0001	
1 2 3	WESTERN INTERIOR FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
4 5 6	PUBLIC MEETING
7 8	VOLUME I
9	PYKE's WATERFRON LODGE
10	Fairbanks, Alaska
11	February 25,2025
12	
13	
14	
	COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:
	Jack L. Reakoff, Chairman Donald V. Honea, Jr.
18	Pollock Simon, Sr.
19	Robert Walker
	Timmthy P. Gervais
21	Tommy Kriska
	Jenny K. Pelkola
23	
24 25	
	Regional Council Coordinator, Nissa Pilcher
27	Regional council coolainatol, wissa lilenei
28	
29	
30	
31	
32 33	
	Recorded and transcribed by:
35	Recorded and cranberrated by.
36	Lighthouse Integrated Services Corp
37	877-261-2495
38	Info.@lighthouseonline.com
39	
40	
41 42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	

PROCEEDINGS

1 2 3

(Fairbanks, Alaska - 2/25/2025)

4 5

(On record)

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: All right, Thank you. So, we're going to bring the meeting to order. It's a little after 9:00. So, we're in Pike's Waterfront Lodge in Fairbanks today and tomorrow and we'll be doing the Western Interior Regional Advisory Council winter meeting. So, we're going to go through the agenda -- the invocation. Would you like to do an invocation, Jenny?

13 14 15

(Pause)

16 17

So, call to order. Meeting is called to order and housekeeping announcements, Nissa.

18 19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

MS. PILCHER: Good morning, everyone. This is Nissa Pilcher for the record, Council Coordinator for the Western Interior. This is the Western Interior Subsistence Regional Advisory Council meeting. For those joining us on the phone, you can find the agenda and meeting materials online on the Federal Subsistence Program website. That address www.doi.gov/subsistence under the Regions tab, choose Western Interior and then Meeting Materials. For all the participants on the phone -- sorry, I'm going to scoot in. Please remember to mute your phones when you are not speaking. If you do not have a mute button on your phone, you can press star-six and that will mute and also unmute your phone.

33 34 35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

For those -- sorry reading my script. Also, for those in the room, the meeting materials are also located on the side table as well as a sign in. So, if folks could please sign in as well, that would be appreciated. So, a current membership update. So as everyone knows, this Council does have ten seats. Currently only eight of those are filled. application deadline was February 16th so we're now past it. Hopefully those two vacancies will be filled by any applications, but I won't know any of that information until your fall -- well, maybe not even at your fall meeting until we get the notice from Department of Interior. So, just as a reminder, Council functions best with the robust and diverse membership and hopefully soon we will have Kuskokwim representation. Moving forward, any assistance in helping spread the word about

9

applying to sit on the Council would be appreciated. Not 1 only Council members but also agency, NGO, tribal partners, anyone. And again, thank you, member Kriska, for your help in the arena. You have channeled several 5 people in my direction, and I do appreciate that. So, 6 anyone listening or present, please feel free to hand out my contact information and I'll work with anyone interested in getting a hold of applications and getting them submitted during the appropriate time. So, anyone 10 wishing to address the Council on non-agenda topics, there will be an opportunity for this later today after 11 12 the Council member reports. At that time, the Chair will 13 announce this opportunity and call on individuals who 14 wish to address the Council. For folks here in person, please fill out a blue card, hence the name because they 15 are blue cards, located on that information table to 16 17 indicate your wish to address the Council, either during 18 this time or during a specific agenda topic. And then 19 you can hand them to anyone from OSM and we will do 20 meeting -- room introductions here shortly. We will 21 relay that information to the Chair. The Chair will also 22 ask if there is anyone on the phone that would like to 23 provide comments after people comment in person. For 24 those on the phone who would like to speak, please press 25 star five to raise your hand and wait to be recognized 26 before speaking. When this happens, please identify 27 yourself for the record by stating your first and last 28 name and if you are representing an affiliation other 29 than yourself. If you would like to submit written 30 comments instead, or in addition to oral comments, you 31 may turn those into any OSM staff in this room or email 32 them to subsistence@ios.doi.gov. Also, make sure you 33 include your name and affiliation on those as well.

34 35 36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44 45

46

47

48

49

50

So, a quick reminder on Council member conduct and ethics. So, our meetings are conducted by Robert's Rules, which help us provide structure and maintain order throughout the meeting. All participants, including Council members, staff and public members, are expected to be courteous and respectful in interactions as a matter of meeting etiquette. It is understood that the nature of some of the issues discussed at these meetings can be difficult and controversial, and although some comments throughout this meeting may be passionate, no insults or foul language will be tolerated in the public meeting. So, if any kind of unruly behavior or insulting language from anyone occurs during the meeting, please be advised that I, operating as a designated federal office would need to intervene.

5

6

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

All right, there is a quick note I would like to make. There's going to be an evening session tonight. It's going to be an outreach and engagement session between this Council and members of the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council that will start in this room at 6:30 tonight. So, the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council is currently considering $\ensuremath{\mathsf{new}}$ management approaches to reduce chum salmon bycatch in the Bering Sea Pollock Fishery and that analysis and management action is ongoing by that body. At its October 2024 meeting, the North Pacific Council discussed opportunities for outreach and engagement on the chum salmon bycatch issue, and staff contacted myself and Brooke McDavid, who coordinates the Eastern Interior and the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Councils about moving forward with available North Pacific Council members, as well as their analytical staff attending these Council meetings to provide a presentation on the current analysis. This will be an opportunity for the Council to discuss the issue with the North Pacific Council members in attendance. Please be aware that the members of the North Pacific Council that are attending do not make up a quorum of that Council, and the session is not testimony to the North Pacific Council as a whole if public testimony -- if there is time for public testimony. That session will break for the evening by 8:30 tonight, as we still do have a full day tomorrow. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair, for allowing me the time to share this information.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you, Nissa. And so, we're going to call, roll and move into election of officers. Would you like to call roll? Go ahead, Nissa.

35 36 37

38

34

 $\,$ MS. PILCHER: This is Nissa Pilcher, for the record. Don Honea, Jr.

39 40

MR. HONEA: Here.

41 42

MS. PILCHER: Pollock Simon, Sr.

43 44

MR. SIMON: Here.

45 46

MS. PILCHER: Jack Reakoff.

47 48

MR. REAKOFF: Here.

49 50

MS. PILCHER: Robert Walker.

```
0005
 1
 2
                    MR. WALKER: Yes.
 3
 4
                     MS. PILCHER: Tim Gervais.
 5
 6
                     MR. GERVAIS: Here.
 7
8
                     MS. PILCHER: Jenny Pelkola
9
10
                     MS. PELKOLA: Here.
11
12
                     MS. PILCHER: Tommy Kriska
13
14
                     MR. KRSKA: here.
15
16
                     MS. PILCHER: and then Darrell Vent, are
17
    you online?
18
19
                     (No response)
20
21
                     All right. Darrel is attending a YRDFA
22
    meeting at the same time so I believe he'll be in and
23
    out and he should be physically present tomorrow. But,
24
    with seven members of eight seated, we do have a quorum.
25
26
                     CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay, thank you,
27
    Nissa. So, election of officers after we established the
28
     quorum. And so, the election of the Chair, I turn that
29
    over to you, go ahead.
30
31
                     MS. PILCHER: All right, again, Nissa
32
    Pilcher, for the record, I have this -- flip flop to
33
    something else in my notes. But -- so this is Nissa,
34
    Council Coordinator with OSM. In accordance with the
35
    Council Charter, Council members elect a Chair, a Vice
36
    Chair and a secretary for a one-year term during the
37
    winter meeting. Member Reakoff is the current Chair;
38
    member Pelkola is the current Vice Chair and member Vent
39
    is the current Secretary. At this time, I would like to
40
    open the floor for nominations for the Council's Chair.
41
    Please keep in mind the nominations do not need to be
42
    seconded in this case.
43
44
                     MR. HONEA: Madam Chair, I nominate Jack
45
    for Chair -- Chairperson.
46
47
                     MR. WALKER: I second it.
```

1	MS	S. PILCHER: Well, thank you member
2	Honea for the mot	ion and member Walker for the second.
3	Are there any other	ers?
4		
5	MI	R. HONEA: Motion to close.
6		
7	MI	R. WALKER: Second.
8		
9	M	S. PILCHER: All right, I believe that
10	means that since t	here's only one nomination then we can
11	move forward, and	I can turn the mic back over to Chair
12	Reakoff.	
13		
14	Cl	HAIRPERSON REAKOFF: We should vote.
15		
16	MS	S. PILCHER: Okay.
17		-
18	Cl	HAIRPERSON REAKOFF: I will maybe
19		doesn't want me to be Chair.
20	-	e have a new administration, want the
21	record to be clear	·
22		
23	M	R. WALKER: I believe the majority rule.
24		
25	M	S. PILCHER: How about we can do
26	by everyone in far	
27		
28	II	N UNISON: Aye.
29		
30	M	S: PILCHER: Everyone opposed, say aye
31	now.	or recommendations opposed, ear are
32	110	
33	(1	No response)
34	(-	ino response,
35	A	ll right.
36		
37	CI	HAIRPERSON REAKOFF: We're going to have
38		record for this meeting because we're
39		be at this time. So, we want to make
40		ning is going well so that we're
41		Chair now. Thank you very much. I
42		confidence. Open the floor for
43	nominations for V	
44	HOMEHIACTOHS TOT V.	ice chair.
45	MI	R. KRISKA: I nominate Jenny for Vice
46	Chair.	Intiona. I nominate beinly for vice
47	CHAIL.	
48	T.//I	R. SIMON: I second.
49	1411	A. DIPON. I SECONA.
50	CI	HAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Anv other

1	nominations?	
2		MR. KRISKA: Nominations closed.
4 5		MR. SIMON: Second that.
6 7 8 9 10		CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Nominations - Well, again, I would like a vote. Those any being Vice Chair signify by saying
11 12		IN UNISON: Aye.
13 14		CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Opposed Same sign.
15 16		(No response)
17 18		Okay, Thank you very much, Jenny.
19 20 21 22 23	was member Krisk Pollock that mad	MS. PILCHER: And for the record, that a that made the initial motion and member de the second.
24 25 26 27 28		CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, for Secretary etary is Darrell. And so, the Chair will for for nomination for Secretary. You ell?
29 30		MR. WALKER: I nominate Darrell.
31 32		CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: All right.
33 34		MR. KRISKA: Second.
35 36 37	nominations for	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Any other Secretary?
38 39		(No response)
40 41		Okay.
42 43		MR. WALKER: Move to close.
44 45	have a second for	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Move to close. We or that?
46 47 48		MR. KRISKA: Second.
49	Favor of Darrol	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay. Those in as Secretary for the Western Interior
\cup	ravor or parrer	as secretary for the Mestern Interior

1 2	Council signify by saying aye.
3	IN UNISON: Aye.
4 5	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Opposed?
6 7	MR. GERVIAS: Aye.
8	CUATARRACON REAVORE. Obs. Occasion
9 L0	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay. Opposed same sign. Your affirmative vote, tight, Tim?
L1 L2	MR. GERVIAS: Yes, I was aye on the
L3 L4	affirmative.
L5 L6	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Right, Okay.
17	MS. PILCHER: Just to clarify, I believe
L8 L9	it was Member Walker that made the original motion and member Kriska that seconded. Okay, yes. Correct.
20 21	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Yeah. So,
22	elections are accomplished. We have quorum, meeting
23	announcement, we've done that. Welcome and introduction.
24	So, I would like to know who's on the phone. I know I
25	have Tim on the phone. Did you join Darrell? Darrell's
26	still off. Who else is on the phone with us this morning?
27 28	Give your name and your affiliation.
29	MC DIICUED. This is Nices Took If
30 31	MS. PILCHER: This is Nissa. Jack If you'd like, I can run through a list
32 33	(Simultaneous speech)
34 35	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Go ahead, Nissa.
36	MS. PILCHER:I might streamline
37	things. So, if there's anyone listening that is not
38	representing anybody that is just a member of the public,
39	if they could introduce themselves right now.
10	II they could included thembelves light how.
11	All right, and if I start going too fast
12	and I jump over someone that hasn't got the opportunity
13	to unmute themselves, please feel free to just pipe up
14	when you can. So, the next is there anyone on with tribal
15	governments or native organizations?
16	
17	MS. ERICKSON: Good morning. This is
18	Diloola Erickson with Tanana Chiefs Conference, and I
19	think we got Brian Lepping on with us for Tanana Chiefs Conference.

1 2	MS. PILCHER: Good morning, Diloola and
3	Brian. Anyone else in that category?
4	
5 6 7	MS. HERZNER: Yeah. This is Katie Herzner with the Intertribal Agriculture Council.
8 9	(Pause)
10 11 12 13 14	MS. PILCHER: All right, thanks for joining, Katie. I don't believe I've heard, or I haven't I'm not as familiar with your organization. I'll have to Google it on a break. Anybody on representing a non-government agency?
16 17	(No response)
18 19	All right, how about Alaska Department of Fish and Game?
20	
21	MR. NELSON: This is Mark Nelson with the
22	Fish and Game and Fairbanks wildlife. And I'll be there
23 24	in person tomorrow.
25	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Welcome, Mark.
26	CHAIRFERSON REAROFF. WEICOME, Maik.
27	MR. BEMBENIC: Good morning. This is Tim
28	Bembenic with Alaska Department of Fish and Game,
29	Subsistence division. I'll also be attending tomorrow.
30	
31 32 33 34	MS. FISHER: Hi, this is Brooke Fisher with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, in the Subsistence Division as well and I will also be there tomorrow.
35	COMOTION.
36 37	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Good morning. Anybody else with ADF&G?
38	
39	(No response)
40	
41	MS. PILCHER: All right, how about Bureau
42	of Indian Affairs?
43	(27.
44 45	(No response)
46	All right, how about Bureau of Land
47	Management? And once again, as a reminder, it is star
48	six to mute and unmute. Unless your phone has a
49	capability or if you're on teams and you have to hit the
50	microphone. So, Bureau of land management.

50

manager.

1		CHAIRPERSON	REAKOFF:	Good	morning,
2	Lori.				_
3					
4	7	MR. HAVENER:	Horr Cood m	ornina	This is
5	Jeremy Havener.				
6	for Koyukuk, No				
7	Refuge and on he	ere with us	is our RIT	Marie	Cleaver,
8	also attending.				
9	-				
10		CHAIRPERSON	REAKOFF.	Good	morning.
11	Jeremy. Anybody				
12	ociemy. Impody	.150, 0.5. 11	ion and will	arric.	
		/3T			
13	((No response)			
14					
15	P	MS. PILCHER:	All right,	how ab	out U.S.
16	Forest Service?				
17					
18	N	MR. RISDAHL:	Good morni	na. Nis	sa. This
19	is Greg Risdahl,			_	
20	Service and ISC				
			Je Joining	you c	ouay and
21	tomorrow, Thank y	you.			
22					
23		CHAIRPERSON	REAKOFF:	Good	morning.
24	Greg.				
25					
26	N	MR. RISDAHL:	Hev, Jack	. Good	to hear
27	you.		<i>1</i> ,		
28	100.				
29	7	MS. PILCHER:	711 right	And +h	on lagt
			_		
30	office of Subsist	tence managem	ient. Anyone	online	3 ?
31					
32		MR. GRAHAM:		_	
33	Members of the Co	ouncil, this	is Corey Gr	aham, i	fisheries
34	biologist with OS	SM.			
35	-				
36	(CHAIRPERSON	REAKOFF:	Good	morning.
37	Corey. And on th				_
	-				_
38	people on this				
39	participating	_		-	
40	meetings. Has any	body from DO	I on this ca	ıll? Was	shington,
41	D.C				
42					
43		(No response)			
44		· <u>-</u> ,			
45	F	Hearing none.	So I think		
46	•		30 1 0111111		
	7.	10 T 7 T T T T T T -	Evanos ma	Tlm c-	
47		MS. LA VINE:			_
48	so sorry. I wasn'				
49	Jack. Mr. Chair,				
50	La Vine. I am wit	h the office	of Subsiste	ence mar	nagement.

1 Now within the Department of Interior. Well, as always, thank you, Mr. Chair. 4 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay. 5 morning, Robbin and so, you will be sitting in for DOI then. Is that just -- you're just OSM not DOI? I've 6 encouraged DOI as we switched over to this, that they 8 participate in our meeting so that they -- because I feel that its - gets a little -- gets them a little 10 closer to the issues, so. But I understand the transition 11 at this time. Do you have a question, Robert? Go ahead. 12 13 MR. WALKER: Yes. You said DOA? 14 15 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: DOI, Department of 16 Interior. 17 18 MR. WALKER: Oh okay. 19 20 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So OSM is now under 21 the Department of Interior. 22 23 MR. WALKER: It's kinda [sic] like, you 24 know, using an acronym sometimes it kind of throws you 25 for what the attention was, Thank you. 26 27 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: I'll try 28 clarify next time, thank you. So, is anybody else on the 29 phone that's joining the call that hasn't identified 30 themselves? 31 32 MS. KENNER: Yes. This is Pippa Kenner 33 with the office of Subsistence management here in 34 Anchorage, good morning. 35 36 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Good morning, 37 Pippa. 38 39 MR. MCKEE: Good morning, Jack. Good 40 morning, members of the Council. My name is Chris McKee. 41 Normally, I'm the statewide Subsistence coordinator for 42 the Bureau of Land Management but, for the next few 43 months, I'll be the acting deputy director at OSM, Thank 44 vou. 45 46 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Oh okay, good to 47 hear you on there, Chris. Anybody else on the on the 48 call now that joined during the introductions? 49

1	MS. MCDAVID: Good morning, Jack and
2	Council members. This is Brooke McDavid. I'm the
3	coordinator for Eastern Interior RAC. I'll be listening
4	in as I can today. Thanks.
5	
6	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Good morning,
7	Brooke. And anybody else?
8	
9	(No response)
10	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
11	So, hearing none, we have a room full
12	of people and so we'll start with Glen Stout in the
13	back. We'll work towards the front. Go ahead, Glenn. Oh
14	yeah, we got to get
15	year, we got to get
16	MS. PILCHER: So, this is for the record.
17	Sorry. Everybody's got to come up and talk into the mic,
18	unfortunately. Thanks, Glenn.
19	unioicunatery. Inanks, Grenn.
20	MR. STOUT: Glen Stout. Alaska Department
21	of Fish and Game, the Galena area biologist.
22	of fish and dame, the datena area biologist.
23	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Good morning,
24	Glenn.
25	GTEIIII.
23	
26	MC MODAN, Marriag Council this is Him
26	MS. MORAN: Morning Council, this is Tina
27	Moran. I'm the deputy refuge manager for Kanuti National
27 28	_
27 28 29	Moran. I'm the deputy refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge.
27 28 29 30	Moran. I'm the deputy refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. MS. FOX: Good morning, everybody. Joanna
27 28 29 30 31	Moran. I'm the deputy refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. MS. FOX: Good morning, everybody. Joanna Fox. I'm the refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife
27 28 29 30 31 32	Moran. I'm the deputy refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. MS. FOX: Good morning, everybody. Joanna
27 28 29 30 31 32 33	Moran. I'm the deputy refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. MS. FOX: Good morning, everybody. Joanna Fox. I'm the refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge.
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34	Moran. I'm the deputy refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. MS. FOX: Good morning, everybody. Joanna Fox. I'm the refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35	Moran. I'm the deputy refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. MS. FOX: Good morning, everybody. Joanna Fox. I'm the refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Morning, Johanna.
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36	Moran. I'm the deputy refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. MS. FOX: Good morning, everybody. Joanna Fox. I'm the refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Morning, Johanna. MR. YASKA: Good morning. George Yaska,
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37	Moran. I'm the deputy refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. MS. FOX: Good morning, everybody. Joanna Fox. I'm the refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Morning, Johanna. MR. YASKA: Good morning. George Yaska, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Indigenous Knowledge
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38	Moran. I'm the deputy refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. MS. FOX: Good morning, everybody. Joanna Fox. I'm the refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Morning, Johanna. MR. YASKA: Good morning. George Yaska,
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39	Moran. I'm the deputy refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. MS. FOX: Good morning, everybody. Joanna Fox. I'm the refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Morning, Johanna. MR. YASKA: Good morning. George Yaska, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Indigenous Knowledge
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40	Moran. I'm the deputy refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. MS. FOX: Good morning, everybody. Joanna Fox. I'm the refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Morning, Johanna. MR. YASKA: Good morning. George Yaska, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Indigenous Knowledge Liaison, Thank you. MR. HARWOOD: Good morning, Chris
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41	Moran. I'm the deputy refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. MS. FOX: Good morning, everybody. Joanna Fox. I'm the refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Morning, Johanna. MR. YASKA: Good morning. George Yaska, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Indigenous Knowledge Liaison, Thank you.
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42	Moran. I'm the deputy refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. MS. FOX: Good morning, everybody. Joanna Fox. I'm the refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Morning, Johanna. MR. YASKA: Good morning. George Yaska, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Indigenous Knowledge Liaison, Thank you. MR. HARWOOD: Good morning, Chris
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43	Moran. I'm the deputy refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. MS. FOX: Good morning, everybody. Joanna Fox. I'm the refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Morning, Johanna. MR. YASKA: Good morning. George Yaska, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Indigenous Knowledge Liaison, Thank you. MR. HARWOOD: Good morning, Chris
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44	Moran. I'm the deputy refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. MS. FOX: Good morning, everybody. Joanna Fox. I'm the refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Morning, Johanna. MR. YASKA: Good morning. George Yaska, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Indigenous Knowledge Liaison, Thank you. MR. HARWOOD: Good morning, Chris Harwood, wildlife biologist for Kanuti Refuge.
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43	Moran. I'm the deputy refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. MS. FOX: Good morning, everybody. Joanna Fox. I'm the refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Morning, Johanna. MR. YASKA: Good morning. George Yaska, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Indigenous Knowledge Liaison, Thank you. MR. HARWOOD: Good morning, Chris Harwood, wildlife biologist for Kanuti Refuge. CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Good morning,
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44	Moran. I'm the deputy refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. MS. FOX: Good morning, everybody. Joanna Fox. I'm the refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Morning, Johanna. MR. YASKA: Good morning. George Yaska, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Indigenous Knowledge Liaison, Thank you. MR. HARWOOD: Good morning, Chris Harwood, wildlife biologist for Kanuti Refuge. CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Good morning,
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45	Moran. I'm the deputy refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. MS. FOX: Good morning, everybody. Joanna Fox. I'm the refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Morning, Johanna. MR. YASKA: Good morning. George Yaska, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Indigenous Knowledge Liaison, Thank you. MR. HARWOOD: Good morning, Chris Harwood, wildlife biologist for Kanuti Refuge. CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Good morning, Chris.
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46	Moran. I'm the deputy refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. MS. FOX: Good morning, everybody. Joanna Fox. I'm the refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Morning, Johanna. MR. YASKA: Good morning. George Yaska, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Indigenous Knowledge Liaison, Thank you. MR. HARWOOD: Good morning, Chris Harwood, wildlife biologist for Kanuti Refuge. CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Good morning, Chris. MS. JALLEN: Good morning, Deena Jallen
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47	Moran. I'm the deputy refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. MS. FOX: Good morning, everybody. Joanna Fox. I'm the refuge manager for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Morning, Johanna. MR. YASKA: Good morning. George Yaska, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Indigenous Knowledge Liaison, Thank you. MR. HARWOOD: Good morning, Chris Harwood, wildlife biologist for Kanuti Refuge. CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Good morning, Chris. MS. JALLEN: Good morning, Deena Jallen with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. The Yukon

1	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you.
2	
3	MR. OLSON: Good morning, Matt Olson.
4	Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Normally the
5	assistant fall season manager for the Yukon River, but,
6	currently the acting manager, Thank you.
7	
8	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Acting fall seasor
9	manager? Okay, Thank you.
10	
11	MS. OKADA: Good morning. Marcy Okada
12	Subsistence coordinator for Gates of the Arctic National
13	Park and Preserve.
14	
15	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Morning, Marcy.
16	AND CAMEDON OF 1
17	MR. CAMERON: Good morning, Council
18	members. My name is Matt Cameron, wildlife biologist
19	with the National Park Service for Gates of the Arctic.
20	Really nice to see you all.
21 22	CHAIDDEDCON DEAKOEE, Morning Moth
23	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Morning, Matt.
23 24	MR. RUNFOLA: Good morning. David
25	Runfola. Alaska Department of Fish and Game. I'm the
26	assistant management biologist for the Yukon summer
27	season.
28	
29	MR. WILLIAM: Good morning. Steve
30	Williams, I'm the Oregon representative to the North
31	Pacific Fishery Management Council. Listening with you
32	this evening, Thank you.
33	
34	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Good morning,
35	Steve.
36	
37	MR. WILLIAMS: Good morning.
38	
39	MR. BEYERSDORF: Good morning, Mr.
40	Chairman, Members of the Council, Geoff Beyersdorf. I'm
41	with the Bureau of Land Management here. District
42	manager for the Fairbanks district, thank you.
43	
44	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Morning, Geoff.
45	MO THE TRANSPORT
46	MS. JULIANUS: Good morning, everybody.
47	Erin Julianus I'm a wildlife biologist (distortion)
48	Central Yukon field office.
49	OHATDDEDCOM DERVOEE, Wales have
50	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: We're here.

