these meetings. And I feel like I go away with
13 more questions than I had, which is a good thing, you
14 know, something to come back to and try to wrap your
15 head around some of these, you know, past, in the future
16 and the present, and where we sit. And you know, I guess
17 that's it. Right? I appreciate everybody's time and --
18 oh, what I was going to say. Rebecca, thanks for your
19 effort. I see you furiously taking notes all the time.
20 I figure that's just who you are, but maybe we can invest
21 in, like, an AI note taking program for this thing,
22 right? Like, so that notes can be sent to us after these
23 meetings, like with, you know, points of like action
24 items and all this stuff that we went over, and we can
25 read and do that. Right? I don't want to -- I want real
26 people to be on the -- you know, the Council. But AI
27 note taking is okay. Right? I can try that, maybe.
28 Anyway, thank you. Thank you, everybody.

29
30 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thanks. Yeah. I had
31 a facial reaction to your -- the fun personalities. I
32 was like, what meeting were you in? Just kidding. Yeah.
33 We're fine. Daniel, do you have any closing comments?

34
35 MR. SMITH: Yeah. I'll just say I
36 appreciate the opportunity to serve on this Council for
37 these last couple of years. And you know, I was sad that
38 I wasn't able to make it out on Unalaska. Just remember
39 a couple years ago going down there in 2024, given the
40 crayfish update and there's definitely something to be
41 said, something missed if not being there in person and
42 in a community like Unalaska. But yeah, I just wanted
43 to say thanks for -- to you, Rebecca, and for organizing
44 the meeting or running the meeting so well. And I just
45 appreciate all the different opinions and ideas when it
46 comes to the proposals and just looking back on the
47 agenda, I think we made a lot of progress in order to
48 provide subsistence opportunity in a way that is
49 meaningful and abides by ANILCA. But with the -- taking
50 into account the conservation as well. And -- oh, yeah,

1 also appreciate related discussions about just local
2 issues here in Kodiak that we find ourselves with. With
3 this ever-changing climate and abundance of --
4 particularly, with pink salmon. And so, I appreciate
5 those discussions and also appreciate the staff at OSM
6 and the time they put in preparation for this meeting.

7
8 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: All right. Thanks,
9 Daniel. I just wanted to thank everyone. So, thank the
10 OSM staff for putting this meeting together. You guys
11 do a phenomenal job. I know this is a lot of work, and
12 I wanted to thank all of the staff and agency people
13 that called in and participated or submitted reports. I
14 know that's also a lot of work and sometimes you get
15 questions from us and sometimes you don't. And I just
16 don't want anyone to think that we aren't listening or
17 don't care about what you said. It just may be that in
18 that moment, your report answered all of our questions.
19 So, thank you there. I also wanted to specifically
20 express my gratitude for the discussion we had around
21 FRMP. So, we had four potential, you know, people who
22 might submit grant applications for FRMP, call in and
23 engage in some kind of free form discussion around that.
24 And I thought it was really helpful. I know it was on
25 the phone, and it was a topic that might have been kind
26 of awkward to jump in, and discuss, and share opinions
27 or, you know, helpful critiques on the program. And I
28 am really grateful for the participation from those four
29 individuals plus the Council that we had. I always
30 appreciate public participation. So, members of the
31 community of Unalaska who came to the meeting, as well
32 as everyone who participated online.

33
34 And then just to say, I think there were
35 probably doubts. I had my doubts this morning when we
36 were only on proposal one and we broke late for lunch.
37 But I think we are going to wrap up before 5:30. So,
38 great job. I think it was worth it to spend a little
39 more time on that first proposal and get a good sense
40 of what the questions were, where we needed clarity, and
41 hash some of that out. And I think it did help the
42 afternoon go really fast. Also, if you're listening to
43 these meetings, it probably doesn't sound like a lot of
44 fun, but anybody who's remotely interested in applying
45 to be on the RAC, I would highly encourage it. I think
46 it is fun and perhaps more of the fun occurs -- not
47 during the public meeting. So, we have -- you know,
48 we're able to visit communities, do fun things, not be
49 in the public meeting setting. So, if you're just
50 listening to the meeting, I get it. It doesn't sound

1 fun, but it actually -- it is pretty fun. So, I encourage
2 anyone who's kind of interested, consider applying.
3 Encourage your friends and family to apply. Encourage
4 them to reach out to current RAC members and ask what
5 it's like. I think we would all encourage anyone to
6 apply to be on the KARAC. And with that, that's all I
7 have. So, I would take a motion to adjourn.

8

9 MS. CHERNOFF: Motion to adjourn.

10

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

13

14 MR. HOLMES: Second.

15

16 MR. RICHARDSON: Second.

17

18 CHAIRPERSON SKINNER: Thank you. Is there
19 any objection?

20

21 (No response)

22

23 Hearing and seeing none. The meeting is
24 adjourned.

25

26 (Off record)

27

28 END OF PROCEEDINGS

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 1 through 148 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the KODIAK/ALEUTIANS SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME II recorded on the 16th day of September;

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

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

DATED at Isabela, Puerto Rico this 1st day of October 2026.

Rafael Morel
Chief Project Manager