1 2 MR. MERRILL: Good morning, Clayton Merrill. Subsistence Coordinator for Arctic Kanuti and Yukon Flats National Wildlife Refuges. 5 6 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Good morning, 7 Clayton. 8 9 MR. MARTIN: Good morning, I'm Ross 10 Martin. I'm a PhD student at the Yale School of the 11 Environment. 12 13 MR. PATSY: Good morning, good morning, 14 Doug Patsy from Nulato. Just a public participant. 15 16 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Good morning. 17 18 (Distortion) 19 20 MR. VICKERS: Oh, I thought the white was 21 on. Okay, red's on. Good morning members of the Council. 22 Mr. Chair, I'm Brent Vickers. I am the anthropology 23 division supervisor at Office of Subsistence Management. 24 I'll be representing (distortion) leadership team this 25 -- these next couple of days. Very excited to be here, 26 and I just want to make one point of little clarification 27 for vocabulary sake. So, we are -- OSM was moved within 28 the Office of Secretary within DOI. So, but no one from 29 the Office of Secretary seems to be on the phone just 30 letting you.... 31 32 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, when we address 33 them, we're going to be addressing the office of the 34 secretary? 35 36 MR. VICKERS: I believe so, I mean, you 37 know, there's a -- we're within an Office of Secretary, 38 then there's a couple other little branches but, I think 39 Office of Secretary will suffice. And that's why I think 40 maybe Robbin got tripped up and she's like, well, I am 41 in DO. but anyway, yeah. That's all, Thank you. 42 43 MR. UBELAKER: Good morning, Mr. Chair. 44 Council members. Brian Ubelaker, wildlife biologist with 45 OSM. 46 47 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Good morning, 48 Brian.

MS. WILLIAMS: Good morning. Liz Williams cultural anthropologist with OSM. Nice to see you.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Morning, Liz. And that's everybody in the room. Vince are you going to -- so we're getting the introductions and so, you're in the room too, Vince go ahead.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, Vince Mathews. Retired Federal employee.

 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: And so, we're going to -- let's see, where are we at here? Review and adopt the agenda. So, the -- we have a -- an updated agenda before us. This green colored agenda. And so, any adjustments inclusions to this agenda? go ahead Nissa.

MS. PILCHER: This is Nissa Pilcher for the record. Just to let you guys know the difference between the agenda that's in front of you and the agenda that was in your meeting book is 1. We moved the agenda item, WP 2401 statewide sale of brown bear hides from under agenda item 15 other business to agenda item 12B under action items, and under -- an addition under reports we -- I added -- or it was added the Tanana Chiefs Conference Tribal Resource Stewardship Department and Kuskokwim River Inter Tribal Fish Commission joint presentation on the chum bycatch EIS. And that is -- if you guys accept it would be at a time certainly today 4 p.m. Also, there was the update from ADF&G Subsistence division update and also a Unit 26A update and this wasn't separated out correctly on the original agenda. But Gates of the Arctic National Park Service submitted a report and an SRC re-appointment request, and the re-appointment request was not separated out specifically on the original agenda. So those are the differences between the one in the book and the one in front of you now.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you, Nissa. That clarifies the updated agenda. So, any comments on this agenda? Any assertions from the Council? Do you have anything? Tim Gervais? Are you still there, Tim?

MR. GERVIAS: Not at this time, Jack.

MS. PILCHER: I think he said "not at

48 this time."

1 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay. Thank you. So, any additions from the Council members here? The Chair will entertain a motion to adopt this agenda... 5 MR. GERVIAS: Jack, can I interrupt? 6 7 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: The -- yes, go 8 ahead. 9 10 MR. GERVIAS: Yeah, I forgot to put in my opening comments but, maybe it could get added to the 11 agenda. Could somebody from Department of Interior or 12 13 Office of Secretary at some point during the meeting 14 explain what's the likelihood of ANILCA title 8 or the 15 OSM being amended or circumvented by presidential 16 decree? 17 18 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: That's a sticky 19 issue. You can -- we could request that -- we don't have 20 anybody from the office of the Secretary of Interior on 21 the phone. We could ask that of OSM when it comes to 22 that point when we're discussing issues with OSM. Can -23 - does that fall under that agenda item Nissa? 24 MS. PILCHER: This is Nissa for the 25 26 record. I mean, it could -- you could certainly ask the question whether that answer-- I mean, I'm not sure we'll 27 28 be able to give you a satisfactory answer, but you can 29 certainly ask the question. Okay. 30 31 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Is that good, Tim? 32 33 MR. GERVIAS: Yes. That's good. Thank 34 you. 35 36 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay so, the Chair 37 will entertain a motion to adopt the agenda. That's nine 38 green that's update before us. 39 40 MR. HONEA: Motion to adopt with the 41 changes. 42 43 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: That's Don Honea. 44 45 MR. KRISKA: Second. 46 47 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Seconded by Tommy 48 Kriska. Any further discussion? questions? All those in 49 favor of adopting the agenda before us. Signify by saying 50 aye.

50

1 2 IN UNISON: Aye. 3 4 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Opposed? 5 6 (No response) 7 8 No -- and that was an affirmative for 9 Tim. Those opposed, same sign? 10 11 (No response) 12 13 (Distortion) is adopted. So, we're --14 review and approve the previous minutes and those are 15 in our book here under what is that seven -- page seven. 16 So, I -- these minutes are fairly brief. I do -- there 17 is when we have public and tribal comments on non-agenda 18 items and Galena. Charlie Green talked to us, it's not 19 reflected in these minutes -- these draft minutes and 20 so I would like to insert, I forget exactly which order 21 he fell in. But Chief Green was before us, and we were 22 discussing trespass issues and other things with Chief 23 Green. And so, I feel that we have to recognize that as something that was before us. Any other (distortion) on 24 25 the agenda -- or correction of these minutes of the 26 October -- what were they? The third, I think. October 27 two and three in Galena. That's the only addition that 28 I would like to see inserted. The Council is still 29 looking them over. Pollock is back for sure -- from a 30 short little absence, we're going over the minutes of 31 our last meeting down in Galena from -- that's on page 32 seven in your meeting book there, and we're moving 33 towards adopting these minutes. Pollock, if you want to 34 look on page seven. No, no, we're looking at our -- at 35 the minutes from the last meeting. We need to adopt 36 those minutes. So, you want to look at, on page seven 37 in your meeting book there. 38 39 MS. PILCHER: Pollock wasn't at that 40 meeting either. 41 42 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: But -- so I want 43 (indiscernible). Council still looking the minutes over. 44 Don. 4.5

MR. HONEA: Wow, Thank you, Mr. Chair.
It is a -- it's a really good to be here present because
I had a hard time telephonically on there, and I wanted
to say some closing comments on the one in Galena. I'm

glad it turned out -- they were, I'm sure, a good host

and I just wanted to comment on the fishing issues and stuff at that time, but I -- right now I'm just out to the public. I wish anybody in TCC had any issues -there was that meeting that we're having here tonight, and it'd be great if the hunting and fishing Department of TCC was here. Even right now, we -- there's plenty of room available, but I just wanted to comment. It --on the last day, my phone gave out, and I wasn't able to do any closing comments, but, you know, consideration, it's really much easier to sit here and discuss our problems and bring them up here to the Council as a whole instead of trying to do that over the phone. So, I wanted to -- you know, express some of the concerns that were expressed in Galena on the hunting issues and maybe in closing comments or something, I'll bring it up again. But I just wanted to mention that my -- in fact, I think Jenny brought it to the -- before that, we should be compensated. At least buy us a doggone phone, because I have one of these old flip top things and I can barely hear out of it. So, it's really great to -- for Nissa to bring us all in, in a timely manner, Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you, Don. There's going to be a chance for TCC to speak at 4:00 today on our agenda and I want to recognize this lady that just came in. You want to come up to the mic here and state for the record who you are? Because we're keeping track of who's in the meeting.

MR. LAPP: Good morning and I apologize for my lateness. A moose held me up in the dog yard this morning. So, my name is Krystal Lapp, and I'm the natural resource policy analyst for Tanana Chiefs Conference.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you. I -- you bring up an important point for the Department of Interior that these face-to-face meetings are integral to this forum under title eight, section 805 of ANILCA. The regional Council structure was set up and so, it's a forum for public comment, it's a forum for interaction of the Council to provide information and -- for the Federal Subsistence Board process or the managing agency processes. So, face-to-face meetings are very important and if, you know, teleconferences with the phone systems in rural Alaska, we have phones dropping galore in our Galena meeting it was a big mess. And the Department of Interior is going to have to understand that these inperson meetings are really important. I don't care if it's the advisory committee process for the Alaska

Department of Fish and Game or the Boards themselves, Federal and state Boards, they need to be in person. So that's an important thing and you bring that important issue up I appreciate that, Don. So, these -- going back to these minutes as any further additions, Don wanted to say his phone dropped out and that should be included that he had some closing comments, which is -- actually should be registered on these minutes at the -- that's before us. Any other comments? The Chair will entertain a motion to adopt the minutes of our Galena meeting October two and three with the additions.

MS. PELKOLA: Motion.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Motion by Jenny

16 Pelkola.

MR. HONEA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Don Honea, second. Any further discussion? We have a question? Questions called, those in favor of the minutes, as amended signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Those opposed same

28 sign.

(No response)

So, minutes are adopted from our last meeting. Let's see, Council members' reports. And so, I will start with Tim. He's on the phone and then we'll move through our Council members' reports and then the Chair's report is last. Go ahead Tim. You still there, Tim?

MR. BEMBENIC: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chair and Council members, staff and attending public. The first item in my report I wanted to cover was the Board of Fish meeting that just recently concluded in Southeast Alaska, where Board of Fish voted down on a proposal to reduce hatchery production by 25%, and this is a significant development because we've been talking for a few years now about how a high level hatchery leases from Alaska and from other countries in the Pacific rim are depleting the food supply for all salmon in the marine environment and it's tallying or disturbing from my point of view that The Board of Fish

1 would not take a more conservation style approach to this proposal. So, something that we just need to keep track of and understand that one of the main issues that the WIRAC has brought up is affecting viability of salmon 5 and the marine environment is -- it's not getting traction on the Board of Fish. Throughout the -- with 6 the Board of Fish process the main adversaries to that 8 proposal being passed was commercial fishermen and to 9 some extent, the Department of Fish and Game was not in 10 favor of that proposal. The second item is if any time 11 during the course of this meeting, if anybody with Alaska 12 Department of Fish and Game could explain if they know 13 that if the Chinook Salmon Research Initiative, which 14 was started around 2014, is still in play, or if that 15 project has been defunded? At the time it was supposed 16 to be a significant research project where certain 17 initiatives are going to be taking place to try to define 18 better what's going on with chinook salmon and one of 19 them was genetic testing from many of the different 20 locations around the state and we just never saw hardly 21 any feedback or scientific information come out of that 22 Chinook Salmon Research Initiative. The third item, with 23 the change of administration in Washington, there's a few new players -- or not, I guess I shouldn't say 24 players. New secretaries that are going to affect our 25 26 interaction as Secretary of Commerce and Secretary of 27 Interior. So new Secretary of Commerce is Howard Lutnick 28 from New York City. He's involved with hedge funds and 29 Wall Street culture, and he doesn't really have, that I 30 know of, any experience in marine fisheries.

31 32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40 41

42

43

44 45

46

47

48

49

50

So, I know we were -- as a Council, we were trying to get more` interaction and potentially like a memorandum of understanding between the Secretary of Interior and Secretary of Commerce regarding chinook salmon protection and with this newly appointed Secretary of Commerce just based on his work history, career history, he just doesn't have much background with fisheries. So, the extent we'll be able to make inroads into getting any kind of $\operatorname{--}$ get it $\operatorname{--}$ getting increased understanding of problems where we're dealing with our chinook salmon and chum issues may be limited. And then the second secretary, Secretary of Interior Doug Burgum, he grew up in North Dakota. His family was involved with farming, but, during his working career he's been mostly involved with real estate, software development and venture capital and I don't have very much more information about Mr. -- Secretary Burgum. And then, the final item was I'm wondering with the -- with presidential present administration --

administration, I'm wondering what effect regarding ANILCA Title VIII and the Subsistence program. How -- if by presidential decree, if the intent or the funding of the program, could potentially be affected. That's all I have for this morning.

5 6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

2425

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you, Tim. It's my understanding that the House and the Senate hold the purse strings and so, the funding is in their court. And so, I -- that's constitutional. So, I have high hopes for our U.S. government - I took U.S. government in school, and it works certain ways. And I mean the president can decrease staff, but that doesn't mean it's going to hold up in court. So, I have high, high hopes for our check and balance system. And so, I don't -- I do know that, you know, OSM's spending was frozen yesterday and I'm a little concerned about that. That's like stuff that should not happen -- not funding that's already been appropriated. That's not the way this is supposed to work. But that'll sort out, I think it'll sort out over time. So, thank you for your comments, Tim and -- so, we're going to start with Tommy over here. We're going to move around the room. Go ahead, Tommy. You got a good list here. You save them up and Tommy's got his hand on the pulse of the land. So, we're interested in what Tommy's got to say about what's happening. Go ahead, Tommy.

272829

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

26

MR. KRISKA: Well, okay, I -- you know, for me, I do a lot of writing when I'm alone and take notes, but I've been taking notes for, like, 35 years, since 1990, when we -- the Yukon Drainage Fisheries Association was formed and thought we were going to get into something and change things. But here we are 35 years later, sitting here in in a worst situation back then, we had smart, strong older guys that were great leaders and good inspiration, and they hollered, they swore they did everything to try to change things. But other people had to feed the -- I don't know, the whole United States and everybody else and not worried about any of these issues that were talked about then and it still be -- and today we're still in the same boat -in the worst boat. We don't even know what a salmon looked like. It might -- government or one of those guys might have to start sending us pictures or whatever because it's been seven years now, and I know -- I'm kind of sad because we have people that are, you know, these departments from Northern Pacific, Department of wherever you're coming from and being back in those meetings back in those days and still nothing

is done. Nothing ever will be done. Might as well just 1 take that to heart because it's sad, it's really sad that I have to look at my grandchildren and like, you know what? to hell with the damn government and all 5 those guys, they're just going to keep on doing what 6 they're doing, and we're never going to ever get 7 anywhere. They're never going to see a fish and I try 8 to -- I usually write everything. All I wrote was 9 fishing, hunting and hatcheries and the ocean and they 10 changed their names and do all this kind of cool stuff to be who they are. They have their bread and butter in 11 12 order to, you know, for their families to live on. But 13 you guys took our -- some of our ways and taken more of 14 it, too. It's got into the fish now. It's getting into 15 our moose and our country, our land, everything. So sorry 16 to have to talk like this, but it's the damn truth and I wake up -- I mean, I been straight for 40 years and 17 18 wake up in the morning and think this is going to get 19 worse today. Think of the best thing you can do for your family today. Now, we don't have no, Fred Meyers or 20 21 Costco or anything around us. We don't have anything. 22 We have a bunch of you know -- I just no offense, but you know, I always thought of all the people in the in 23 24 the crowd and the people who are listening, people who 25 are recording you and what they do with that information? 26 We're going to meet with somebody else tonight. Maybe, 27 I don't know, they're getting all booked up and see what 28 we have to say today and get into their defense tonight. 29 I don't know where this information goes or how it's 30 dealt with or whatever, but I found out something in the 31 last past few years that a lot of our tribes, they go 32 directly to DC because they want to figure out what's 33 going on. And these tribes go to DC, and they ask these 34 questions and the government President Norman Baxter 35 saying, we never got that information. We -- where is 36 it? We - well what -- all we go to the Board of Fish, 37 Northern Pacific, Board of Game. All that information 38 comes here but, then you have Board of Fish, Board of 39 Game, Northern Pacific trawlers fishery industry and 40 then you have the government over here. I don't think 41 this information -- it hits right here and it's like a 42 screen, its thrown out, thrown away because it never 43 gets to where it needs to be. I'm kind of fed up with 44 it. That's why I was going to write up some things about 45 what's going on out there but I think what I was doing 46 was giving the information, what's going out there and 47 then better and these guys attitudes and their whatever-48 - put another dollar in the pocket or whatever I'm -- I 49 don't know I'm confused and my people are paying for it 50 throughout the whole state of Alaska. Alaska is the third

-- one third you know, biggest United States. Three 1 Alaska fits in the United States but we're a forgotten state. We're forgotten people. They want the minerals. They want the whatever they can -- you know, they're 5 trying to get this Ambler Road going through there. 6 They're working for development, and the development is money, and the fishing is money, and they're going to 8 fish that fish to the end, and they're going to starve 9 themselves out and finally realize what was going on but 10 it's going to be too late for their own selves, and it's going to be -- and it's already pretty much too late for 11 12 all of us here. I mean, I think I'm going to die like 13 this, I guess maybe in a worse situation. But it's sad 14 to see that the government and the U.S., you know, they 15 say live free. Yeah, that's for some people. Not us up 16 here in Alaska. But I could go on and on and all this stuff. I mean, I quit talking about the moose and what's 17 18 out there, all this stuff. Because if I mention it, 19 it'll probably be used against me in another way. So, 20 I'm just going to leave what's out there and protect it 21 physically myself, I guess, for around our area and I 22 hope everybody else will do the same. And like -- just 23 other folks, you know, I hope Doyon was here, TCC and 24 maybe a rep from each one of our AC Councils and it's 25 kind of hard to do because it's a -- this is serious. We're in a serious situation and like I said before, no 26 27 offense to a lot of you out there, but, you know, I feel 28 like some things entering my back here in some way, the 29 sorry to say that. But I have to say it because when I 30 go home, I don't know what's going to happen with --31 going on in the future unless I don't know. I don't know 32 what's going to -- I don't think anything is ever going 33 to be done. It's going to get worst, worst, worst [sic] 34 and until maybe be better, we just run out of everything 35 now so that we will figure out what to do, and they can 36 help us and figure out what we could do. So anyway, I 37 could go on and on. So, I just want to thank the Board 38 for being here and, you know, giving it all our -- trying 39 everything we can. So, I'll leave it at that and thank 40 you for that.

41 42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Appreciate those comments, Tommy, I think everybody feels the same way. I mean, we make all these comments to the Board of Fish, you know, all these various North Pacific Fisheries management. It's like it gets it goes into a sound, deadened room. They don't hear what we're saying, don't want to hear it and so, it gets frustrating. But we just got to keep trying. That's -- I've been doing this for 30 something years just like you and I -- you just got

to keep -- I mean, it's like you're breaking trail in deep snow. You keep getting stuck over and over, but you got to just keep going. You got to sit there and die. You got to keep going. So, I appreciate your comments. Pollock.

5 6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2627

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

MR. SIMON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My name is Pollock Simon Sr. I live in Aztec at Upper Koyukuk River and there hasn't been any fish for the last several years. First years we were restricted to taking king salmon and chum salmon population also crash [sic] and we're not fishing for anything now. That makes life kind of tough. But where I live upper Koyukuk River there's caribou hasn't returned for many years and there no population of moose and the black bears has disappeared, and life is kind of tough. With the new president, the new administration -- not so much free money would be available so it's going to get tougher yet. But (indiscernible) about salmon. (Indiscernible) kitchen timer set for 1940 there was no fish (indiscernible) and- but, in five years 1945, it improved. So, there were some lean years but, the elders or -- our elders has always told us to respect the animals and the fish, and we did that. Yeah, when salmon coming up, we go to fish camp and take what we need and that's what the elders wanted us to do and that worked good. Then there was (indiscernible) and then of course, the state therefore mentioned the fish with (distortion) the fish and then, there's no more salmon. But we all work, we all try to bring the salmon back. I believe personally that the wild salmon stock is a better fish than the hatchery fish. Sometimes you talk about putting in the hatchery into this river, which could release a million fish but these fish up to our ears but that wouldn't be the answer either. Maybe, we prefer to eat the wild stock salmon. I'm a little bit concerned about the nonsalmon species like sheefish and whitefish. If there's no king salmon, no chum salmon, then we depend on these for the success, and we want to fish too much on the whitefish and sheefish. We have to be careful that if this whitefish and sheefish (indiscernible) we left the rest of the country no fish. I'm glad I came back here, I missed a couple of years of meetings, but I'm glad that Jack Reakoff and Jenny still send after the officers running the meeting. But I'm glad to see all of you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

46 47 48

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you,

Pollock. We appreciate you. They got you tuned up, you're looking great, and I always enjoy your comments and your

1 input. You know, we had the marine systems have crashed in other years. In 1919, the fish came back so bad that people had to kill all of their dogs in the interior of Alaska and Hudson Stack, who built the Episcopal mission 5 in Allakaket, had to go to Congress to get Congress --6 because it was a territory -- to close the canneries at the mouth of the Yukon River that were wiping out all 8 the remaining fish. The fish came back. The fish came 9 back because there were no trawl fisheries and there 10 were no hatchery fish being dumped out by 1.9 billion 11 fish smolt into the North Pacific, into a marine crash. 12 And those -- and the salmon returned fairly quickly once they went back to protection of the spawning returns. 13 14 The problem we have right now is warmer water, we have a marine crash in the North Pacific Gulf of Alaska, and 15 16 they just keep -- they don't stop dumping the smolt and 17 the fish are competing with the wild fish. They take the 18 food right out of the wild fish's mouth. And so, I'm 19 getting really concerned that the Board of Fish did not 20 see the handwriting on the wall. All the fish are getting smaller and smaller. They're really skinny, all these 21 22 sockeye that they bring back to the -- they send them out by TCC People: like, "I don't like these fish, 23 they're too skinny". Yeah. Even the sockeye are really 24 25 skinny. Sockeye aren't supposed to be that thin. Their 26 spawning viability of the sockeye and the salmon that are actually going to get into the river -- or actually 27 28 I don't know if they're really viable stock, their egg 29 loads and stuff. I don't know their survivability. The 30 eggs could be not nearly what they should be. So, this 31 -- it's a -- you know, Pollock remembers the stories of 32 those salmon crashes and the stories -- and I remember 33 people have told me about -- you know, Sydney and those 34 people told me about these -- those days. Those were the bad old days. And so, we -- I'm glad you brought that 35 36 up, Pollock about these -- you know there's been crashes, 37 but it's a different landscape now. We're still 38 overtaxing the oceans. So that was a good point. 39 Appreciate that, Pollock. Jenny.

40 41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48 49

50

MS. PELKOLA: Good morning, everyone. I'm Jenny Pelkola, living in Galena. I'm originally from Koyukuk, but I live in Galena now. Very good, Tommy and it's good to see you back. Like you say, you've been gone for two years, Pollock and I'm glad you're back. And you're — like Jack said, you're looking younger and good to see Don back. I'm always pushing for having our members present and I know it's — one day we'll all be — all of us will be setting up here, but I don't — I still don't understand why we have two vacant seats. I

think we need to work harder and get those filled, because the more members we have up here, you know, we learn from each other. I wasn't going to run again on this last one, but I was talked into it again. And I 5 keep saying this, it's going to be my last time, but I 6 learned a lot from these younger folks and our elder. So, I enjoy just meeting with the guys, and I'm always 8 pushing for women -- more women on the Board but as you 9 can see, it's hard to get, I guess. But there's a lot 10 of women out there that I know can also be sitting up 11 here. I had an opportunity to go to a training in Galena 12 for -- to understand that North Pacific Fisheries a 13 little bit more and thanks to TCC And Krystal was there. 14 Thank you, Krystal. That was very enjoyable. And I wish 15 more tribes would take the opportunity to try to learn 16 a little bit more about the North Pacific Fisheries and 17 from that, I got an opportunity to go to Anchorage to 18 testify along with folks from all over Alaska. And I 19 don't know if we did anything, but they listened to some 20 of -- they listened because one of the members came up 21 to me later and thanked me for what I had to say and --22 so maybe I don't know. But, anyway, we're going to meet 23 with them tonight, and hopefully they put on their listening ears. We've had a lot of snow in our area in 24 25 Galena, and I know the wolves are out there doing their 26 thing, and -- but we have -- thank God we have men that 27 -- and women that go out and look for the wolves that 28 are doing their things and some of them are having 29 success. So, I just thank the guys that can, you know, 30 go out in the cold and do that -- still do that for -to keep the moose population up. I enjoy sitting on this 31 32 Board, like I said, and it's good to see all your faces 33 out there. Sometimes we have -- all the Chairs are filled 34 and sometimes they're not. But I hear there's a lot of 35 people online, which is good. I see new faces, and I see 36 faces from the past that I've known. Good to see you, 37 Vince and obviously oh -- thank you for the honey, gee.

38 39

CHAWIRPERSON REAKOFF: That's.....

40 41

MS. PELKOLA: I forgot your name.

42 43

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Jeff.

44 45

46

47

MS. PELKOLA: Oh, Jeff. Thank you, Jeff, for the honey and we all got -- we must be sweet or something so, thank you. But, with that, I'll just end my Comments. Thank you.

48 49 50 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you, Jenny. Appreciate that. And Robert.

2 3 4

1

MR. WALKER: How come you skipped yourself, Jack? I mean....

5 6 7

MS. PELKOLA: He's last.

8

10

11 12

13

MR. WALKER: Oh, thank you, Mr. Chair, for giving me this opportunity to speak. Members of the Board, Nissa and our coordinator. And I'd like to give a big, warm welcome to our former warden, who gave us a lot of inspiration back in the day when we were a lot younger.

14 15 16

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: He's referring to Vince Mathews in the audience.

17 18 19

MR. WALKER: Thank you.

20 21

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: He used to be the coordinator for this Council.

22 23 24

2526

2728

29

30

31

32 33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

43

44 45

46

47

48 49

50

MR. WALKER: And, you know, Mister Beyersdorf was working with us for years with BLM and part of 21E there -- it's called Lower Yukon subregion in the TCC area with tagging moose and having the students in the classroom following on their computers, which was very inspirational to them. Something learned that they will never forget. Even at this age, we never had that done ever again. Thank you again, Geoff, for doing that. And thank you all the Board members and all the staff here for all the work they've done. I know it's a turmoiled time just listening and watching the news, talking with staff members on what's going on, but I don't know if it's for better or for worse. Sounds like a marriage to me, but, I don't know. We'll find out what happens in the end, but I hope everything turns out right and our Board, Western Interior, how long are we going to be able to function with this also, in the Eastern Interior and all the other interiors that have to work with this. And I just want to say one thing, we testified, like where Jenny was a week ago with the inter-tribal (indiscernible) and the fish Commission from Bering Sea, and it went on for seven days testifying. Every three minutes there was somebody up testifying. It didn't matter who you were, you were from the interior, the coast, southeast, Aleutian chain, whatever. But I watched the people who sat at that desk up and watched, a lot of them didn't really pay attention

1 to what people were saying because they heard it over and over and over again. I don't know, but some of them did pay attention and John Moller was there. I've known him for a long time, and he paid attention because he's 5 from the Aleutian chain, and he knew what we were -- or 6 what was going on our way of living our lives so far. But one thing when I testified, they gave me six minutes and I did talk for our tribes, I did talk for an animal 8 9 because nobody ever speaks for them. They are being 10 mercilessly killed for starving because there's no fish. We shot so many bears in our area, it's not funny, then 11 12 to open them up and see they have no fat on them because 13 they're coming down to our village eating dogs and 14 killing all the moose, calves in our area, which is 15 really something that [sic] hard to see in the last five years. There used to be 120 moose on the island and now 16 17 there's only 10. I mean, we don't hunt in our -- right 18 around town so, you know that if you kill 30 bears within 19 five miles of Anvik or Grayling, they're out there eating 20 and hunting moose. So that's a new trait for them. It's 21 not really in Anvik, but it's all through the Yukon 22 Valley from Fairbanks all the way down. And I find this 23 really irresponsible because this never should have 24 happened. Talking with the fish Commissioner, Doug Lang 25 and I explained that to him and he says, no, I have to 26 follow to what the governor has told me to do and the 27 Fish Board and now, Mr. Walker, what we're going to have 28 to do we're going to have to put a seven moratorium on 29 fishing on the Yukon River and I asked him why. He said, 30 well, this is the spawning ground and I said, are you 31 for real? He says, I have to follow orders like everybody 32 else and I said, well, what about Bering Sea? Why don't 33 anybody do anything about putting a seven-year 34 moratorium on the Bering Sea? and he says, you have no 35 jurisdiction and walked away. I kind of felt a little irritable, because I think if we're going to have to 36 37 bear the burden for food. The Bering Sea fishermen should 38 bear the burden of having no money. But you know money 39 is going to win because it's a billion fishery. We see 40 it, you know it all too, but you're not going to speak 41 up. Because when I do talk to people, it's like something 42 that -- afraid to speak that you might be heard by 43 somebody else or something. But I am a tribal chief 44 also. So, I have to speak for all our tribes as it goes 45 and being back on the west Interior RAC, I was hoping 46 that we could all work with our government and the 47 Federal government on this issue, but it seems like we're 48 split so many different ways that we're never, ever going 49 to be together to finalize this. Now we have another 50 burden that has come to all of our departments and our

1 own on how the door is going to be functioning and working to -- what government efficiency is, is going to be something else for us too. it's going to fall right down on the bottom of us. CDQ is part of a federal 5 monies and state monies. I don't know what's going to 6 happen there, but they are in a better position than we are in the interior because they have monies, and they 8 have fisheries. We don't have anything, and we're just 9 going to have to tighten our belt and try to figure out 10 how we're going to use that front door to get to places 11 or is there a back door somebody can show us on how to go out there and to work at this. I'm afraid to say that 12 13 our young people are learning how to steal from the 14 government, going out and taking salmon and passing it out to the elders. This is something that -- what I 15 16 hoped I didn't want to have to see, but it is coming to 17 that, and you can't blame them, they're hungry too. So, 18 Mr. Chairman, I will leave it at that. I know we're all in the same boat together here. So how are we going to 19 20 row it forward and backward? How are we going to do 21 this? Split the boat in half. I know there's no happy 22 ending to this one. It might not be in my lifetime 23 anyway. So, Mr. Chair, thank you. Members of the staff, 24 Thank you. Members of the Board, Thank you.

2526

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you, Robert. I appreciate all your comments and yeah, like a lot of people -- subsistence people don't know what's going to happen, not just with the government. We just don't know what's going to happen with the way the climate is and how the populations of fish and wildlife are going. We just don't know. It's getting like, really concerning about what are we going to do if stuff just goes completely down to nothing? There's lots of snowshoe hares, and I know that elders told me that when they had salmon crashes in the -- long time ago, they had to eat snowshoe hares and muskrats was there -- a large food source. Those were tough days. There were no moose. It was bad times. So, we might be looking at that. Hopefully not and so, Don -- appreciate your comments. Don, go ahead.

41 42 43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's good to be back on the Board, but I -- it's kind of odd the way it fell into place so, I'm just filling the seat till 2025, which is right now. So, I just got back on, and I got a refile. I guess that's the process, but, hey, I -- it's interesting listening to the comments and I appreciate the Board as a whole. I -- it's always been my concern-- is still my concern. Why don't TCC? Why

don't we? Why don't somebody [sic] that can get reps 1 from out of McGrath, Red Devil, Aniak? We should be striving for that. You know, I've always been told, hey, you can know -- you're only speaking of your -- from 5 your subregion or your village, your refuge. Well, of 6 course, I mean, I don't know what's going on. I don't know what's going on in Kaltag or Huslia or something 8 like that. That's why I just deem it important. We have 9 people like Pollock, with wisdom coming from over there, 10 and my cousin Jenny, I appreciate her comments and all of you, Robert and Tommy. Those of you who don't know 11 12 that quy is a go getter. He goes out and he gets wolves 13 and stuff like that. I wish I could be the same way, do 14 the same thing, you know, we all have gifts of some sort, but, I just -- I -- I'm kind of really unclear as 15 16 to whether I gave a report on the numbers of moose on the Novi this fall, but, I just hear there's a large 17 18 wolf population between Ruby and Galena, maybe around 19 Bible camp or maybe around Novi, on the south of the 20 Nowitna River there hasn't been a -- those people up 21 there for maybe three years now, a couple of years at 22 least and so, there's actually nobody up there. We have 23 a cabin at the Marten River on a Native allotment, but 24 I haven't been able to get up there. I did have a couple of friends from TCC staff that went -- I let them go 25 26 down there, and they used the cabin about this time of 27 the year. They traveled by Snowmachine, and they were 28 able to take some. So, I think anything that we could 29 do to strive to keep our population -- our moose and 30 just one other thing I wanted to mention you know, when 31 we talk about fish, dang, there's a myriad of things 32 that are happening and so I'm -- you know, I guess maybe 33 this could be posed in North Pacific, but, how much is 34 that bycatch really taking a toll? I mean, okay, we 35 crashed. We -- I mean, you know, like a friend of mine 36 years ago when we were in Galena or somewhere we 37 mentioned that, hey, we could always rely on the summer 38 chum, the fall chum and to this day, we can't. That's 39 really distressful and, you know, we didn't care about 40 the king run. Hey, we could pour -- we'll just let that 41 go. but, since then, you know -- and so how much, how 42 much bycatch of chum -- I'm more concerned about the 43 bigger picture, like Area M. Okay, if they say, well, 44 those fish, they were targeted for the -- maybe the West 45 Coast, not the Yukon and the Kuskokwim, but, I don't 46 know, you know, are they tagging them? How do we -- how 47 do they actually know where they go? So, there's a lot 48 of lot of questions and I haven't been keeping up with 49 the Inter-Tribal Fish Commission. I missed a couple of 50 meetings there, but I just -- I'm kind of anxious to see

what the forecast is for this year. Other than that, it's good to be here, and I appreciate each one of you guys for your comments and your concerns, Thank you.

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2425

26

2728

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44 45

46

47

48

49

50

1 2

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thanks, Don. I want to find out if Darrell Vent has come back onto the phone or did you ever get on Darrel? So, I would like a Council member report from Darrel and so, it's the Chair's report. I'm on the Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission. We had a meeting in November. We talked quite a bit about dall sheep and caribou populations. That's a -- kind of a thing in the mountains is the dall sheep population and the status of that. We had a presentation from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. They have GPS collars on ewes and rams in the park and then east over to the outside of the park. And so that's a multi-year study of the dall sheep population. They had some mortalities. They flew and found that wolverines had killed one of the dall sheep, and one died from pneumonia, and they had a necropsy. So, we're learning stuff about the dall sheep from that project. I have high hopes for that project and so, that -- I wanted to bring that before this Council, because this Council is also concerned about the dall sheep population in the Brooks Range. We -- we've had a considerably different winter than most people are experiencing the rest of Alaska. The Brooks Range has received a lot of snow when it's raining, and in Anchorage it's raining, in Fairbanks, it was snowing and snowing we had 51 inches of snow that fell in Wiseman in January alone. We've had 90 -- over 91 inches of snow this year. I take weather for the National Weather Service. We had an apex of snowpack at 52 inches. It rained in January 18th on that snow and melted for nine hours. It made a crust in the snow. The moose were to their belly and snow. We've got good strong stock. We've got big moose that have survived 2018, 19, 20. And so we had a cool summer, and our moose camp seem to be still surviving this. There was blood on the snow. There's where they rake themselves up in those cross and the calves are getting cut up a little bit. The snow is really deep in the mountains, and it only rained on the valley floor fortunately, I didn't find crust in higher elevations. I'm trapping higher -- wolves at higher elevations. I didn't find crust when the -- there was deep snow for basically three weeks, and the sheep had a real hard time with that, and so did the caribou. We have -- I think they're Teshekpuk Caribou to the west of us and the wind blew really hard about a week ago, ten days ago. Rip the snow right off the mountains. So

now the caribou are way up. They've gone higher on the 1 ridges. The wolves that we've caught are really fat. That's because they -- they've had quite a bit of snow. 4 They got the advantage on the moose, and they got the 5 advantage on the Caribou. So, we're working on this wolf 6 thing, you know you can ask Glenn back there. Basically, 7 one wolf is worth 7 to 12 moose -- when you say that, 8 Glenn? something like that. 7 to 12 moose you catch a 9 few wolves you take away; it makes credits for the human 10 harvest. So, it's like a teeter totter. You have to take 11 moose, caribou and sheep on this side. You got to take 12 predators off the other side, and we take bears also. 13 If we can get a bear, usually in -- someone in our 14 community will get a bear and -- at some point, and a 15 lot of the bears that we -- have brown bears, they need vegetation in the fall. They want to fatten up on eating 16 17 roots and stuff. So, they're really good eating bears, 18 even if they eat moose calves in the spring. So, we do 19 catch bears. So, one of the elders or person that I knew 20 a long time ago said that if you catch a moose or a 21 caribou, it's your obligation to take a wolf or a bear. 22 And so that's what everybody, you know, if you're out 23 moose hunting and you see a bear, take it. If you see a 24 wolf, take it. And so, Tommy's -- at one point he told 25 me how many wolves he got, and I calculated it was around 26 1100 moose savings and about a 3- or 4-year period. So, 27 Tommy is making all of the -- pretty much all of the 28 harvest and people around in that area. The harvest of 29 the local people there. Of all the communities in your 30 central Yukon area, you're saving the moose that are 31 going back into the human consumption. This is part of 32 the rural methods is to take predators, everything, not 33 just go get a moose in the fall and go home and watch 34 football all winter. You're out there beating yourself 35 up. Theres -- two weeks ago, I was in snow breaking 36 trail in my Muskeg on Willow or something, and I'd sink 37 to my chest stuck. That's never fun, but we got to keep 38 -- that's what I keep -- I use that as an analogy. So, 39 our winter is really hard, but our game is healthier and 40 so, our sheep population was starting to come up. We 41 showed 41 lambs per 100 ewes. There's hardly any ewes, 42 but I mean there's 41 per 100 ewes. And so, they're good 43 strong stock. And so, they're also -- they had a rainy 44 summer and rainy summers -- when they don't get caribou 45 and sheep surveys are actually extend [sic] the blossom 46 periods for the flowers and the sheep and the caribou 47 benefit highly from rainy summers and the insect numbers. Kanuti gave us a report last fall that the 48 49 bumblebees were down to about 90%. Well, that's across 50 the board. There's not -- there's ants pollinating

insects are not there. I don't know what in the world 1 that's about. There weren't even a lot of mosquitoes last summer. So, these things affect the birds, you know, the grouse and so forth. The bird flu is decimated the 5 wild raven population. I drove the Haul Road down. There 6 are hundreds of ptarmigan from north of the Yukon River all the way to the south slope of the Brooks River. Literally thousands. They're getting run over by trucks. 8 9 If the ravens are in the country, they're going to eat 10 those carcasses. I only send -- seen ten ravens between Fairbanks and lives, call it Livengood in the Brooks 11 12 Range. Raven populations they've been killed off by bird 13 flu. Hawks and -- you know, on the Yukon River peregrine 14 falcons have gone way down so, the number of predators 15 are down. So, grouse and ptarmigan are doing really, 16 really well. There is lots of ptarmigan so, those are -17 - and the snowshoe hare population is low but, stable. 18 The Lynx we're catching are fat and so, the Lynx --19 Riverbank Lynx with kittens moving in back into the 20 Brooks Range right now. And I caught two kitties just 21 about a week or so ago and they're pretty good sized and 22 they have fat on them. So, if you got a kitten with fat 23 on it, that shows that the habitat is really good for 24 them. So, I am -- I'm really concerned about these salmon 25 stocks. I -- I'm concerned that we're not going to ever 26 get them back, when the Board of fish just puts their 27 head in the sand and re-allocates all of the resource -28 - all of the food resource, the trophic of the North 29 Pacific to the hatchery fish, wild stocks are going to 30 continue to decline. We cannot come back unless they get 31 it through their head, their studies -- I'm reading a 32 study from Washington State University in British 33 Columbia about hatchery influence. 1.2 billion pink and 34 chum salmon smolts are having a giant effect on wild 35 chinook, coho and wild chum. That's what's beating us 36 up and so, I don't know that bycatch of the returning 37 few that are coming back is a problem. But the main 38 problem is hatcheries. The big -- the elephant in the 39 room is the hatchery release. Washington state -- here's 40 what Washington state releases 200 million pink salmon 41 and one year on the high year and then they don't release 42 the next year because pink salmon have an alternate year. 43 The state of Alaska allows hatcheries to release every 44 year, millions. It's a problem, there's no science 45 involved in the hatcheries in Alaska, and I'm highly 46 annoyed with the Board of Fish for not addressing the 47 issue. A 25% decline -- reduction in hatchery release 48 would not -- it would help -- it's not going to fix the 49 problem. Their hatcheries were not even getting enough 50 returns so that they could even row strip their own

fish. They're affecting their own returns. The hatchery 1 -- hatcheries are owned by the Aquaculture Association, which is the seining industry and there's people that work for the hatcheries, and that's the main obstacle. 5 They're going to cut off all those jobs. Well, there's 6 too many hatcheries. They're industrial hatcheries. They need get it through their head. They need to stop the 8 hatchery production. I'm not opposed to raising chinook and dumping those in the harbors of Juneau and people 10 catch these fish, some coho and chinook I'm talking about in pink salmon industrial millions, 11 hundreds of millions, 750 million pink salmon release. That is way 12 13 too much fish. Our chinook stocks move into the marine 14 system. The pinks are there to eat the fish in front of 15 them and so, it's a giant problem. We do need to talk 16 about this as the few chums that survive -- some of the 17 stocks -- and Don touched on that, there's no genetic 18 work done to a large degree of Area M. What chum salmon 19 stocks are going where? They just basically want to put 20 their heads in the sand. They don't even want to talk 21 about the chums moving through Aea M. Those are the 22 survivors; there's like huge mortalities of our wild 23 chums so the few survivors need to be protected. We need to talk about the North Pacific Fisheries Management 24 25 Councils there. There's going to give us various options 26 and I encourage your Council to be prompt at 6:30 for that meeting tonight. This is going to be a big part of 27 28 this meeting. Is this North Pacific Fisheries Management 29 Council. So that's my report and Tommy has a question 30 or comment. Go ahead, Tommy.

31 32

33

34 35

36

37

38

39

40

MR. KRISKA: Okay so, I see that, you know, the -- all these hatcheries are a big issue with our, you know, our fish. So, you know, why is it that all the hatcheries are along the coast of Alaska? Why, if they all belong to the government or the Northern Pacific fisheries, why don't they move back down to the middle of the United States, down there, away from the -- our Yukon River? Why can't they have their fisheries hatcheries down there instead of right on the mouth of our river?

41 42 43

44

45

46

47

48 49

50

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: These are Alaskan hatcheries. We're the problem. We've got to look in the mirror. Alaska is the problem. We're the largest release of hatchery of fish into the North Pacific and North America. Yeah, they release fish down in the Washington, Oregon, Northern California. Nothing like the Alaskan release and they don't release pink salmon at this level. Everybody knows that anybody that knows anything about

pink salmon, they're voracious. They grow to full maturity in two years. They eat everything in front of them. They eat all the plankton, and then they start moving into small fish and a lot of our -- the second 5 year pinks are wiped. I'm sure they're eating a lot of 6 our chum and our chinook because there's so many. They ate all of our smolt that are moving into the ocean. They can't. They - there are just too many pinks in the 8 9 ocean. They're not supposed to be like that. Yeah, and 10 then they'll say, well, there's lots of hatchery lakes over in Asia. But, Asian stocks, they don't go -- they 11 move into the North Pacific, but they're more to the 12 13 West. They're not so far into our fish. A lot of our 14 fish out of the Yukon move into the North Pacific. The 15 Japan currents running along the south Alaska coast and 16 our stocks of salmon go along the southern part of 17 Alaska. They're moving all the way and they're right in 18 among all that pinks. And so, they're our wild fish that 19 we got by the time they get to the North Pacific, the 20 pinks have beaten them, and the pinks move all the way 21 in, and our pinks move up halfway into the North Pacific. 22 So, it's a -- the hatchery is the elephant in the room. 23 No one wants to talk about it because it's. There's too 24 many jobs involved. We got to look ourselves in the 25 mirror. It's not the other states doing it. It's us. We 26 are doing it to ourselves, and we're wrecking our 27 fisheries. I don't care. It'll come out in the wash, and 28 someday they're going to be deeply regretting that 29 they've done this to the wild salmon stocks of the North 30 Pacific and Alaska in particular. I appreciate that 31 comment, Tommy. Any further questions or comments on 32 those issues? So....

33 34

MR. GERVAIS: Mr. Chair, this is Tom.

35 36

37 38 39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. GERVAIS: Yeah, I would -- I have two things on Tommy asking about the ownership of the hatcheries and why they're at the mouth and for the most part, they are close to the coast. They're -- we need to always remember there is a king salmon hatchery up in Whitehorse that is -- was put there to mitigate the effects of Whitehorse Dam. So, we actually have hatchery enhancement on the Yukon River. As far as I know, the only major -- no, I shouldn't say that. I just wanted to say that I don't think there's any hatchery influence on the Kuskokwim. The -- a comment you just said-- oh, and then the ownership of these hatcheries. So, Prince

William Sound Regional Aquaculture, Cook Inlet Regional 1 Aquaculture Association, I don't know the exact name of the Southeast Alaska Aquaculture Association. These are non-profit companies that are kind of -- they're an 5 association. It mostly all started up when the state was 6 rich with oil and pipeline money and then people were like, oh, wow, we should -- we got all this money, why 8 don't we manufacture more salmon? And I think originally 9 it started out with good intentions, but, then over the 10 course of decades, people were like, wow, the more hatchery production we put out, the more commercial 11 hatchery fish we can catch and the more money we can 12 13 make. And then the fishermen started making more money 14 and they were buying bigger boats, and they wanted more 15 hatchery production to pay for their bigger boats. And 16 this whole, this whole economic model snowballed on 17 itself, and it got to the point where the increased 18 demand for hatchery production to increase commercial 19 harvest affected the actual food supply of the ocean, 20 enough that wild stocks are affected. And, Jack just 21 said that nobody wants to talk about it. I think a lot 22 of people want to talk about it. I know mostly everybody 23 in the Subsistence community wants to talk about it. I 24 know researchers and scientists that are getting their 25 funding that's not -- I would call it like dirty money in research, like there's scientific research or 26 27 ostensibly scientific research, but some of it's, you 28 know, is funded by industry groups that are trying to 29 push a certain agenda, such as we've seen increased 30 research into salmon shark predation and other research 31 projects that are kind of intended to deflect the blame 32 from problems with salmon survivability in the marine 33 environment. And we all had really good presentations 34 last March and the All Council meeting with those 35 scientists and researchers talking about the effect of 36 hatchery production in the North Pacific. So, I believe 37 there's a lot of people that are -- that want to talk 38 about hatchery production and want something done with 39 it. But I feel at this point on this day here, February 40 2025, we're not getting cooperation from the Alaska 41 Board of Fish. We're not getting enough cooperation and 42 buying in from Alaska Department of Fish and Game. We're 43 not getting enough cooperation or admission of that they're part of the problem from the commercial fishing 44 45 fleet. And I'm talking about the state regulated 46 fisheries like salmon seiners, salmon gillnetters. And 47 so, we need to exercise our voices and whatever rights 48 we have. I mean, obviously WIRAC is an advisory Council, 49 we can't -- we don't have rights beyond what's outlined 50 in in title eight of ANILCA. But title eight does have

1 a lot of rights in there but, for some reason, I think because it's inconvenient to advocate or enforce Subsistence rights or -- I don't even know what the exact terminology of it. What's the right of a species, 5 king salmon or chum salmon or coho salmon -- what's 6 their right to actually have a sustaining population? There must be there must be some term for that. So, I 8 know everybody's tired of getting on the short end of 9 the stick, but, basically, when you're a subsistence 10 user rural Alaska, you don't have very good legal resources. You don't have good financial resources. Your 11 12 population numbers are less than the general population 13 of the state in whole. But I want all the Council members 14 and the staff members to realize that what we're advocating for and fighting for, with maintaining 15 healthy Fish and Game stocks is super important. 16 17 Probably -- I mean, other than taking care of the 18 immediate needs of your family and your village, these 19 are really like the most important thing that you can 20 do in your life is to -- so when we're dead the next 21 generation, ten generations down the road and 100 22 generations down the road, they can have fish and game 23 populations in which to feed their family and it's not 24 just it's not about calories either or culture. It's like what's coming out of -- what's the -- like what I'm 25 26 seeing from state government and Federal government 27 saying we don't have to really pay attention to how much 28 salmon is available on the Koyukuk or the Kuskokwim River 29 Yukon River. We can just give these people food stamps 30 or whatever the card is where you can get food. But, when the diet of like the population of the people who 31 32 live on the river changes to ultra-high processed foods, 33 it's like -- it's basically poison. It's damaging 34 everybody's health, super high rates of chronic diseases 35 that are rooted in poor nutrition quality and then there's additional impact where just mental health, 36 37 sense of self-worth, your ability to take care of 38 yourself and your family is compromised because you are 39 being eliminated from access to a resource that no longer 40 exists. So, I would -- I just wanted to expand on Jack's 41 assertion that nobody wants to talk about it. It's like 42 a lot of people want to talk about it, and it needs to 43 be talked about, and we need to do better at whatever 44 it's going to take to get these resources back into 45 sustainable populations and back into harvestable 46 populations. Sorry to talk so much.

47 48

49

50

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay. Thanks, Tim. I didn't mean that nobody wants to talk about it. I mean, the Board process and the Department of Fish and

Game, they don't want to think about it. They're like 1 in a state of denial. There's studies that -- you pointed out that there's a hatchery at the -- in Whitehorse and they release fish hatchery fish chinook salmon that go 5 out and compete. So, they're basically they're have [sic] the same problem. The hatchery fish from 6 Whitehorse go down into the Bering Sea, they move into 8 the North Pacific and there's no food for them and 9 they're coming back instead of -- we had escapement goals 10 of 42,000 555,000. They upped that to 75,000. Yeah. What did they get? 32 -- almost 30,000 this year with full 11 12 closures. It's like it shows that there is a problem 13 even when they're hatchery fish, which are actually a 14 little bit larger than wild stock, they still can't 15 compete in the ocean. This is what we're looking at. 16 That hatchery is actually a -- that should be analyzed 17 scientifically about what that effect is. And so, it's 18 not that no one wants to talk about it. Everybody's 19 starting to realize, I don't think a lot of people realize the hatchery problem. You just go on the website, 20 21 go on and look at the -- there's papers published by the 22 Department of Fish and Game about the hatcheries, and 23 it shows this increasing releases. This keeps going up 24 like on and on. It doesn't stop, it doesn't top out and 25 they just -- it's -- and if you look at the decline of 26 the wild stocks, it's exponential to this increase in 27 hatchery fish. That's the elephant in the room. But the 28 science doesn't -- the Department of Fish and Game 29 doesn't want to use science. Can't be talking about 30 science. We've got an economic -- it reallocates the 31 resource of the ocean to the cost recovery. It's the 32 seiners have to get money back for all that money they 33 spent on that hatchery fish. It's cost recovery, all the 34 staff and all that stuff. It's a fiasco. It's not that 35 no one -- it's the Board of Fish and the Department of 36 Fish and Game is going to stay in a state of denial 37 until they hit the wall, period and so, we're paying the 38 price. The people who rely on those wild stocks are 39 paying the price and they're under a state mandate for sustained yield management and they're not doing it. So, 40 41 it's really super frustrating. We got to look ourselves 42 in the mirror. The state of Alaska is the problem. So, 43 we -- that's probably enough for our Council comments. 44 We get super frustrated. That's part of our platform 45 here is to voice our -- blow some steam out and all 46 that. So, we do have one blue card here for Vince 47 Mathews, but I might take that after a short break or 48 make -- take a ten-minute break here, and then we'll 49 have Vince come up and for non-agenda discussion. So, 50 ten-minute break. We'll be back on record at about 11:00.

1 2 (Off record) 3 4

5 6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: We're going to come back on record. If I could get everybody to come back to their seats. And so, we're going to have Vince Mathews come up and then I found out that Geoff Beyersdorf with BLM is here, but he cannot -- he has to leave. He's here this morning and so he -- I would like this Council to have the benefit of the -- of Jeff Beyersdorf to talk about the Ambler Road and some other aspects while he's here so that I -- so I'm going to-- want to go to Vince. Vince is going to make a public comment, and I would like to have -- oh, well, we got some more. Let's see, I wasn't expecting that. So, we have some public comments here. Oh, gee. Okay, so we got to get the public comments because that's our agenda item. So, I'm not sure that I can get you up here Vince. We'll see how -- or correction Geoff, I'm not sure if we can get you up here or not. So, Vince Mathews go ahead, Vince, say state your name for the record.

(On record)

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. MATHEWS: Yes, my name is Vince Mathews, and Mathews is spelled M A T H E W S, one T cause [sic] I'm Irish. I can give you a long story on that. but, anyways for those that don't know me, I was a regional Council Coordinator for Alaska Department of Fish and Game way back in the 80s for 14 advisory committees, and then I advanced, I suppose, one way of looking at it to Regional Coordinator for Western and Eastern Interior since 1993, and retired -- and moved on to a refuge position in 2009. The reason I'm here is, one of your former Council members I discovered was ill and that's Benedict Jones. So, I visited him a couple of times and for those that don't know, Benedict Jones, he's an Native elder from Koyukuk. He served on the Middle Yukon, I believe advisory committee and on this Council. His illnesses as he broke part of his hip. So, he's in a long-term healing phase and for many elders, Benedict -- I mean Pollock just did it a few minutes ago. They're like an encyclopedia. For me it's like going to a friend's house that got a new encyclopedia, and you pull out the different books and you look and learn about all different stuff. With Native elders they don't -- you don't have to pull out a book they start sharing. So, what he did share with me, Pollock just mentioned, he said there was a fish crash in 1939. He said 1940. Benedict went on about Sidney Huntington, that one of

the crashes was because one winter, I don't know which 1 one, it was 100 below zero, and it killed all the fish -- or the -- you know, the eggs and the spawning grounds. So, my objective meeting with Benedict was to thank him 5 and to apologize. I apologize to him that I listened, 6 but we didn't listen when he gave us insights on why there's no salmon and I get very angry reading the paper 8 years later that there's some study confirming that it's 9 water temperature -- when he told us many, many years 10 ago. So, he then went on and asked me to share that he says, leave our fish alone. He's talking about tagging 11 12 and other stuff. He says that the fish get confused and 13 can't figure on where to go and for those that have been 14 around a long time, Benedict, when he talked about fish, 15 always shared that he knew when to put his net in the 16 water; was when this certain bird would be in the bushes. 17 So, I asked him, and his wife was there, Eliza, and she 18 quickly spoke up and said it was a savannah sparrow. So, 19 for those that are into ecology, this is something that 20 I will look into further. Now for the rest -- for the 21 new staff to OSM and others. I came from a blue-collar 22 family so, when my brothers and sisters would say, what 23 did you do as a regional coordinator? I drew a blank. 24 So finally, I came up with something. People within OSM 25 are the clutch. The engine is a subsistence user, and the vehicle is the Federal Subsistence Program. So, all 26 27 of you, your team people, your -- on that you're the 28 clutch between that engine which is Subsistence, which 29 was defined in ANILCA title eight, and you help that 30 power from that engine be transferred into the Federal 31 Subsistence Program so it can go forward. I'm not going 32 to hoodwink you guys, as a clutch you get burnt both 33 ways, but that's okay. It's part of a learning process. 34 You're the front face of the program many times, and the 35 program and government can be very slow. So, with that 36 I would share with you that I want to thank you for your 37 continuing dedication. I just was talking to staff back 38 there. Yeah. It's very frustrating to hear these same 39 concerns about hatchery fish and all that. For those 40 that know Virgil, he'd be yelling in my ear. My memory here years ago saying the same thing. So, I want to 41 42 thank you for staying in there and, yes, we need to get 43 more involved, more Council members. Hopefully that will 44 happen. So, with that I'll stop. But Benedict is in town 45 here recovering. He concerned me, when I asked him how 46 he's doing, he says I'm really tired. So, I'm hoping 47 that was just because I broke them away from lunch and not that it's any indication of his overall health. So, 48 49 with that, I'll stop. 50

1 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you, Vince. 2 Any questions for Vince or comments?

(No response)

I will comment on your -- you know, the decline in the late 30s, 40s. There's other -- there's other marine -- there's factors but one of the drivers is the marine declines and so, we had this -- in the 90s. There was this chum salmon decline, and we went into restrictions and then -- I remember these 90s restrictions. So, we get into these restrictions. But, if you look at when those were happening and where the hatchery releases were then, they weren't nothing like they are now. So as time goes on, as the hatcheries keep continuing to put out more and more fish, the recovery time has gotten to the point where the returns can't return. They didn't come back in 2 or (indiscernible) three -- in three years or four years. They're not coming back. It's like-- so I do -- you know, there are other declines, but there's documented declines in 1919. I mean, significant declines in 1919 where people had to kill all their dogs and were starving. That was a problem. So, any -- oh Don. Go ahead.

MR. HONEA: Yeah. Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to compliment you on your remarks. I believe that when I first got on this particular Council, you were our coordinator at the time and appreciate that many years and some of the Board members aren't here, but you are, like, a mentor to myself, and a good role model. I appreciate that.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, Tommy. Go

36 ahead.

MR. KRISKA: Yeah. Well, Vince, I appreciate everything that you did back in the -- all your days up to now. I was on the Western Interior Regional Council up to 2005 from, I think 98, 99 back in those days and once I moved here, I had to get off of it. And then after I moved back, I wound up back on it but Benedict -- yeah, it's kind of sad to see that old man. He's 90 years old. He was just going out, you know just to enjoy a grouse hunting here this last fall, and he with a four-Wheeler, and he stepped off the four-Wheeler he shot a grouse, and he was tipping off the four Wheeler to go get it. And he stepped off the four-Wheeler at the same time he stepped into a hole and

fell. Then he broke his hip and he -- well, actually, 1 he walked away from the four-Wheeler, grabbed the grouse was turning around and he fell. It was about a -- I don't know, 50, 60ft from the four-Wheeler. Then he had 5 to crawl all the way back to the four-Wheeler. No one 6 knew where he was. So, they started looking for him. They found him, and he couldn't get himself back onto 8 the bike and it was already getting dark, but his 9 grandson found him in the -- and he had a rough healing 10 thing -- he broke it two more -- or, I guess, two more times ever since he'd been in the hospital. He can't 11 12 stay in one place, and he don't give it time to heal. 13 He fell and broke it again at the hospital or somewhere. 14 Was this going to get up and walk out but, yeah, he he's 15 still trying, but he -- yeah. He's getting -- seemed 16 like his voice is changing and everything and I have a lot of concerns for him, and ${\tt I}$ intend to visit him while 17 18 I'm here. Thank you.

19 20

21

22

23

24

2526

27

28

29

30

31 32

33

34

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you, Tommy. Yeah. Ben used to be on our Council here, and he told us a lot of stuff. He told us back when we were, you know, they would initiate commercial harvest at the quarter point on the Yukon River for chinook. And Ben said that's the Koyukuk River stocks. They -- if they open at the quarter point, it'll wipe the Koyukuk stocks So, they started reanalyzing when they had commercial openings. Ben knew a lot about salmon. So, Ben was a huge part of this Council, and we deeply missed him. Vince was a big -- was a -- our coordinator for a long time. Vince did a great job for this Council and when he was a Subsistence for the refuge, he interacted with this Council a lot. So, we really appreciate all the work you've done in your work life, Vince. And thanks for coming to speak to us.

35 36 37

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ MATHEW: Well, good luck and have a great meeting.

38 39 40

 $\label{eq:chairperson} \mbox{\sc ReakOff: Go ahead there,} \\ \mbox{\sc Robert.}$

41 42 43

44 45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair and thank you for being the coordinator for all these years. You know something that we do talk about some of those guys that are not on the Board anymore. We ask where you are, and I'd have to call Nissa to find out where you are. So, we kind of kept an eye on, you know, where knew where you were So. But, again, thank you for all the time that you gave to us. Thank you, Vince.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Pollock.

MR. SIMMON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Vince. You had pretty good comments. I know Vince for a long time, and I went to a lot of Fish and Game and virtual meeting and benches. I was sitting there and today he's still here in Cook County, concerned about our way of life so, good comments, Vince. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: And Jenny.

 MS. PELKOLA: I would like to echo the words. Thank you to you too. You were the coordinator when I first got in over 20 years ago, and I was wondering why they were calling you chief or warden, and I was wondering, is he a warden? I couldn't figure it out, you know? And I guess it's just a name that the boys gave you then. And I just want to thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: That was a term that Robert and his cousin Jimmy used to call Vince when he would, like, get them to get -- show up on time and do various things. He -- they -- he -- they felt he was more like a prison warden. So, thanks so much, Vince. So, we're going to go through these public comments on non-agenda items. So oh, George Yaska and so, yeah, they got out of order there. Good to see you again, George.

MR. YASKA: Good morning, Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the Council, it's good to be here and speaking on these issues. I work for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and my job title is Indigenous Knowledge Liaison. So, I sought permission to speak on issues that I'm familiar with indigenous knowledge of the people. So, I'll back up briefly and say that I have a traditional knowledge that's been passed on to me through my own observations and growing up in fishing on the Yukon River and living on the Kuskokwim and then fishing again on the Yukon. And my father, George Yaska Sr., has always spoken to me ever since the first time that I started talking to people about -- and asking questions of issues of importance. So, all of a sudden, he realized I'm an extension of him and I had better be taught the right way to talk about these things. So, I thank him for that. I can speak to some of these issues, and I hear my cousin Tom talk about the role of us and the audience, and I take that to heart. And this is why I asked for permission from my boss to relay what I know about our way of life. And so, I grew up fishing on the

1 Koyukuk River. I was operating the boat by 1967, and I was only five years old, no, seven years old. So, but times were different then by the time I was five and was dragging the can of gas down to the boat. So, times were 5 a lot different, and we were taught to be independent 6 and to think and do things safely. And we're taught about survival, and we're taught about caring for the 8 country out there, that these things can't speak for 9 themselves. So, it's our responsibility to talk about 10 those things. So, we began to notice the weight of king salmon in the 70s already coming down and I remember 11 12 late Uncle Franklin Madras talking about seeing oil slicks in that 1920 fishing disaster, 1919 or 1920. And 13 14 I was traveling down the Yukon two years ago and saw the great oil slicks coming out of the Novi River. It ran 15 16 for miles and miles and miles, and I recall seeing oil 17 slicks like that in the Koyukuk River way back in the 18 1960s. And so, I asked a scientist about it, and he 19 said, well, these lands have been releasing hydrocarbons 20 for a long time. Climate change has been happening for 21 a long time. The end of the Ice age has been happening 22 for a long time so, there's been a warming and a loss 23 of permafrost and the release of the frozen things into 24 the water and he says perhaps it's related to that and certainly on the Novi River today with all of that 25 26 permafrost that's been released and the release of those 27 hydrocarbons, it's evident on the face of it. And so, I 28 wanted to relate that this has been happening for a long 29 time. But, along with the recent issues from the 1970s, 30 when we started seeing dramatic declines in weight of 31 king salmon and when my late aunt Angela Huntington asked 32 her late husband, Sidney Huntington, why the weights 33 have gone down -- this was in 1980 of the king salmon -34 - he didn't really have an answer and we now know that 35 you're right, Mr. Chair, about Roger Owen's work in the 36 University of Washington and the analysis of the science 37 of the release of pink salmon into -- from the Prince 38 William Sound into the Gulf of Alaska. That as they 39 increased more in 1973 to 1975 to 1979, from 12,000 to 40 20,000 to 45,000 to 200,000, that there was a direct 41 correlation to the increase in releases of pink salmon, 42 to the decline of the weight and productivity of king 43 salmon. There are direct correlations. It's clear as 44 day. So, you're definitely right in that respect. So, I 45 just wanted to say that I saw that. Many people noticed 46 it from early on and I'll stop on that point, but you 47 are definitely correct Mr. Chair. The -- on another point on the loss of black bears. I was asked in 1995 by the 48 49 late John Starr Junior to bring him down to the Novi 50 River. He said, can you call somebody and have us go

50

1 down? I want you to go down with me. I was working at Tanana chiefs, and so I called the Tanana Tribal Council to bring us down and Fred Nikolai for the Tribal Council brought John and I down to the Novi River. He said he 5 saw -- that he heard that there were no more black bears 6 in the Novi River, that grizzly bears were taking over and this was years ago, and it was something that the 8 late Edward Simon talked about in the 1975. He said, ever since you guys made us stop hunting grizzlies in 10 the 1950s, this population has boomed. So, where's our black bears? Where's our moose? These grizzlies are 11 having a field day, and it took a while for it to reach 12 13 the rest of Alaska but, by 1995, when John and Fred 14 Nikolai and I went up 75 miles up the Novi River, we 15 walked, I think, in five different places where John 16 knew of black bear dens. All those black bear dens were 17 old and collapsed. We saw no black bear tracks. We saw 18 a lot of grizzly tracks. So, the understanding that I have from my father was that his people before him his 19 20 father, (in native) and (in native) father. They always 21 talked about; you have to keep those populations down. 22 That's what my father told me. You have to keep those 23 populations of the things that are eating all of these 24 other things down and try to get it early. Populations of grizzly, of wolf and of eagle and another story from 25 26 1995, I had a fish biologist on staff at Tanana chiefs. 27 He and members of fisheries staff from the U.S. fish 28 Wildlife service were waiting for salmon to come up the 29 hog River into Clear Creek. They hadn't come up, and 30 they noticed an eagle sitting on the cottonwood there 31 in an island -- back in the island where slack water, 32 but there was water. Great amount of geese and ducklings, 33 goslings and ducklings. And the late Bergman Sam said 34 they're waiting for those birds to become a little 35 bigger. And so, sure enough, they sat there for two 36 weeks. They didn't move for two weeks, and right when 37 they were bite sized, they swooped in, and one day they took 90% of that population of goslings and ducklings. 38 39 So that illustrates to me that my grandfather and great 40 grandfather were definitely correct. They knew what they 41 were talking about. So, when we think of the wildlife 42 and the interactions of people and wildlife and animals 43 it's been happening for a very long time, perhaps thousands of years. We've impacted and managed fish and 44 45 wildlife, and it was our own style of management. And 46 so, I just wanted to relate that, Mr. Chair. I had other 47 comments, but I'm blanking right now. Thank you. 48

CHAIRPE REAKOFF: I appreciate those comments that customary and traditional knowledge is

1 being transcribed. And so, we have people who are looking at our transcripts over time. There's a lot of knowledge that gets conveyed from the public into these regional Councils, because this is a forum for that to happen. 5 And I really appreciate you pointing out these various 6 things, because we had a meeting in Galena several years ago right before Sidney passed on, and he was deaf. I 8 had him -- I broke the meeting. I say, come to the mic. 9 He says I can't hear what you're saying. I say, we're 10 here to listen. Sidney and his discussion was, you've got to take these brown bears. He is shouting, as Sidney 11 12 always did, as loud as he could into the mic. The grizzly 13 -- the brown bears will eat all the of all of the black 14 bears, then they'll eat all the moose, and they're going 15 to control your lives. And he was pointing at us just like that, and they're going to control your lives and 16 17 that -- as the salmon decline in the bear, the brown 18 bears don't have salmon. They're really starting to put 19 the herd on the moose and I -- and there's hardly any 20 black bears. There are black bears are gone. I don't 21 know that the black bear population is been this low for 22 a long, long time. So, thanks for those comments and I 23 got -- Pollock wants to say something. Go ahead.

24 25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

MR. SIMON: Yeah. I want to make a comment to (indiscernible). You were a lot of grizzlies last few years, and I guess they've been eating black bears, which is no -- don't see any more black bears. Used to be if you can't get moose, you just now they wouldn't - you could pack a black bear and cook meat, but, today there's nothing, really has been (indiscernible) and the last several years (indiscernible) blueberry crops or such (indiscernible) impacting them. Good comments George, thank you.

343536

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: From Jenny.

37 38

39

40

MS. PELKOLA: George, thank you for that. That was very interesting. I hope more -- I mean, you know whatever your scientist -- is that what you said or...?

41 42 43

MR. YASKA: Well, Native, Native scientists.

44 45 46

47

48

49

50

MS. PELKOLA: Oh okay. Well, I think they're very important because that's where I learned a lot of my stuff from my parents, and I never really knew my grandparents but, years ago, we used to have a Fish camp in between Koyukuk and Nulato. It was called Nine

1 Mile and the people from Huslia used to come down to Atlas. Your grandpa George Atla, the Bifelts and the Sams, Tony Sams family and there were others, but those are the ones that I remembered. And in fact, my mother 5 delivered George Atla Jr. at fish camp, and she always 6 talks about it, but, thank you for that. That's very interesting and I think the people don't listen to the 8 elders. They think they're just old timers and they don't 9 know what they're talking about, but they do know what 10 they're talking about because they lived it. And I think 11 it's very important that we get a more traditional 12 knowledge you know, going unrecognized in the state of Alaska or wherever in the world. But thank you very 13 14 much. That's very encouraging. And keep your work up.

15 16

 $\label{eq:CHAIRPERSON} \mbox{REAKOFF: Thank you, Jenny.} \\ \mbox{And Don, you want to comment?}$

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

MR. HONEA: Oh, yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, George, for that presentation. I also like Robert and all of us are concerned about the brown bear population and stuff. I mean, I've seen it on the on the Novi itself. Where they've taken black bears. There's just nothing there except hair. They eat everything, but I just had a comment on, you know, whether it was on the Novi or whether it was on the Koyukuk or something. The studies of that oily -- I'm just wondering if anybody ever studied that or do they -- you know, does it come and go or something? I mean, I remember a few years ago, I was at a fish meeting and we had a presentation, I think it was in the evening at the university, at the campus there. And they knew intricately, really studied the population that goes into the Novi, goes into the Susitna or whatever tributary there is and now I'm just wondering is that -- you know, I'm trying to figure out why, as we go up the river, less and less fish and stuff -- but I just had a question on that, You know, it's interesting. I mean, the very fact that that Sheen or something that I see, I mean, I wonder if it's -- is it constant? Do you just notice it? Does anybody ever figure out is it coming from up toward McGrath or, you know, the way the Novi runs?

43 44 45

42

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ YASKA: Mr. Chair, thank you. If I might answer.

46 47 48

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Go ahead.

49 50

2

5

6

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

MR. YASKA: So, as I understand it, the way I hear it now from the scientists that the release of oil or hydrocarbons into the water from the degradation or the melting of the permafrost has been going on for a long time. We see it physically around Huslia, where lands that were high, 25ft high in the past, and perhaps a landmark on the land are now sunk and they're low Tundra, they're bog from either melting -- some melting occurring down there. Some of this melting of the permafrost occurs near riverbanks. And there is work now, but I'm not sure if it's understood yet or have been analyzed. And the Kobuk River, where there's heavy release of hydrocarbons and minerals into water. So heavy that the water is orange. So, the USGS and the National Park Service, and I don't recall the college, maybe it's University of Colorado are looking at that right now.

17 18 19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: I live in the Brooks Range, and we got more of the creek that I live on Wiseman Creek has just turned orange since 2017. Lots and lots of iron oxide coming out. Did you have a comment on George's presentation? We're going to move on with some other comments.

242526

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. You know, George, you're right about this grizzly bear. We followed one about five springs ago. It went to all the dens of where the black bears were and dragged the mother out, injured her so bad. Take the cubs out, eat the cubs, and we would find all these little heads, you know, like, you know, it's kind of -- they wouldn't eat the head. Then we would track it some more, and then a couple later. Then we'd catch the bear again where it would drag another bear out. And I think this is just like a constant thing for all of them. Not only one bear, but that's what they do all spring long. Another thing we found out, you know, the days of the 30, 30 and 30 out of 6 are over. All these young guys are getting like, 375, 300 now because of the numerous bears right in our town. People got them on their cameras, standing on their porch, looking in their windows. So, this is something that we have to really kind of invent ourselves on how to use a bigger gun, because before it never was needed. You know, you had the moose stew 30, 30 and 30 out of 6 and that was about it, because the moose didn't have such adrenaline in its system to repossess itself and attack you. So that's -- thanks for that commentary, George.

49 50

1	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you.
2	Appreciate your comment and look forward to working with
3	you in the future. And so, then we got another Doug
4	Patsy on to speak to us. Come on up, Doug.
5	
6	MR. PATSY: Thank you, guys, for seeing
7	me. I just want to thank you guys, all of you, for what
8	you're doing. I know you guys have been in here for
9	years, and you always say the younger ones got to get
10	in there. Well, I'm one of them younger ones now. So
11	now, over the years
12	non, ever one jears
13	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Would you like to
14	state where you're from?
15	state where you is from.
16	MR. PATSY: Oh, I'm from Nulato, Yeah, I
17	live in Nulato there. Oh, just I'm a Subsistence
18	user. I grew up was raised in the Subsistence
19	
20	lifestyle by my grandparents, Justin and Marianne Patsy.
21	CHAIDDEDCON DEAKOEE. Von wort to be or
22	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: You want to be or
	the regional Council?
23	(G:
24	(Simultaneous speech)
25 26	MD DAMON T
27	MR. PATSY: I was on the middle Yukon.
28	CHAIDDEDCON DEAVORE. At this regional
29	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: At this regional Council?
30	COUNCIL:
31	MR. PATSY: Oh.
32	MR. PAISI: OII.
	CUAIDDEDCON DEAKOEE. On the Markey
33 34	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: On the Western
35	Regional Advisory Council?
	MD DAMOV. O
36	MR. PATSY: Sure, yeah.
37	CHAIDDEDCON DEAKOEE M.L. 1.1' C.
38	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: We're looking for
39	membership. Okay. Yeah.
40	
41	MR. PATSY: I've been in contact with
42	Nissa before.
43	
44	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: We're looking for
45	younger people to work into the system so, continue on.
46	Get in there.
47	
48	MR. PATSY: It was good comments that
49	George was making about the Grizzly bear, Robert brought
50	that up also. I know since Tommy moved to Nulato there,

he -- I kind of -- he took me under his wing and showed 1 me the outdoor lifestyle. Bear hunting. I already kind of knew about the wolf hunting there, but every spring we go out and we're harvesting I don't know, 5 or 6 5 grizzly bears. But, since then, our moose population has 6 boomed. The middle of Yukon, I don't know if you guys know or heard about it. I'm sure Glen knows about it. 8 Glen keeps the numbers in check there, but, from --9 correct me if I'm wrong, Glen but, from 2012, we went 10 to 2000 moose in our area. Four years later, I think 2016, we're at 4000 and now we're up over 6000 moose in 11 12 our area. That's due to a lot of predator control. I'm one of the ones that's out there every day when I'm not 13 14 working, riding -- the villages in our area, they do a 15 bounty. I think Nulato is sitting at 350 per wolf. I 16 don't know what the other villages are doing. But grizzly 17 bears -- this fall, I was over in Kaiyuh, heading towards 18 my cabin, and there's a couple of young guys from Kaltag, 19 they shot a grizzly bear. I know you guys are familiar with grizzly bears, you don't eat them in the fall time. 20 They stink. They're musky. The meat's no good. This thing 21 22 was perfect. It was like a springtime bear. Almost like 23 a black bear. Kaiyuh, we've never seen grizzly bears up 24 in there before, but they've kind of migrated in there. 25 And the -- you could tell if a grizzly is good by the color of the fat. The fat was white. yeah, it was -- I 26 27 made bear dogs out of it and it was -- it's freaking 28 delicious. You can't tell the difference between beef, 29 pork or whatever. The hot dogs. And two weeks later, 30 same spot 200 yards away, my wife and I and my daughter 31 and my son were in the boat, and there was another one 32 there. I was like, where the heck are these things coming 33 from? But -- and all my riding I do, I do a lot of 34 thinking. We're not going to take no pressure off of 35 trawlers or anything, but I see our buddy from North 36 Pacific is not in here anymore, but, what should we call 37 it? Grizzly bears. I don't know, Fish and Wildlife in 38 here studied them or not, but, with the amount of grizzly 39 bears that there are in the interior of Alaska and the 40 tributaries for the Yukon but they, I'm sure, eat a lot 41 of our fish also. I don't know if they're spawned out 42 yet or what, but I'm getting off the point of I don't 43 want to take nothing, no pressure off of trawlers or 44 anything on that point. But, no, there -- like I said 45 about that grizzly bear though, with no smell in there 46 and the end of August that's very unlikely to have 47 especially interior of Alaska when they -- you know, the 48 bears should be eating fish all summer long and all its 49 living off of is meat and vegetation and berries. We 50 opened it up, and there's -- the intestines were blue.

1 It was, yeah, it was like a black bear almost, you know. I was going to bring up another point. I heard it from, I think it was Ivan Demientieff, grayling jet boats and our tributaries especially in the -- when the salmon are 5 spawning or whatever. We get it a lot in the Nulato 6 River with jet boats going up there. I think someone mentioned in the Anvik River before the sport fishers 8 there, their jet boats were going up in there and they 9 were wiping out the gravel that was -- the salmon were 10 spawning. It's things like that, you gotta [sic] little things like that that you gotta look at. In order for 11 12 us to help our fish. Again, not taking pressure off of 13 the trawlers, but help ourselves, you know. It's like 14 the people that live here in the city. It's like you 15 take something away and you're sick for it. It's like, take every coffee shop off the corner here, take that 16 17 coffee pot away there, you're going to be sick for it. 18 Everybody will be sleeping in here. But that's what they 19 did with our salmon. You know, we're sick for it.

20 21

22

23

24

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: I have a question about these jet boats. Is that something that's new? These jet boats going up to Nulato River? They run right over those -- where the kings spawn, right over the river. They blow all that out?

252627

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

MR. PATSY: Yeah, I -- was it -- I think it was Ivan that said it before. Correct me if I'm wrong on that, Robert. I think I was at a meeting and Robert mentioned that before, I think also. They said those jet boats in the Anvik River, they were cruising up the river and they could see the row on the sides of the cut banks there where those jets were washing them up on the banks. Yeah, and that that kills a lot of the fish also. No, I was going to make a post. I see all -- like Pollock, Jenny, Robert, they're elders, you know. And I think it's time for us as younger generation to step up and get on board with these guys, get their knowledge from them. You know they've been in there fighting the good fight for years, and it'd be good for some of us younger ones to learn from them while they're still in there. Thank you, guys.

42 43 44

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Appreciate that. question Jenny.

45 46 47

MS. PELKOLA: I didn't get your name.

48 49

MR. PATSY: Doug Patsy. I'm from Nulato.

50

2

5

6

MS. PELKOLA: Okay. Thank you, Doug. That was very, very good. Like we said, we have two vacant seats on the Board right now. All you got to do is put your name in there, but thank you. You know for coming and talking to us. It makes us feel like we're doing something, and I'm ready to step off the Board and this is going to be my last term, for sure.

8

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Tommy.

10

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2627

28

29

30

31

32

MR. KRISKA: Yeah. Thank you, Doug, for your comments there. One of the things that -- were I was saying a few years back was why a lot of the grizzly bears, you know, there are -- a lot of people wouldn't eat them, but they're never realized that in this last few six, seven years, there's hardly any fish there and so they don't really have a lot of fish to eat. They eat what they can, but then they're forced to go into the hills and eat the blueberries and that's one of the reasons that now that the bears that were taken are really fat and they taste different because they're forced to eat the berries and it's -- which is good. I mean, you know, we're not shooting them for nothing and just throwing them away. So, and I wish there was another way, Ms. Nissa, that we could just add this guy to a Board. As a Board, you know, voted on and put up here instead of the state. They go through a lot of regulations -- rules and regulations, background checks, all this stuff when we know these people and it'd be a big step that if we ever can get something like that for a recommendation or just -- I don't know, I lost my words, but, to appoint him ourselves so, it would be nice, thank you.

33 34 35

36

37

38 39

40 41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Yeah. Well, the way the appointments go, they have to be vetted and a whole bunch of stuff and the Federal Board actually reviews those applications, and so -- but we're -- it's not that hard to get on here, but it's a whole process and that's -- we're not the appointing source. It's not like Advisory Committee where we vote them in there. This is a regional Council that has to work through the Federal - were an arm of the Federal Subsistence Board. We had Brown Bear up north. I live in the Brooks Range. We hunt them quite a bit. We don't have very many salmon in the valley that I live in, but there are predatory bears. And predatory bears, you know them -- watching bears. Predatory bears got really long claws because they don't dig a lot of those bears dig rut vegetation. If they got really long, smooth claws, they don't dig that much.

They walks [sic] crosswind. When you see them, they're 1 always walking crosswind hunting the wind so that they can go kill something. Those kind, I don't really want to eat those kind that much. Those have bum flavor. 5 Whereas those -- the ones that dig roots a lot, they got 6 a dirty face, they got the short claws or they're out in the blueberry patch. Those are the ones with the 8 white fat. The white fat is the thing. I see somebody killed a bear last spring. I was like, oh, white fat. 10 He says you want half I say, I'll take as much as you want to give me. That was a nice bear -- excellent made 11 12 -- and I jarred quite a bit. The really nice jar. Jar 13 that bear made takes a long time. Jar the fat jar the 14 meat, you like that? Really good meat. Yeah. Oh, Pollock. 15 Go ahead.

16 17

18

19

20 21 MR. SIMON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I (indiscernible) Doug's comments to me and Jenny, we are getting kind of old, but we keep coming back and things like this. And then the interesting part is we should have more young people get interested in the sport. Yeah, good comments Doug.

222324

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Robert.

25 26

27

28

29

30

31

32 33

34

35

36

37

38 39

40 41

MR. KRISKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you for that Discussion here Mr. Patsy, which is true, you know, like I have worked with my son and some other people on how to hunt grizzly bear without, you know, kind of endangering themselves and endangering other people too. So, this is something that we have to learn, and we use the word incentive when we do things. We don't use the bounty, because I know the friends of animals will eventually catch up with us. So that's why we use the word incentive. And one of the things too, that we learned that if you hang a wolf skin on your porch, that bear will never come on your porch, because that grizzly bear has respect for that wolf, even though it's dead, it's hanging there because they're both carnivorous animals. Something to remember if you have a lot of bears in your area, just hang a little skin on your step. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

42 43 44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you.

Appreciate your comments Doug, hope you get your application in. And so, we need to have people on this Council, and I really enjoy having people that are on the Council that are out doing stuff out in the field, been around a lot of elders and implying that knowledge of the elders. So, I appreciate that.

MR. PATSY: Thank you, guys, again.

2 3 4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: And so, before lunch, I want to have Geoff Beyersdorf come up to the mic because he's not going to be able to be here later today and tomorrow. And there's important issues with the Bureau of Land Management. So, I would like to know the status of the Ambler Road and some other aspects of the BLM and the interior of Alaska within our region. Thank you, Geoff, for coming to the mic and thanks so much for the for the treats that you've given us here. Go ahead.

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. BEYERSDORF: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Through the Chair to the members just -- I apologize that I'm not here for both days. Today's just the kind of the day that I can be here and all I wanted to do really was give you an update in regards to some bigger picture issues that are going on. Just to give -- I don't have a lot of final decisions or anything like that, but as I think many people are well aware, President Trump has been issuing executive orders, and he gave a specific executive order for Alaska in regards to unleashing Alaska's energy resources. That was also followed up by Secretary Burgum, issued a secretarial order. Within the executive order and the secretarial order, there are many different things, but, in particular the BLM there's a reference to the Ambler Road and the decision. There's also a reference to the Central Yukon Resource Management Plan and that decision, and then also to Public Land Order 5150. The -- what was in the executive order, and the secretarial order was a little bit confusing to us. And so, we've gone through them both and then prepared some comments to kind of better understand what their goals are and in addition to that, I've been preparing some briefing papers that have been taken up to our headquarters level through our state director. Not only to understand what the goals are, but, then if we understand what the goals are, here are some options to be able to help you to reach whatever your goals are within administration. I think that the last two things I will leave you with is that it's becoming very obvious to this administration that Public Land Order 5150 is kind of the key to what they're looking at trying to obtain through the Ambler Road decision or through the Central Yukon RMP. We don't -- I don't have anything final yet. A week ago, Friday, I sent up those briefing papers to our state director to meet with the national director

5

in Washington, D.C., and I haven't heard anything back. So, I would just say at this point, those are in the process. I just kind of wanted you to know that they're embedded in secretarial and executive orders, and I know that those are some things that have been of interest to this Council. Thank you.

6 7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

2425

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 REAKOFF: I would like to obtain those -- your responses to that -- the or -- I would like to get up -- the order, see the orders -- the presidential orders myself and I would like to see your responses to those. This Council is -- been involved in the whole Ambler Road, the RMP process and the 5150 and so -- and in the western interior Bering Sea public land orders -- issues. We've discussed all those. Ill state for the record right now that if those orders are lifted, it will have an extreme impact on Subsistence uses of the people of who reside in this -- Because it - what -- yeah, like conveyance of the 5150 takes away the Subsistence opportunity for 2.1 million acres. I reminded an individual just the other day that was talking about the 5150, I says [sic] that eliminates Subsistence the rural Subsistence priority for many people. I mean, it's not that there's people from Kaktovik. They're going in and out of an Kaktovik all the time lately because they got Ice roads in there. So, there's a bunch of people that are using the road. There's people from Allakaket came up into the Brooks Range. They don't have caribou down there. So, an individual from Allakaket came up and got seven caribou up there -- were up in -- up the valley from us under Federal Subsistence and took them back to Allakaket. It's an important Subsistence for me. That's what I do. I live from predominantly from that 5150 lands and so that's a -- it would take -- completely take away our Subsistence uses. So, I do want the record to reflect that, you know, the Resource Management Plan allows mining and so forth in the, within the Dalton Highway Corridor area, the 5150 area. Placer mining has little effect on what -- the animal resources and the fishery resources we have because they're settling ponds and so forth. There's a place where they mined extensively just to the west of Wiseman about ten years ago, that's growing back in brush. There is a -- right now the moose of deep snow are going to that mining area where it's all these willows are growing back there. It's like a burn or something. So, the moose are -- there's a bunch of moose back there because they it's growing back to the age classes of willows that they like. So, I think that there's opportunities in the area for mining and so forth, which the administration's wanting to have mining in this on these 5150 lands but it's -- there's no reason to throw the baby out with the bathwater either. So, I wanted to state that on the record because this thing is in play. I would like to know your response. So that would be my comment. Any further comments on Geoff's' presentation on what's going on in the changing political climate and lands in Alaska?

(Simultaneous speech)

MR. GERVAIS: Mr. Chair...

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Go ahead, Rob.....

MR. GERVIAS: This is Jim.

 $\label{eq:CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: I'll take -- okay.} Go ahead, Tim, and then it's Robert.$

 MR. GERVAIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Geoff, this is Tim Gervais. Can you briefly -- I don't quite understand the status. Like, how far did the Ambler Road decision not to be built get advanced during the Biden administration? And then how complicated -- or what timeline would it take to unwind that if the Trump administration was heavily in favor of putting that road in? And I just take your response, but I just want to emphasize that having that area of Alaska remain roadless is a huge factor in the fish, wildlife and the residents of the area. It really would be a very detrimental development for the Subsistence of -- Subsistence economy, if that -- if a road was put in as planned.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Do you have a response, Geoff?

MR. BEYERSDORF: Through the Chair, to the member Gervais. Hi Tim, by the way. You know, as far as the Ambler decision. The Ambler decision, the record of decision, the final SCIS was this last -- was in June of 2024. And within that the proposal had been to issue a right-of-way grant for them to be able to build the road, you know, starting off the Dalton Highway Corridor, our decision at that time was that because of the impacts the Subsistence under ANILCA title eight that we ended up turning down the proposal and then not issuing the right-of-way grant. So that was final at

00058 1 that time, Tim, and I'll stop there to see if you have questions. 3 4 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Is there a question 5 on that, Tim? 6 7 MR. GERVAIS: No, no, that's what I 8 wanted to know, and I thought it was final. So now that 9 it's final, does that -- how long can that take 10 precedence or are we actually in a rule-making regime where whatever it is, every 4 or 8 years, the Bureau of 11 Land Management flips flops, you know, basically 180 12 13 degree turn on what the road policy is going to be. 14 what's it going to take for the Like, administration to unwind that -- the June 2024 decision, 15 16 if they want to be pro road? 17 18 MR. BEYERSDORF: Well, through the Chair 19 to the member. I guess, one thing -- to clarify, it's 20 not that the BLM is quote unquote flip flopping. It is, 21 you know, we work at the behest of the of the president 22 and the Congress. So, it's whatever the administration 23 priorities are and so, if they change, then we have to 24 -- then we work with that. As far as the timeline to 25 unwind, Member Gervais, I guess what I would say is it 26 all depends on where the Secretary of the Department of 27 Interior and the BLM is the agency where they end up 28 going in terms of these executive orders. As I said, PLO 29 5150 is kind of key to that and so, it will depend on 30 where they want to go with public land order 5150. And 31 we don't have any direction on that yet. I don't have 32 direction on any of these on the public land order, on 33 Ambler or around central Yukon, you know, I've just 34 provided options basically for them. You know, if this 35 is your goal, this is a way to get there. But, you know, 36 we're still kind of in the beginning phases of the 37 conversation trying to understand what their goal is. 38 Is that helpful? Member, Gervais. 39 40 (Simultaneous speech) 41

42 MR. GERVAIS: Yeah, that answers my 43

question....

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: That answer [sic] your question?

MR. GERVAIS: Thank you.

49 50

44 45

46

47 48

50

Just ideas.

1 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: And then I had 2 Robert with one question then be Tommy. Did you have one question, Robert? 5 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, 6 I did, but seemed like Geoff has answered that about the Ambler Road. That was my question about Ambler Road. 8 What's going to happen now since we have a new president here with that's going to -- working with opening the 10 oil and everything is to -- and I'm -- you're going to be leaving today Geoff? And this could be the last time 11 12 you're going to be -- this the last meeting -- this the 13 last time you're going to be meeting with us? 14 15 MR: BEYERSDORF: It's probably the last 16 time that I will meet with this Council. Yes. 17 18 MR. WALKER: Well, how many years? 19 20 MR. BEYERSDORF: 25. 21 22 MR. WALKER: 25 years. God, I was a young 23 guy. So are you. 24 25 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Are you retiring? 26 27 MR. WALKER: Yeah. Well, I wish you all 28 the best, Geoff. I wish you everything -- I've -- all 29 the things that we have done together. I think we did a 30 lot to really do a lot for the tribal people and I thank 31 you for all that work that you've done for us. That 32 makes us -- you know, I'm going to go back and tell the 33 other guys that are still alive. Hey, Geoff finally 34 retired, I'm going to tell. They gonna [sic] say what? 35 That's what they used to say, again. Mr. Beyersdorf, 36 thank you for all your work. 37 38 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, Tommy had a 39 question. Go ahead. Tommy. 40 MR. KRISKA: Oh, yeah, I was I don't 41 42 know, a lot of things. I was running through my mind in 43 different ways. I know they're after minerals, and I don't know how far the minerals is from the ocean, the 44 45 coast. And why can't -- if they want those minerals so 46 bad, they're probably going to run through around Red 47 Dog Mine wherever those roads go and build a road out 48 to the ocean and barge everything all the way around the

other way and leave our country alone. I don't know.

3

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: And then Pollock had a comment. Go ahead, Pollock. Did you raise your hand?

4 5 6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. SIMON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The past president and administration has started the hard road for (indiscernible). Now, this new president and new administration and possibly the hard road will go through. But it has some concerns. And the people from (indiscernible). We have no more salmon, no more chum salmon, no king salmon and low number of moose and the caribou hasn't returned and that's a concern. The people are afraid about the development of the whole road. The past (indiscernible) said it would be for commercial industrial use only. But now, with the administration, that road could be open to the public. And people are concerned back home about flocks of people coming up to the road, not only to look at the mountains, but trap, hunt and fish in the area where there's always already low number of whitefish and (indiscernible) also. (Indiscernible) the people back home in Allakaket, Thank you.

232425

2627

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you, Pollock. I'll comment on the Ambler Road aspect. If the PLO is lifted or the approval of the Ambler Road, there's still the Doyon and the Nana are not on Board. They've not opened the road corridor and so they have not actually -- there the final -- will be the final say on whether that road is actually completed, because the road has to cross some Doyon land. And so, they -- Doyon and Nana have retracted their support of the Ambler Road, and even Nana did and so that's not a given that that road is going to be built well tomorrow -- until they deal with the Native lands also. And in a sense, this may be the last time we see Geoff before this Council. In his professional life I do want to say that Geoff was Subsistence coordinator down at Koyukuk Nowitna, worked with BLM, with this Council and through his other jobs. He's always worked very well and had very good understanding of this Council and the rural lifeways, having lived in Galena and stuff like that. So, I really appreciated you -- all of the work you've done. And I wanted to state that on the record that we highly appreciated your quality of work with this Council and always informative and to the point and so I -- short and sweet and I appreciate that. So, thanks so much -my -- you got a seat at my table anytime you happen to be wandering up the road again. And so that'll be my

final comment. And so go ahead, Don. One more final.

1 2 3

4

5

6

8

9

MR. HONEA: Yeah, Mr. Chair, thank you. Geoff, as a personal favor, I appreciate in the late 90s to build — to be able to harvest my — harvest some for my health, for my home. And with your position and, you know, we go back to the 90s and stuff like that. So grateful to have your friendship all these years and hey, we'll probably see you down the road. I don't think you're old enough to retire, Thank you.

10 11 12

MR. BEYERSDORF: Through the Chair. Could I address both Pollock and member Kriska?

13 14 15

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Yes. Please do.

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2627

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. BEYERSDORF: So, member Kriska, in the supplemental environmental impact statement that we did for Ambler, we did look at that alternative route that you're talking about. One thing, I guess I wanted to note is that what we found there is that there would actually be more salmon stream crossings and then, you know, with the potential for a road that way the impacts to Caribou habitat Jim Dau from -- retired from ADF&G provided some critical information in regards to what that might look like. So that was incorporated. That's why we didn't look at that route at that time just to be aware. And then to member Pollock I wanted to thank you. We did incorporate extensive information in regards to caribou and sheefish and salmon and I know that some of my staff spent considerable time in Allakaket and Alatna visiting with some of your elders to get that information, which was then incorporated into that supplemental EIS as part of that decision. So, thank you for that. And then, you know, just on a personal note I want to go around the table just a little bit. You know, member, Kriska, I've always appreciated your getting out there, getting on the ground you know, with your wolf hunting, etc. I know that you spent a considerable amount of time with Benedict Jones and that, you know, I think you saw him as a mentor and I also I've appreciated it in these years, as Benedict is maturing in age that you've been looking out for him. Because I just kind of kept in touch over the years, and I know that you've been doing that. And so, I want to say thank you for that, to member Simon, for 6 or 7 years I ended up running the, the Nowitna check station, and so I was never able to go out moose hunting and yet, every single fall, I would come home and there would be moose in my freezer and it's because your son did that. And I wanted

to say thank you for that, for raising him that way. 1 Jenny -- Member Pelkola, you invited me into your Fish camp. You allowed me to bring our assistant secretary 4 into your fish camp to learn about your lifestyle and 5 your culture. I've never forgotten that trip and I would 6 say on Saturday nights, having the privilege to sit 7 around and play cards with you and listen to your stories 8 and make my belly hurt because I was laughing so much 9 has always meant a lot to me. Member Reakoff, Chairman 10 Reakoff you and I have shared bread together, sat around a kitchen table and talked about big picture issues and 11 12 providing your input into how we might address that. 13 Thank you for that. Member Walker, Robert, there's a 14 couple of things that really stand out in my mind. One 15 of them was when we were going through the H1N1 bird flu 16 and I flew into your village and I brought fruit, and 17 there were kids lined up out the door. It was like 18 Christmas, and your wife made me like an herb pillow to 19 help with my dreams and such, thank you for that. In 20 addition to that, you and your cousin Jimmy and I got 21 to go on a -- we took a flight, and you re-educated me 22 on where the moose and 21E were going, which then started 23 the interagency Fish and Game, Fish and Wildlife and 24 Park Service Collaring Project that we did, which indeed 25 showed your indigenous knowledge was true. Moose were 26 migrating a lot farther than we had thought and we ended 27 up utilizing that as a platform because your wife was a 28 schoolteacher, to be able to teach the kids not only 29 about kind of the Western science, but about indigenous 30 knowledge, and then being able to -- the kids that did really well at the end of that year, we ended up taking 31 32 them on a flight to go $\operatorname{--}$ actually go out and track 33 their moose. Member Honea my first relationship with you 34 was a little bit embarrassing because I had started at 35 the at the Nowitna check station, and I was out cutting 36 firewood to get ready for that year. And it turns out 37 your dad shows up, and I was cutting firewood on your 38 dad's allotment. And I've never -- I've always -- I was 39 embarrassed about that. Your dad was very gracious about 40 that, and I know you and I go back 20 some years as 41 well. So, I think the thing that I want to emphasize 42 here, because there's a lot of people behind me that 43 some of them have extensive time in their agencies, 44 organizations, and some of them are kind of coming in 45 new. All of that is to speak to the importance of the 46 relationships. I was blessed enough to have spent 16 of 47 my 35-year career in villages, and with many of you, and 48 getting to know many of you, and it's that, that has led 49 to the success of the relationship that we have had and 50 I just want to underscore to others that having

relationships with you is important because it helps us to understand what your issues, concerns are and to be able to reflect and be able to carry them forward. So, thank you very much for your time over the last 25 years. Hopefully our paths cross again in the future. Blessings.

6 7 8

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

2526

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

5

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, my comment on the Ambler Road is that there are four options. One was a railroad that went from Ambler, basically the upstream of the Ambler River, across the Kobuk River, with one large river crossing to the base of the Seward Peninsula went to Port Darby, which is in Norton Sound, which is an 80ft deep port for large ships. It was 286-mile railroad. The railroad could haul natural gas to mine the mineral and Ambler and take the mineral back to the coast. That option has never been discussed, because that -- there was -- the state of Alaska has been fixated on a road. That option should have been in the forefront, and I've said that over and over. That is the most accurate -- and that's what the industry wanted 15 years ago, because I read it in a magazine, out of resource magazine and the pocket in an Alaska Airlines flight, flying down to the Federal Subsistence Board. That's what the industry wanted. They wanted a railroad to the coast, you know, now they're going to have to ship the mineral all the way across Alaska, all the way down to Seward, when they can make the shortcut right to the Ocean Park. Arby's open right now. Norton Sound is open. So, there's really no reason not to. I would encourage the BLM to remind the current -- new administration, the new Secretary of Interior and the presidential process, that that was the most viable option. That was the cheapest, because you don't have to maintain the roadbed. I mean, you don't have to plow snow all winter. You don't -- there's a whole bunch of pluses about that. Bringing the -- there's a lot of energy consumption. It brings -- the liquefied natural gas could be used to mine the mineral. I would encourage the BLM to remind the Secretary of Interior, that's what the industry originally wanted. The state of Alaska got involved with the road idea and they couldn't get off the road. The paradigm but, the railroad was the most viable aspect of transporting mineral to the coast that would not impact the rest of the interior of Alaska. So that's my final statement on that issue. Thank you, Jeff, and appreciate that. So, I think it's time to go to lunch. And so, some people ate lunch and so let's see what time we got here. A quarter after 12. What time should we come back, Nissa. About quarter after one. Can

find out where Darrell is.

you eat -- Can people get lunch in an hour? An hour and a half? No, I'm -- I've been drinking coffee. I'm wound. So, okay, we'll come back at 1:45 is an hour and a half right now. So, 1:45 but I want prompt. We got we got a 5 lot of agenda. Everybody has to be seated at one -- I 6 don't know you're all kind of on your own, yeah. 7 8 (Off record) 9 10 (On record) 11 12 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, we're back by 13 the mic here. Are you there, Tim? Are you back on the 14 line? 15 16 MR. GERVAIS: Yes, I am. 17 18 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Tim Gervais. Say 19 again. 20 21 MR. GERVAIS: Yes, Jack. I'm here. 22 23 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay. Tim is there. 24 We're gonna [sic] come back on the record and Pollock, 25 he was around. Oh, he did go back out. So -- but we do 26 have a lot of agenda to go today. So, Pollock will come 27 back in. We're gonna [sic] be back on record after lunch. 28 I got what, is it? 1:50 p.m. So, we did our -- let's 29 see. Where are we at here? So, we're public members, 30 Tribal Council training, proposed changes? 31 32 MS. PILCHER: Yes. 33 34 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: And so, that's 35 Brian. 36 37 MR. UBELAKER: Right here. 38 39 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Oh, there you are. 40 I got the sun on my card here, let me turn it slightly. That's all right. I just -- getting the light straight 41 42 off that card there. So, let's see. Oh, Tommy, we're 43 looking for Tommy. I thought he was here. Does anybody 44 know what happened to Tommy? Nissa. 45 46 MS. PILCHER: I think him and Darrell 47 were planning on flip flopping at the Watershed meeting, 48 I think Darrell is supposed to be here, and Tommy is supposed to be there. I just did message Darrell to 49

1
2 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Oh, I didn't know
3 that Tommy was going.

4 5

 $\,$ MS. PILCHER: We do have -- we still do have quorum.

6 7 8

9

10

11

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay. So, that would've been good if Tommy was here, Darrell, one of them. So, we should continue, though, because we don't -- can't wait all day. So, you have your PowerPoint there? Go ahead, Brian.

12 13 14

15

16

17 18

19 20 MR. UBELAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the record, Brian Ubelaker, wildlife biologist with OSM. Are we good? Okay. Good morning, Mr. Chair and Council members. We are currently in the open period for wildlife proposals. This call for proposals closes April 4th of 2025. So, for the 2025 Winter Council training, I'm gonna [sic] briefly cover proposing changes to Federal Subsistence hunting and trapping regulations.

212223

24

MS. PILCHER: This is Nissa Pilcher, for the record. This is also found on page one of your Supplemental Material Packet.

252627

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. UBELAKER: Okay. There are two ways in which you can change Federal Subsistence regulations. First, is via Special Action Request, and the second is by proposal during the open period. Key difference between these two is that Special Actions are for temporary short-term changes, and can be submitted at time, whereas a proposal changes any codified regulations and can only be submitted during the open period. And since we are currently in that open period for wildlife proposals, I'm gonna [sic] walk through the proposal submittal process. If the Council would like to submit a proposal, all we need is for one of you to make a motion and have a vote to submit the proposal on record and OSM staff will draft it up to submit and this can happen at any time during this meeting. Any member of the public can also submit a proposal as well, and this would occur via either standard mail to our office in Anchorage. You can hand a written proposal to me or any other OSM staff during this meeting, or you can submit it through the regulations.gov website. I probably should've started this off with we're gonna [sic] breeze through this pretty quick. I think you're all pretty familiar. If there are questions afterward though, definitely answer them.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay, that's fine.

2 3 4

5

6

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 29

30

MR. UBELAKER: Proposals must include -when the public submits a proposal, please make sure to include who is submitting the proposal with your contact information, what regulations you want changed, and in which Unit they apply to, what you would want the regulation to say and why you want to change it. Any supporting information that you can include with it would help the Board to evaluate it. Next one. Sometimes a submitted proposal may be invalidated. This is because they pertain to things that are outside of the Board's jurisdiction. Examples are, if there are requests to change anything to do with halibut, that's out of the Board's purview. Marine mammals, migratory birds, and non-Federal lands all fall into that category as well. Next. For reference, the subsistence regulations that can be changed through regulatory proposals are found in the Code of Federal Regulations, subpart C and D. Next. These cover a wide variety of regulations from general, such as sealing requirements and definitions to more specific regulations like harvest limits, permit requirements, and customary and seasons, traditional use determinations. As I said, brief. Thank you. That is the end of the presentation. And please remember, we are currently in an open period for proposals, and they need to be submitted by April 4th. If you have any questions or would like to see some examples of past proposals and regulation changes, we can help you out with that. Thank you.

31 32 33

34

35

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, earlier I got -- I was in the middle of plowing a lot of snow. Like, there's -- didn't you have a couple of issues that we may address at this meeting for proposals?

36 37 38

MR. UBELAKER: Yes, there was a list of those, and did you want to get into those now?

39 40 41

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Don.

42 43

44

45

46

MR: HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I had a quick question. Okay, you said by April 4th we should have -- are you talking about, like, hunting and fishing proposals for next year to be submitted to you guys by April 4th?

47 48 49

50

MR. UBELAKER: Thank you, Chair. Yes, it is the -- currently, it's the open call for wildlife

proposals to change hunting and trapping regulations. And that period is open until April 4th, and that will change for the 26-28 regulatory seasons.

MR: HONEA: Oh, that -- okay. Mr. Chair, through the Chair. I just think (indiscernible) that's really fast. I didn't realize that we had to have them in so -- if it's beyond that date, then it's not considered or...?

MR. UBELAKER: If there is an emergency situation that you would need to have looked at, you can submit a Special Action Request, which can be analyzed at any time. But the typical Wildlife Proposal process takes about a year. So, we call for the proposals right now, we get all the proposals entered, and then I, as an analyst, write the analysis for these. And through the review process and all the different levels that we send it through, it takes about a year to get the analysis finalized and presented to the Board.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, any other questions, comments about proposals? Does any of the Council members understand how this process works? Go ahead, Robert.

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is only for Federal land, right?

MR. UBELAKER: This is for proposals to change Federal hunting and trapping regulations, yes.

MR. WALKER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, I -- you know, we have this shape management strategy, and the question is, how would that -- we would like to have this before the Federal Subsistence Board. We would like that to be part of our management under 805 of ANILCA. We can talk about sheep management strategies. How does that fit into this. What the authority, how the Federal Board would address that. Do you have an idea how that works?

MR. UBELAKER: We actually do. We had some pretty deep discussions with the solicitor and Justin, our new regulation specialist. What we came up with is no, this -- there's not a proposal that you can enter for the management strategy. You -- Nissa maybe can correct me if I'm wrong, but you can advise and you can develop the strategy and get it in as part of your

Annual Report and then put it in for -- before the Board in that way. But it wouldn't be through the proposal process.

4 5

6

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

1

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: The objective of the strategy is that the Federal managers continuously change -- it's a flux staff, and it's gonna [sic] get even more convoluted as time goes on, as staff comes on. We would like to stop having to say the same things over and over and over. This is what (indiscernible). This is how they have to be managed. You know, under the Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission, we have a hunting plan, recommendations. We have a book of all these various, basically management strategies of how park resources are gonna [sic] be managed. If -then we should submit an idea to the Federal Subsistence Board that this is -- that within this region, they should contemplate that this aspect or this issue that they should have discuss. But I would like to have it submitted at this meeting for the wildlife, cause it's a wildlife issue. How they would initiate that so that, you know, the agencies -- this is the template of how we're going to manage in this region, BLM, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, Park Service. This is the template of how we're gonna [sic] manage sheep. I was talking about a survey methodology with Arctic Refuge just at break here. There's specifics and I said that's in the management strategy. Get the management strategy out and read it again, has to do with continuity and a bunch of biological -- staying within biological parameters. So, I would like either through a letter to the Federal Subsistence Board how to initiate this management strategy position of the Council for our region and how the Board is going to have this as a -- endorse it. So, the Federal Subsistence Board has endorsed the Koyukuk River Moose Management Plan. They've endorsed the Bison Management Plan for the Innoko, they've -- the Board has endorsed various planning processes and strategies. So, this is a strategy that this Council is making, and we have probably more authority than a lot of other entities that are coming up with planning processes and how I would like either it now or not right this second. But sometime during this meeting, I would like OSM to develop a response on how we're going to approach the Board with having a management strategy, which we've worked on extensively, as you know, and before the Federal Subsistence Board so that's the way the dall sheep are managed in this region. So, you don't have to answer the question right now. I'm just asking you, do you know, or do you have a way (indiscernible) it's not on the

1 list and so, how are we gonna [sic] get it on the list? Let's put it on the list. Customary traditionals weren't on that list either, customary traditional uses weren't on that list either. But the Council has talked 5 extensively about being on that list, being involved in 6 how the customary and traditional use determinations were determined. So, that's a question out there. 8 That's, putting that out there right now Brian, you got a statement or comment or. So, you're in a quandary 10 right now because there is no such thing. Well, we want that to be before the Board. Do we put that into our --11 12 another hunting plan recommendation or our 13 correction, our annual report topic, which that's not 14 the question. It's not a -- it's something that we've telegraphed to the Federal Subsistence Board that we're 15 16 making this sheep management strategy. Now we -- how do we get it for this region? That's the question. They 17 18 endorsed it for the Wood Bison Plan in our region, for the ANILCA. They endorsed the plan in our region. How 19 20 did they do that and how are they going to address this Sheep Management Plan? So, that's a question, I want OSM 21 22 to tell us before the end of this meeting so that we can enter that into the record. That's what I would like. 23 24 You have a comment there, Don.

25 26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36 37

38

39

40

41

42

MR. HONEA: Oh, yeah, I have a comment. Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is really good information. To me because I -- you know, I didn't really know the process of submitting these because sometimes we have like Eastern Interior and Western Interior are kinda [sic] merged at the Novi River there and we have like -- oh what do you call it? We support each other because we're that close, Tanana and Ruby, to making measurements for that. So, if I had you know, a like concern that Eastern Interior and we supported each other because we utilize the Novi River quite a bit there. That their proposal, that they submit, or we submit, if we didn't do it by April 4th, would have to wait for a year. So, I'm really glad to know the process of this, because I guess I did not know that the ones we submitted in the past went protocol went to OSM. And so, it's actually good to know how these are formed, know how these are submitted. Thank you.

43 44 45

46

47

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: It's good to review that, how this process actually works and the division of where it applies to, the Federal lands versus State, etcetera. That was excellent. Robert.

48 49 50

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Brian, you know, right now I think we're looking at probably what Game proposals? And I think when we have our RAC meeting in October that's our fishing proposals, right? Or just -- it's just either or anytime we need to do it, right?

MR. UBELAKER: No, we're -- through the Chair, sorry. We are currently in the wildlife open call for proposals so, they get submitted this time around, and then the fall meeting coming up in 2025 will present the RAC versions of our analyses to you to get, to kinda [sic] inform you on which direction we're heading and get your input on what we're doing with that. Before we send it to the Board in April of 2026.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, Robert, you were here on this Regional Council when we addressed Fish and Wildlife simultaneously and the Board met on those mixed proposals at meetings. Several years ago, they divided them out. So, one year is wildlife cycle, the next year is fishery cycle. So, we're -- we've just come out of the fishery cycle now we're moving to the wildlife cycle. Now it's the time to submit the will proposals. The fall meeting discuss proposals, then all the proposals that come before this, in this region were crossovers, and then we'll make comm -- we'll make a recommendations on those. So, you remember back in the old days when we did both at the same time. So, I -- so that's -- we're on the -- at this point we're gonna [sic] be talking about submitting any proposals. If there's proposals, this is when we talk about submitting those. So.....

MR. WALKER: Okay, thank you for that information. It's been a while. So, thank you, Jack. Thank you, Brian.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: And Tommy's back again. Let the record reflect. And so, we're talking about how the process of submitting wildlife proposals on Federal public lands and Brian just went over an overview of how that works. So, but I -- I'm asking because this is a wildlife proposal window. I'm asking the Federal Subsistence Board and OSM to develop a response to the Western Interior Council of how the Western Interior Regional Advisory Council's Dall Sheep Management Strategy will be endorsed by the Federal Subsistence Board. For the record, for the agencies that are managing dall sheep in this region. They did

it in our region for bison. They've done it in our region for the Koyukuk Moose Management Plan. Those are all within this region, those — the Board adopted management plans within our region before. So, we need to know how — okay that was a state process or a Federal process. How does the Council process fit into that, the Board endorsing management strategy. That's the question. So, Liz and everybody here can — Brian can figure out what — Brian.

9 10 11

8

5

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ UBELAKER: I do have an answer to that question.

12 13 14

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

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Oh, you got one. Okay, good.

15 (16

> MR. UBELAKER: Yeah. So, we had -- from our discussion on the sheep management strategy, we had two possible outcomes, and you can do one or either or both. So, OSM can also facilitate getting the sheep guidelines to the Board through the Council's annual resort report process. The Council can request the Board do one or both of the following. Option one is to direct OSM to use the sheep guidelines while forming future analyses evaluating relevant proposals and or number two requests that the Board draft correspondence to relevant DOI land managers and or apartment -- the Alaska Department of Fish and Game requesting that a cooperative working group be formed to address the quidelines, perhaps with the intent of creating a management plan out of that. So, there's two options. You would -- you have it drafted; you would include it in your annual report and then you would ask the Board to do one of two things. And so, basically what we can do is you submit the plan, if you just wanted to stay in-house and apply to this region only. Anytime I draft an analysis having to do with sheep manage -- or sheep harvest, I will take that management strategy and use it as part of the analysis. Or you can ask the Board to draft correspondence to other agencies to get everybody on board with what the management strategy is asking for. We'd have to do that because OSM does not have -we can't tell BLM how to manage or how to survey for sheep. We don't have that regulatory. It's not part of OSM's or the Board's purview, I guess.

45 46 47

48

49

50

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, I feel there should be a blend, you know, the Federal Subsistence Board can adopt the management strategy, you use it inhouse. But it also should be recognized because the Board

members who are these Federal Board members anyways, 1 they're the land management, I've met several of the BLM, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, National Park Service and Forest Service. Forest service doesn't have that many 5 sheep, they're mostly goats. But they do have some sheep, 6 a few, but those land managing agencies should have --7 as Board members should endorse the management strategy 8 as far as on our -- within our region. So, I think that 9 there could be a blend. I do feel that it should be 10 always used in house but should be suggested for the 11 other land managing agencies. And so, with the National 12 Park Service we're working on -- in April, the end of April, we're gonna [sic] be over at Ambler. We're gonna 13 14 [sic] be talking about that management strategy and how 15 it's gonna [sic] be made into a hunting plan 16 recommendation, and how sheep are gonna [sic] be looked 17 at and surveyed and etcetera, within the gates of the 18 Arctic National Parks. With the other agencies, the Board is made up of the other agencies. That's what it 19 is. So, I think that there can be a blend. And so, I 20 21 would -- my response would be that there should be a 22 blend. The OSM always uses the management strategy, and 23 the other agencies should look strongly to it. Arctic 24 Refuge and the other agencies should be looking strongly 25 to that management within this region. This is how the 26 - cause [sic] we get new people all the time and people 27 got all kinds of ideas about how sheep -- what happens 28 with dall sheep, but the reality is they don't really 29 understand the ecology. And there's not a lot of 30 schooling on the ecology of when dall sheep are doing 31 various things. There's a lot of TEK in that thing. It's 32 like, oh, that's not science, no, it is traditional. Ask 33 George back there with TEK has got -- actually got --34 will reflect scientific investigation. The lynx don't 35 migrate, they told me that for years. Well, come to find 36 out if you put a GPS collar on them, we got lynx that 37 were in the Brooks Range that are down in northern 38 British Columbia. They do migrate. TEK said they 39 migrated and now they -well the science -- if you don't 40 have science, your scientific data, there's a whole 41 bunch of scientific data that's lacking in the current 42 sheep management. A composition of the ram component is 43 completely lacking in current management, that has to be an -- so, if you got -- if you're surveying moose, 44 45 you got eight structures of the moose, you're looking 46 at stuff like that. The management strategy is talking 47 about how to scientifically manage the sheep. So, I think that there should be a blend. And I think that this 48 49 Council can write a letter to OSM and to the Federal 50 Subsistence Board that states that we feel that there

should be a methodology in place, like the authorities of this Council is to develop management strategies and how does that enter? We have a management authority under the Title Eight 805 ANILCA that we can make management strategies and how do we submit those? It's a glitch in OSM is what it is. So, you need to fix.....

6 7 8

5

MS. GREDIAGIN: Mr. Chair.

9

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Yes. That's sounds like Lisa. Go ahead, Lisa.

11 12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2728

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, this is Lisa Grediagin, Wildlife Division supervisor with OSM. And I just wanted to point out that in section 805(c) of ANILCA, it specifies that the secretary, meaning the Board, shall consider the report of the Regional Advisory Councils concerning the take of Fish and Wildlife. And so, that report they're referring to is the Annual Report, which includes the harvest management strategy. And so, I mean, the Board already, you know, should be considering the harvest management strategy. You know, it's in statute that they need to consider the Council's reports and associated, you know, management strategies when they're considering the take of Fish and Wildlife. And also, I mean, with like the endorsement of, say, the 40 Forty-mile Caribou Management Plan or the Western Arctic Caribou Management Plan, the Board endorses it. But that doesn't mean they're necessarily tied to it when they're making decisions. I mean, just because they endorse a plan doesn't mean they have to follow it exactly to a T. But I mean, generally they do so, I mean, I think unless the Council wants to make significant changes to the strategy they've already submitted as part of their Annual Report. I mean, like Brian said, OSM will consider that harvest strategy whenever we're analyzing proposals concerning sheep in the Western Interior Region. And then obviously the Council will do the same when you're delivering proposals and recommending them to the Board. And then the Board also per statute will have to consider that when they're deliberating on proposals for the take of you know, sheep in the West Interior Region. So, I guess I'm not clear you know, beyond that, you know what you're....

45 46 47

(Simultaneous speech)

48 49

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Well....

MS. GREDIAGIN: What you're seeking.

1 2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: I wanted to make perfectly crystal clear is that the management strategy will be swept under the rug, and the next -- in five years, nobody will know anything about it. That's what happens. I've been here a long time I see stuff happen. The Board endorses a management plan, they said bullcow ratios for the Western Arctic Caribou Herd, the Koyukuk River Moose Management Plan, their specific biological parameters that are in those plans and those analysis are revolving around those management objectives. That's not like they're endorse it and don't pay any attention to it. If there's a problem with those populations, they're gonna [sic] look heavily at those management plans and are we staying within the biological parameters. So, they're just not lost in the shuffle. The Board's endorsed these various plans and they basically are -- or should be adhering to them in the analysis. I do feel that it's very important for option one minimum to be used for the management strategy that OSM uses in the analysis, but I don't want it swept under the rug, lost in the shuffle along the way.

232425

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

So, somebody's talking off mic there that's your how. But, anyways, I want OSM to think again about this. How do you know - where -- we got a management strategy; we want that before used in the process. We also want the agencies to stop reinventing the wheel, I get a whole other administration with some refuge. And so, then we have to reinvent the -- we have to go back over it again. Well, this gets lost over time. It should be some more to the forefront. This is a management strategy for dall sheep, this is in the Western Interiors realm and so, that should be embedded into our -- into this region, into our -- how this shape is managed. We do the same thing with moose on Koyukuk. We do the same thing with other areas where we have management strategies or management plans. So, option one is a real viable thing, that's a given, as far as I'm concerned. Option -- your option one, that's a given. But I do feel that the other agencies should be -understand if OSM is reviewing and making an analysis that they should also notify the affected Federal land managers. This is our management strategy and this is the way we're going on that. So, when you're gone (indiscernible) this stuff does not change. This is -we're talking nature here. We're talking science and nature. This stuff doesn't go away with politics or anything. So, at this point we're going to have to take

a position. Since we've spent all this time on this one. I would like the Council to make a motion to submit this sheep management strategy to -- as a -- to the Federal Subsistence Board to be part of our documentation, to be utilized by OSM and in the future and for future analysis for dall sheep within our region as part of our -- part of the process for analysis and that's exactly what you, what you're endorsing. So, the -- which was referred to as option one, so, we'll go with option one. But I do feel that the -- it should be also an addendum to that, that if you're -- if OSM is analyzing a proposal and it affects certain Federal lands that they wouldn't be in contact with those other Federal land managers about how this is the way this Council feels strongly about dall sheep management and what's wrong with that. That's just part of what you're gonna [sic] be doing anyway, isn't it, Brian?

MR. UBELAKER: Yes. I mean, when I write a sheep analysis, when you submit a proposal regarding sheep, I will take the Sheep Management Strategy and put that in, as part of my analysis. And that goes out for team field review, which is our second step of reviews, and all affected land management agencies get to read it over and have a say in the direction that we're heading, just as same as you guys do when we present it to you at the fall RAC meeting.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay. I don't have a lot of confidence in the Statewide planning group thing, that just fell apart. I wasted a bunch -- I wasted two years of my life with it, Dall sheep management planning process for the State, it fell completely flat. Where they even got Israelis and Arabs to agree on ibex, they could not get anybody to agree on the Dall Sheep Plan. So, I don't know, I have no faith in the -- in that kind of a planning process. So, we'll go with that. We're gonna [sic] go for option one with the understanding that it's gonna [sic] be used throughout the -- through the analysis and the other agencies that have land managers are also involved in the whole -- in that process for that analysis. Is that clear for the record. So, motion by Robert. Do we have a second?

MS. PELKOLA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Seconded by Jenny. Any further discussion? Don.

MR. HONEA: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Under discussion so, would this be part of our Annual Report submitted to have those -- to have that request?

MS. PILCHER: This is Nissa Pilcher for the Chair. So, you guys do have that already in your Annual Report. It is an action item a little further down. So, what you guys are gonna [sic] do when we get there, it's agenda item 12D is -- what we -- we can reference this conversation about adding additional language into what is already in existence on that motion that you just made and the conversation that Jack just had and then we can -- I can add it into the current annual report because it's already in there, it's just not.....

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Fresh on our minds. I wouldn't want to pass this motion now so that when we get to that, we just paste it in. So, just paste right in. So, that when we get to that Annual Report topic. You're right, we do have it on the Annual Report. We just gotta [sic] -- we're gonna [sic] add to it.

MR. HONEA: Okay I would just like the wording on that motion. What exactly is that motion?

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Motion is that the OSM is presented there -- they had a discussion. They had two options one was a public, wider process where they get a whole bunch of people involved. And the other first option was that the management strategy would be used for doing analysis. When OSM is doing an analysis, it would be in the forefront for this region, and we're making an addendum to that, that they would be heavily -- work with the agencies and if they don't have the management strategy at that time, they give it to the agency who doesn't have the manage - cause [sic] I was handing it out to Arctic Refuge, they didn't have it. I sent, -- we sent it out, when? April of 23. They didn't have it. So, I had to give it again back to -- I keep having to give it to these various -- they should have it in their portfolio. So, that's the motion. The motion is to go with OSM to option one that it's gonna [sic] -- the strategy will be used in their management -- at their analysis and that they use the other agencies and involve the other agencies with the understanding that this is what this region would like, how dall sheep should be managed. So, that's clear Don?

MR. HONEA: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, any further discussion? Questions called, those in favor of that motion signify by saying aye.

4 5 6

3

IN UNISON: Aye.

7

8 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Opposed, same 9 sign.

10

(No response)

11 12 13

14

15

16

17

Motion passes. That'll be added on to our -- in our discussion on the annual report. So, thank you, I appreciate that, Brian and being out in front of me on that one with the two options. Good job, again. And so, now we're -- call for proposal, which is action item A call for Federal Wildlife proposals. Brian.

18 19 20

MR. GERVAIS: Jack.

2122

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Oh, go ahead, Tim. Oh, go ahead, Tim. Go right ahead.

232425

2627

28 29

30

31 32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44 45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. GERVAIS: Thank you, Mr. Brian, so, looking at your PowerPoint and you have a slide about why may a proposal be invalid and you got marine mammals, migratory birds, fishing in marine waters. When I look at section 801.5 in ANILCA and it talks about the national interest in the proper regulation, protection and conservation of fish and wildlife on public lands in Alaska and the continuation of the opportunity for subsistence way of life by residents of rural Alaska require that administrative structure be established for the purpose of enabling rural residents who have personal knowledge of local conditions and requirements, to make a meaningful role the management of fish and wildlife, and of subsistence uses on public land. So, if this proposal process restricts or makes it invalid for us to have proposals like, I know this is a game cycle, but let's just -- I wanted to use fish for right now. Why if ANILCAs saying that there has to be an administrative structure available and then the proposal process is saying that we can't talk about certain topics like marine mammal, migratory birds, or fishing, commercial fishing in the EEZ then what's the solution? How do we meet the requirements of ANILCA and still have proposals that can be invalidated based on jurisdiction, when you have migratory species, such as fish that are swimming

through multiple jurisdictions. But they are keystone subsistence resources.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Well, that's your question? Can you answer that question?

MR.GERVAIS: My question is, it's ANILCA grants, and administrative structure be established and then this particular -- like the proposal process is kind of the bread and butter of our management ability with the RACs. But then the PowerPoint is saying we're not allowed to make proposals on these certain topics. So, I'm asking, how do we address these invalid topics if they affect our keystone subsistence species resources?

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Nissa, you're gonna [sic] answer to that?

MS. PILCHER: This is Nissa Pilcher, for the record. I think the short answer that you're looking for, Tim, is the way that the Council can address it is through correspondence. Since that you can't -- there's no regulatory process for this Board with the Federal Subsistence Board. You're -- basically the only answer is correspondence, and we can certainly do that.

MR. GERVAIS: Okay. I would like to comment, if I may, Mr. Chair. That correspondence is not a meaningful role in management of fish and wildlife, when it can just be ignored by ADF&G or the Commissioner of ADF&G or the North Pacific Management Council or whoever the respective agency may be. So, I would like to get past this situation where people are saying that we don't have authority to have any meaningful role in management because it's a migratory species and it's out of our jurisdiction. I think what this ANILCA 801.5 is saying is that Congress is requiring an administrative structure be established for meaningful role management of fish and wildlife, and that correspondence does not meet that means and we have a biologic [sic] crisis on our hands because of that.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Well, it's a jurisdictional restriction. This Council can deal with Fish and Wildlife. We can write to the Federal Subsistence Board. We can tell the Federal Subsistence Board that we need to do this or that, and they can move that up the chain to, into the Interior Department to deal with, you know, marine mammals or whatever issues

that we can't deal with that was on the list. But we 1 have the administrative structure for a meaningful role, that's the Council process, that's the Subsistence Board process, the expanded Board with 5 additional public members, that's, you know, that's the 6 meaningful role part. But then we get 7 jurisdictional boundaries where we can't talk about 8 migratory birds because there's a migratory bird 9 Council, that's their authority. And so, this getting 10 into the EEZ, we're, you know, North Pacific Fisheries is gonna [sic] be here to talk to us tonight. That's --11 12 you know, we've made so many waves with the Federal 13 actually Subsistence Board process that they're 14 responding to these letters and things that we've written. But we don't -- this Council does not have a 15 seat on the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council. 16 That's a different realm. But I'm really super happy to 17 18 have North Pacific here to talk to us this evening at 6:30 p.m. So, but yeah, I feel your frustration, but you 19 20 know, we got a marine crash, we've got too many -- you 21 know, if it was up to me, we'd just, like, pull about 22 50% of the hatchery release. We would, you know, try to 23 stay off of the passage of fish moving out of the South 24 Alaska Peninsula and protections in the Bering Sea for 25 our salmon to move into the Yukon and Kuskokwim River. But that's -- I can't do all that. We can't do that; we 26 27 don't have authority to do that and the other Boards, 28 everybody just got their own idea how this is gonna 29 [sic] go. Eventually it will go the right way, but it's 30 gonna [sic] have to go to like zero and then back all the way out. They'll -- their hatcheries will crash. 31 That's what's gonna [sic] happen to them. So, then 32 33 they're gonna [sic] have a -- then they're going to be 34 -- they'll have us come to the plate and actually start 35 using real science again. This has always happened. They 36 wiped out bison and now we're trying to get them back 37 again. This happened over and over and over in American 38 history. They push beyond the -- it's all for economics. 39 First, they sold all the buffalo hides, then they just 40 ground up all the bones into phosphorus. And it's just 41 -- this is what America does, and they always forget how 42 that, these are finite resources and there's not an 43 unending supply. This has happened over so many times, 44 but we can't do anything and we're doing as much as we 45 can. And I'm happy we got North Pacific Fisheries 46 Management Council coming to see us. So, I'll just leave 47 it right there. We can't just keep going on that. I do 48 appreciate your comment on that though Tim. You had a 49 comment there Robert, go ahead. 50

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Brian, with all this conversation that we're having here, is that Federal proposals and all this and I see it on the bottom down here, the State proposals. What would happen if, let's say, the Anvik tribe or the West Interior RAC put a proposal in to declare all the fish, chum salmon, chinook salmon as a extinct fish, in a proposal of what would happen here. I mean, would that say that since there's no more fish up the Anvik River, how do we do that? Do we just say, well, we're just gonna [sic] fish 'till [sic] we get the last one, or it's gonna [sic] be the fish to the last one, or bycatch or, you know, something like that. Who declares in that proposal to declare a disaster or extinction for the chinook salmon or both species?

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Robert, I'll answer that one. You do just what -- you go ahead and answer. I can answer it, or you can answer it. Why don't you take your.....

MR. UBELAKER: I'll defer to you, Mr.

Chair.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: You're asking for an endangered species or threatened species status, which you'd have to submit that to NOAA. That's under that's what's going on right now with chinook. They -somebody submitted that the south Alaska coast is endangered. What about the Yukon? They forgot the Yukon on that one. But the reality is the -- so the NOAA is going through an endangered species analysis for chinook salmon and that's who deals with that. OSM, Federal Subsistence Management is on Federal public lands and of associated waters. That's what we're -- that's where we're at. So, the jurisdiction your tribe could submit a proposal that chum salmon on the Anvik River are becoming extinct, and we want them under threatened species status, and they might start to do something, the North Pacific Fisheries management. But it's still under analysis, they're probably not gonna [sic] go for it. I don't know, especially now. Political climates changed now, as is the weather. So, go ahead, Robert.

MR. GERVAIS: Well, I got a comment about something you said that is relevant.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Tim. Well, Tim

49 is....

5

6

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

MR. GERVAIS: I'll be brief. So, they didn't, NOAA didn't forget to put Yukon River or Kuskokwim River salmon in the ESA. What NOAA's position is, is that's outside of their jurisdiction. So, they need to talk about it. They'll need to think about it. They'll need to do anything about it. And that's the whole problem, is we're gonna [sic] hear it tonight. Everything we say to North Pacific counts or the like Dr. Stram, the main staff member that's dealt with this chinook issue for decades. She said in 2009, in the rulemaking meeting for amendment 51, she said that her working as NOAA, they did zero analysis of the in-river population level of chinook salmon. So, somehow, we need to break the stalemate and stop this deal where oh, that's out of our jurisdiction, that doesn't matter, or we don't have to account for that because the fish are migratory. Because what's happened is the resource has been destroyed. The fishing culture on these rivers is destroyed. And we just -- we have to develop different management structures that protect the species and protect the subsistence users. And I mean, it's -- we're just gonna [sic] hear it. I can tell you what's gonna [sic] happen tonight is they're gonna [sic] say, oh, it's out of our jurisdiction and everybody's gonna [sic] to go home and would come back next time and they'll say the same thing. And meanwhile the salmon stocks continue to be deteriorated, and we don't meet subsistence needs and we don't have viable stocks.

28 29 30

31

32

33

34

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay. Thanks, Tim. Tonight the meeting is about -- tonight the meeting is not about, you know, it's about the options for chum salmon management on the Bering Sea. That's what the meeting is about tonight. So, Robert, you have a comment? Go ahead.

35 36 37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44 45

46

47

48 49

50

MR. WALKER: Yes. The reason why I asked that question was because the Anvik River used to have between 8 and 1,500 chinook salmon spawn every year, and the last three years there haven't been one chinook salmon come back. So, we're looking at how many other side streams in the lower Yukon and all the way up the Middle Yukon that don't have any salmon come back anymore. So, that's something that — where we're gonna [sic] go and how long will it take to get there, seems like we're not doing anything about it. We're just kind of like talking about it and talking about it and NOAA whoever they are, they're not gonna [sic] do anything. Not as far as I can remember, they never even talked about how these small streams and everything. And like

I said earlier about this, Doug Lang declaring the Yukon River a seven-year moratorium and there's no more chinook salmon going up these side streams? How are we gonna [sic] do that? They'll never come back the chinook salmon to Anvik River because they're all gone. The species has been wiped out.

6 7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

5

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Alright. I mean, all we're hearing in this room is the extreme frustration that the people who live on the land are just -- we're just frustrated to no end that this is getting to this point where we can't stop the powers that be that keep raping the oceans and we can't stop it. And so, we're like, we're just standing there on the other side of a fence watching bad things happen to the -- to this resource. But we can't just keep belaboring this. We've gotta [sic] move on in this agenda. I mean, we're just gonna [sic] keep going in circles. So, we're up for, call for proposals. And so, Brian we're gonna [sic] start talking about call for proposal.

202122

23

24

2526

27

28

29

30

31

32 33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

MR. UBELAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I do have a little blurb for that too. So, I'll spit that out and then we can start talking about the good stuff. Once again for the record, still Brian Ubelaker OSM. Now is the call for wildlife proposals and the Council's opportunity to submit proposals to change Federal Subsistence Wildlife Harvest regulations. informational flyer on how to submit a proposal to change Federal Subsistence regulations can be found on page asterisks-asterisks of your meeting book. I did not fill in that blank, and I apologize, it's in your book somewhere. As we mentioned during the training, Councils must make a motion and vote to submit proposals. Also, the opportunity for Councils to submit proposals is available during this entire meeting. If a Council member thinks of a proposal later or in response to another agenda item, they are welcome to suggest submitting a proposal then. Of course, anyone can submit a proposal as an individual before the submission window closes. That is the end of the blurb, Mr. Chair. I'd be happy to answer any questions or have more discussion on the topic.

43 44 45

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Any Council

comments?

46 47 48

(No response)

So, no. So, you had some ideas about alignment with some previous actions taken by Boards. Go ahead, Brian.

MR. UBELAKER: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair. So, my supervisor, Lisa Grediagin, keeps a running tally throughout the year. Things that have changed by Board of game actions and whatnot. So, we have a couple - Nissa emailed you that list of them, correct?

 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: I got that list. I was plowing snow. You don't understand how busy I was, and I couldn't -- I looked at it, it sounded good, but I wanted to talk about it at the meeting so, I turned off my brain on that one, and now I've turned my brain back on. So, now it's the time to talk about it.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ UBELAKER: Okay, let me -- Nissa, do you have that email handy?

MS. PILCHER: I do. Nissa Pilcher, for the record. The first one is Unit 19, and I did just turn off the projector. I might need to turn it back on again. It's to revise or eliminate the Upper Kuskokwim controlled use area. The rationale is, as it exists now. So, this is to revise or eliminate it in Federal regulations because as it exists now, there is no Federal land within that current controlled use area boundary.

MR. UBELAKER: I will modify that statement a bit. There is Federal public land, but it is not open to subsistence it is Native or State selected. But I guess a brief history and if you can get the map up -- brief history is 2000 and the 90s, maybe the State established the CUA. They expanded it experimentally, two different stages and when it expanded to its largest size, the Federal regulations adopted it. And then like two years later, the -- on the State side, the CUA shrunk to two miles to either side of several of the rivers, whereas in Federal regulations it remained humongous. It did cover a little bit. It does currently cover BLM land down at the southern end of it. But for the most part inside the State boundaries, there is no subsistence, no Federal lands open to subsistence uses.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: It's my understanding the State Board has eliminated this controlled use area now.

MR. UBELAKER: No, they didn't eliminate it, and I dug into a little bit of the Board of Game history, they expanded it. So, it was two miles on either side of the rivers as it sits right now. They expanded it for whatever reason, and then they expanded it again for whatever reason. That's when the feds adopted it. And then a year or two later, the Board of Game didn't make any more adjustments to it, and it reverted to its original state, which is two miles on either side of the river.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: It's not reflecting that in the game -- in the book here.

MR. UBELAKER: Federal side, that is the controlled use area on the Federal side. If you look in.....

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: This is the old, controlled use area.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ UBELAKER: No, that's the current Federal control use area.

 ${\tt CHAIRPERSON\ REAKOFF:\ I\ mean,\ the\ current}\\ {\tt Board\ of\ Game\ controlled\ use\ area\ is\ much\ smaller\ than}\\ {\tt this\ one.}$

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ UBELAKER: Yeah, and if Nissa can get the map up, we -- oh, there we go.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Yeah.

MR. UBELAKER: You can see it. The blue outline is the current Fish and Game, the current State controlled use area and the reddish-brown hashed area is the Federal controlled use area.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, we can submit the proposal -- this proposal, the idea of this and then we can discuss it further at our fall meeting after it's been analyzed with our -- we need to get comments from people around McGrath and so forth. And so, I would prefer to get this in as a proposal basically for discussion. So, I would -- is it okay for the Council to submit this proposal if -- to eliminate the old, controlled use area size back down to what is currently reflected in blue as the States so that we can discuss it at our fall meeting. Yes.

MR. HONEA: Mr. Chair, thank you. Is this -- could you tell me who submitted this and the purpose of it? I mean, is it within our books here?

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: We would be submitting this proposal because currently in the Federal Regulation Book that we have right now, this is basically outdated. We were -- the State Federal Subsistence Board was staying with what the State -- it's on the screen there, what the State actually had at times. But when it was this last -- was it the March Board cycle that they -- of 24, were they reduced that controlled use area which what Board meeting reduced it?

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ UBELAKER: Like 2008. It was a long time ago.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Oh, a long, long

time ago.

MR. UBELAKER: Long, long time. Like I say it, they -- for whatever reason and I couldn't find the -- and I didn't listen to the transcripts, but they kept expanding and expanding it, and I guess it didn't do what they wanted it to do and then they stopped caring and it reverted back to what you see there.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: A lot of it had to do with, they had a predator control project going on there, and it was -- that was part of the -- what are they -- it had an acronym that they used for that area. That had a lot to do with that. So, we can submit a proposal to revert back to, you know, basically eliminate the old control use area boundaries, which then it goes into it's all State land, at that point. It's not really doing anything, but I do wanna [sic] get comments from the local people. We'll submit the proposal, and if Kevin Whitworth or somebody down there in McGrath goes, no, we want to do this, well, we'll go along with the local. But we need to get it out as a placeholder. We need to get it into the -- go ahead.

MR. HONEA: Mr. Chair. I guess that's why I was asking the question. If it was submitted a while back, was it from somebody in McGrath? And so, we are just supporting this? I mean, if you -- so this is gonna [sic] be coming up in the fall meeting, then.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: If we make a proposal, if we get a motion and a proposal to submit this as a proposal, then it will come up in our fall meeting. Nissa, you don't wanna [sic] answer the question?

1 2

MS. PILCHER: I can give it a shot. So, this is Nissa, for the record. So, right now the Federal regulations are more restrictive than the regulations and they also don't match which creates user not conflict, but confusion. So, right now you guys are talking about if you want to submit a federal proposal to reduce the size of the Federal controlled use area down to match what the State has and Jack did lodge the concern that you, there's no Kuskokwim members on the Council. So, what I can make sure that I do is if you guys do choose to submit this, I can relay it to the contacts I have on the Kuskokwim and let them know you submitted it. But you're fully aware that you did it without input. Because there's no Council members from that area and if they have concerns to please let me or anyone on the Council know so we can get them logged for the fall meeting and go from there. So, if you want to go forward with the proposal, like Jack said, you'd need a motion and a second to align the State and the Federal regulations cause currently the Federal regulations are more restrictive than State.

 MR. UBELAKER: Mr. Chair, and to add on to Nissa's Statement, one major important fact that I forgot to mention is that having the controlled use area on the balance that it exists right now only applies to federally qualified Subsistence users. It does not apply to State users as they have to go with the blue area. So, everything that's over in the Federal regulations doesn't restrict anybody from using it. If that makes sense.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Right. So, like this type of a proposal is what I would refer to as housekeeping cause [sic] it aligns with State. So, there's less confusion. I don't see where there's a conflict. I don't think that it's gonna [sic] be a big issue. But I do wanna [sic] get the proposal on clean up these regulations. So, there's not a lot of confusion and what I want to get the comments. So, when the proposal comes out in the summer or whenever it comes out, then the -- then McGrath and people can talk about it and then we know where we're gonna [sic] proceed from then. But this is the way to get the issue on the table.

So, the Chair will entertain a motion to submit this proposal, to realign with State current control use Upper Kuskokwim control use area in the blue as referred to on the mapping on the screen there. And so, we need 5 a motion. Do we have a motion? 6 7 MR. HONEA: I move. 8 9 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Motion by Don. We 10 have a second? 11 12 MR. KRISKA: Second. 13 14 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Seconded by Tommy. 15 Further discussion. 16 17 MR. HONEA: Mr. Chair. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Yes. Go ahead, Don. 20 21 MR. HONEA: Yeah, okay. Under discussion 22 I really don't understand this. I mean, okay so, do we 23 know when it was submitted, who it was submitted by the purpose of it? I mean, I love reinforcing this, but are 24 25 -- do they still want it? I mean, are we going past our 26 or, we're just supporting them? 27 28 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Brian, did you have 29 an answer to that? 30 31 MR. UBELAKER: Through the Chair. Member 32 This idea -- nothing has been submitted 33 officially yet. This idea came from my supervisor, who keeps track of changes this Board of Game makes and 34 35 notices differences in State and Federal regulations. 36 And she just put a list together -- she keeps a running list throughout the year, and this is just one that she 37 38 noticed where Federal and State regulations do not 39 match. We're trying to bring them into alignment so that 40 there's no confusion -- less confusion for users in the 41 field. 42 43 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Nissa. 44 45 MS. PILCHER: And I do believe that a lot 46 of those questions will be answered if you guys do choose 47 to submit this, in the analysis. Because Brian sitting

right, there is gonna [sic] have to do a lot of work on

the who's and the what's like you've been asking, so.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, this will go through an analysis where that'll get presented in our fall meeting. We'll get comments, we'll call up Kevin or somebody in McGrath or -- and we'll get comments about this particular proposal, they will probably go whatever, we don't care, or they'll have problems with it, and then we will vote accordingly. But we need to address this issue. We have to have it in a proposal form. So, I have a motion and a second on the floor. Do we have any further discussion. Question is called. Those in favor of submitting that proposal to the Federal Subsistence Board process signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Opposed, same sign. So, there's one other, is it -- go ahead, Brian or Nissa, do you have the ideas before you there?

MR. UBELAKER: I've got an email pulled up. So, the second one that I have that was on the list is in Units 24D and 21D of opening a Federal muskox season, which the State has on the books for a year or two now. So, once again Federal and State regulations do not align. Federal regulations are more restrictive than State, currently.

REAKOFF: CHAIRPERSON So, that aligning with that would be beneficial to Subsistence users to align with the State current -- is it coming up on the screen now? So, it would be to open Federal muskox season in concurrence with State -- current State Game regulations as of established in 2021. And so, they voted against an ANS. But there's apparently a harvestable surplus of Muskox and the Board of Game has that season, and we should have that also under Federal regulations. So, that's in the near area there, dead center in your area there Tommy. So, I feel that we should submit this proposal to make it legal under Federal Subsistence regulations, also. Would you like to make that motion?

MR. KRISKA: So, moved.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Moved by Tommy. Do we have a second?

MS. PELKOLA: Second.

permit hunts as well.

1 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Seconded by Jenny. 2 So, that basically aligns State and Federal regulations on Federal public lands. Further discussion? We'll be also discussing this at our fall meeting. It'll be a 5 proposal. Questions called. Those in favor of that 6 motion signify by saying aye. 7 8 IN UNISON: Aye. 9 10 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Opposed, sign. So, I..... 11 12 13 MS. GREDIAGIN: Mr. Chair. 14 15 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay. Go ahead, 16 Lisa. 17 18 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, Lisa Grediagin, for 19 the record. I just wanted to clarify that those muskox 20 hunts under State regulations in Unit 21 and 24 are draw 21 permit hunts. So, could you clarify whether your intent 22 is for the Federal hunts to also be by draw, permit or, 23 you know, any sort of permit or just open? 24 25 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: My intention was to 26 align with the State regulations so that there's not 27 confusion. There's not a lot of muskox in those Units. 28 So, it can't be a full-on season. You know, everybody 29 go get one muskox that would be too much, especially 30 cows. And so, I would, at this time, I would become more 31 comfortable with staying with the State draw permit. 32 That's what I would be more comfortable with. 33 34 MS. GREDIAGIN: Okay. I mean, yeah, we -35 - I guess we can work it out in the analysis cause Federal users can't, you know, use a state draw permit. 36 37 We've -- they've used State registration permits for 38 Federal hunts, but I don't think there's ever been a 39 case of a -- you know, we've had separate, you know, draw permits. So, I guess yeah, you could either clarify 40 41 now or we'll work it out as a modification in the 42 analysis. 43 44 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay, I understand 45 that you cannot use State draw permits, but you can 46 issue Federal registration permits, right? 47 48 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, we have Federal 49 registration permits, or we also have Federal draw

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: I would be more comfortable with a federal draw if that's the case, cause.

MS. GREDIAGIN: Okay, yep.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: If they cannot use the State draw permit, then they could have a federal draw permit. I'm not sure how that would play out in the analysis about, you know, how that's gonna [sic] work as far as how many of those draw permits there's going to be. So, I would be -- and I appreciate you bringing that to light and I didn't realize that you could not use a state draw permit, but you can use a registration permit and if there's Federal registration permits. So, I would -- that should be part of the proposal that it's for an open season concurrent with whatever the State has, but also with the Federal limited draw permit. Which there's areas in Alaska where there's Federal muskox lottery draw permits. So, thanks for clarifying that and so, that -- actually we need to vote. Okay. Yeah, we can vote. Those in favor of submitting that proposals.

MS. PILCHER: So, there was a vote,

but....

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Yeah, we need to amend -- we need to retract. What we need to do is retract that vote and amend the motion and then revote it. That's what we were supposed to do. So, with that coming to light and that additional language being needed to be put there. The Chair will entertain a motion to retract that last vote and make a motion to retract that last vote. So that we can add additional language to that proposal.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ KRISKA: I make a motion to retract that.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: And Jenny was the second. Do you concur, Jenny?

MS. PELKOLA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: And so, retraction now adding the language. To have the -- it's a draw permit a Federal draw permit for muskox in Unit 24D and 21D, and with a concurrent season to the State season. So, that's clear for the record. So, further discussion

1 2	to that, the motion is still up, still on the floor. Completely new. Okay, you're right, right, right. So,
3	the motion is retracted. So, at this point, Tommy can
4	make a motion to adopt
5	•
6	MR. GERVAIS: (Indiscernible)
7	
8	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Say that again. Is
9	that you, Tim?
LO	• ·
L1	MR. GERVAIS: Yeah. We never voted on the
L2	retraction. Just got a second.
L3	
L 4	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay. I'm getting
L 5	way off. I need more coffee. So, okay, we're gonna [sic]
L 6	vote on the retraction of the motion. Motion by Tommy,
L7	seconded by Jenny. Those in favor of retraction signify
L 8	by saying aye.
L 9	
20	IN UNISON: Aye.
21	
22	Opposed same sign. So, new motion on the
23	table. So, the motion you can resubmit a new motion,
24	Tommy, to align the State and Federal hunts on Unit 24D
25	and 21D on Federal public lands with a lottery draw
26	permit. Federal with a federal lottery draw permit
27	for muskox. So, that's your - that you can make that
28	motion.
29	
30	MR. KRISKA: So, moved.
31	
32	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Moved by Tommy.
33	
3 4	MS. PELKOLA: Second.
35	
36	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Seconded by Jenny.
37	So, now we're back where we're supposed to be with the
38	additional language, with the clarification for the
39	lottery draw permit. So, any further discussion?
10	Questions called, those in favor of the new motion
11	signify by saying aye.
12	
13	IN UNISON: Aye.
14	
15	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Opposed? Tim's an
16	affirmative on that one.
17	
18	UNIDENTIFIED: (Indiscernible).
19	

2

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Right. You're exactly right, my mistake. So now, does anyone in this Council have other issues that should be submitted a Federal Subsistence proposal at this time for wildlife within our region. So, I don't have any proposals myself.

5 6 7

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Oh, go ahead. You got another one there.

8

MR. UBELAKER: Mr. Chair, I've got two more.

12

13 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Oh, you got two

14 more.

15 16

17

18

19

MR. UBELAKER: I really wanna [sic] get down to it. Number three on the list is the 24A, 26B sheep closure. The special action that was codified in the last regulatory cycle is due to sunset at the end of 2025.

202122

23

2425

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 REAKOFF: So, I will discuss that. And so, we -- we've had the closure. The closure will go through 2026. So, we -- the closure was to restrain the public from killing off the last remaining rams and to get the population to develop a healthy pop [sic] -- more healthy breeding, retain the breeding population. So, now we're -- our sheep population is responding to the closures. We're starting to -- the last survey information that I've -- that was -- I was given by Brad Wendling and the National Park Services, that we had 40 lambs per 100 ewes to the east of the road, and we had 41 lambs per 100 ewes to the -- ewe likes to the west of the road. So, our sheep management strategy has been working, our sheep closure has been working. And one more fall and then I think we can open back up with normal Federal Subsistence regulations for harvest again. Which we had in 21A and 21B was one ram, one ram in 24A and one ram, seven eights, I think in 26B. The State will then revert to their normal harvest of full curl. We have a proposal before the State Board of Game to eliminate eight-year count. And so, the State Board of Game will be visiting that, the proposal to eliminate eight-year-old count at their March meeting. So, hopefully they adopt that because that's been a big problem. Hunters cannot identify eight years old at a distance, and they can't even hardly identify them in their hand. And so, the State Board of Game needs to address that issue. But right now, the population is coming back around to where I feel that we can open up

50

1 for subsistence harvest and the State regulations and in 2000 -- after 2026, so 2026 is the end of the closure period. So, I don't feel that we need to submit a proposal for an extension of the -- and we'll let it 5 sunset. Is that okay with the Council, my line of thought 6 on that? 7 8 MR. WALKER: Yeah, I'm good with closing. 9 10 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: No, we don't want 11 to close it anymore. It's already under, it's under 12 closure right now and that closure will go through 2026, 13 next year. 14 15 MR. WALKER: It'll go through next year? 16 17 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Go through next 18 year. 19 20 MR. WALKER: Because I thought it was --21 we're bringing it up. 22 23 MR. PILCHER: Mic. 24 25 MR. WALKER: Sorry. I misunderstood what 26 Brian was saying to me. It was like we're bringing it up now so we can have that for 2026. And that's why I 27 28 made that motion, to have it continue closed. 29 30 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, the current 31 sheep closure was adopted by the Federal Subsistence 32 Board in July of 2022. We had two years of closure. Then 33 we had another proposal last April before the Federal 34 Subsistence Board. The Federal Subsistence Board adopted 35 the -- an additional two-year closure, and that was by 36 the Western Interior Council's Proposal. But at this 37 point, with the sheep population responding to our management restrictions, we've -- I feel that there will 38 39 be enough resources for subsistence and non-subsistence 40 harvest. If -- especially if the State eliminates the 41 eight-year-old count. But at this time, I don't feel 42 that the Council should try to submit another extension 43 to the closure. That -- I don't feel that it's necessary. 44 Yeah. 45 46 MR. WALKER: Just like I said, I wasn't 47 here in 22, so this was.....

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So right now, we

don't -- the question was, do we want to extend the

closure beyond 2026? And my response is I don't think we do need to, and we do not need to submit a proposal. So, that's my response. I live in Unit 24A, and we have C&T in 26B. So, I'm watching the sheep population. We've gotten some older rams back. I've seen rams breeding ewes. So, where everything's getting a lot better, and the closure was very instrumental and the kind of recoveries that we're having. So, another issue we had four, Brian. Oh, Tom, you have a comment?

MR. KRISKA: Yeah, Mr. Chair. So, actually, essentially what we're doing is, we're reversing that or lifting that ban. Is that all we're doing?

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: We're letting it sunset. It would basically be in place for four years straight, and then we're just gonna [sic] let it fall out. So, we'll just let it sunset. So, number four. Go ahead, Brian.

MR. UBELAKER: Number four. Before I dig in, member Walker, I apologize. I did say the closure went through 2025; Chairman Reakoff was correct. It goes through 2026. I was doing some mental math, and it came out wrong. Okay, then last, number four proposal. So, this one, I hope it's not too confusing. This one is gonna [sic] hinge on Board of Game action at their upcoming Statewide meeting in March. There's a proposal to change the boundary between 21D and 21E. It's a Board of Game Proposal 119. If the Board of Game adopts that, it's gonna [sic] misalign Federal and State regulations. So, we're thinking that we can -- you can submit a -- I don't know what, preliminary proposal that if the Board of Game does adopt this boundary change, your proposal will be analyzed, and then State and Federal regulations will remain aligned. If they don't adopt it, you know, you can have the motion, or the proposal withdrawn.

 $\mbox{ CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay. You got a comment there, Robert. }$

MR. WALKER: Brian, do you have a map of this, bigger so we can take a look at it, where the changes are gonna [sic] be? Cause I'm familiar with 21E and 21D.

MR. UBELAKER: Through the Chair. Nissa is on that. That's why we keep Nissa around.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: One of the many reasons we keep Nissa around. Nissa is pulling up a map there for that change. And so, I -- did the GASH Advisory discusses this issue, do you know? And so, I would like to know what the Advisory Committees have been talking about on this one. Go ahead, Nissa.

MS. PILCHER: I do know that the GASH AC did try to meet, and they were weathered out, and I don't believe it happened. But they could've met before. If I find the map, I'll see if I can find if they were able to meet.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: But I do think that Brian's right, that we could submit a proposal to align the boundary change, if the Board of Game does choose to change the boundary and it will be in place. And if GASH AC is fine with it, everybody's cool with it, then we won't have confusion about different Unit boundaries of 21D and 21E but, we need to have a placeholder for it. So, you have a comment there, Don?

MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So, to make it kinda clear here, I mean, we — this is just a preliminary hearing on this. And actually, when — at our fall meetings, we'll go ahead and I mean, I — it's good to know what, that we're going through them. So, on our own time we could find out, study them, etcetera. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Well, Don it'll — if we submit a proposal to concurrent proposal for the same boundaries, the Board of Game, the Board of Game adopts it, if they adopt it. Then we have the opportunity to discuss that with our constituency at our fall meeting. We would know what the GASH Advisory Committee is — actually wants. And so, then we can change it but if we don't do anything, then we're gonna [sic] have a complete misalignment of the State and Federal regulation boundary and that's gonna [sic] be really a challenge for people.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ HONEA: So, I guess what I'm saying right now is -- I guess what I'm saying right now is this is action items that we are taking a stance on.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Yeah, it's an issue that Brian's bringing up that there's gonna [sic] be a misalignment if the Board passes the regulation. So, we need to, instead of waiting for one whole Board cycle,

Federal cycle, two more years, we should have that in the hopper. Then we can talk about it at -- the State Board is gonna [sic] meet on that in March. By October of this next year, whenever we have our next meeting, then we'll know what they did, and we can move forward with that. But it's just what referred to as a placeholder proposal is what that's referred to. Oh, Nissa has got it up now. So, you got a comment there, Tommy? Go ahead.

MR. KRISKA: Yes, this is -- Mr. Chair, this is Tom. Anyway, this proposal is with our ACs in Middle Yukon Advisory, we oppose this because the -- due to the fact that the people at Kaltag and a lot of people, they do own what -- allotments down there, in that area. And you're going over -- you're gonna [sic] put the boundary line above those allotments, which is -- they're already allotments meant for the people of Kaltag that live there. The grayling moved to the Yukon from the Holikachuk in 1959. And so, it's just a new thing and the people in the past from Kaltag and those places were living around that area. So, we opposed it because the people -- I don't know how it will work with people already owning land in that district. So, the Middle Yukon Advisory opposed that, and I will oppose it, too. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay. Well, that's super important because we didn't have that information. That's why we're discussing these things before we even make these proposals. So, that's why I want to know what the Advisory Committees are doing, and what was the original reason why the Board of Games even entertaining this, change.....

MR. KRISKA: I have another comment. So, I think on behalf of some people from down there, it was this personal use in a way that maybe they have a license and stuff. They would be better off getting a license to do what they want this area for. Sorry to say, but, anyway, I'm just wanted say that. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay. And you have a comment there, Nissa, go ahead.

 MS. PILCHER: Yeah, my comment -- is Nissa Pilcher, for the record. So, it was the GASH AC that did submit it. Fish and Game is opposed to it, I didn't read exactly why Middle Yukon is opposed to it. The few times that I did deal with boundary issues when

I did work for the Board of Game, they like the ACs to come to an agreement if a boundary is going to be changed. So, take that as you will.

4 5

1

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, oh, go ahead there, Robert.

6 7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

WALKER: Thank you, MR. Mr. Talking with the Tribal Council from Grayling, I haven't met with the president or chief there, and they appeal -- opposed it also. But they weren't too sure on why they wanted to add to it. Nobody did really give them information on why, I mean, just like this upper, the 26D here where Kaltaq, Nulato and Koyukuk are too. You know, it just kind of like we're gonna [sic] do this and that's it. And when I asked, as a -- I said, as a RAC member and I asked as a chief to the AC Board in 21E, I didn't get -- nobody never gave me an answer. It was just like, we're doing this and bye, so I'm just kind of like sitting in the middle with everybody else. But I would have to say no too, because, if they say I have to support the other people, and I have to support the Grayling Chief and their tribal Council. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

242526

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

43

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, this -- because the Council's under Title Eight 805 are to look to the advisory committees, that's part of our process. And so, when we have two divided advisory committees within our region, Middle Yukon and GASH is doing something else, I don't really want to get in the middle of that. So, at this point I'm getting more inclined to just not submit a proposal like we're endorsing one side or the other. And this let the cards fall how they may. And if they really do, if the Board of Game really does pass this change, then we might have to realign that further. But at this point, after this, it was important to have this discussion. I don't think it's a good idea for us to submit a proposal at all, until it's -- the Board of Game has actually sorted it. So, I'm opposed to the -to submitting a proposal now, after your discussion. I did -- that's what I wanted to know, I wanted to know what GASH did and I didn't know that -- I didn't realize you had had a meeting about it. So, go ahead, Tommy.

44454647

48

49

50

MR. KRISKA: Yeah, it -- that was one of the bigger points that I hope Doug was still here. One of the bigger things that came up with the Middle Yukon Advisory for the -- I don't know, it -- someone has a cabin up there, and it was sort of like a personal gain.

I shouldn't say that, but just to be truthful, to make sure that you know that this land was owned by the folks that rightfully use it, and I just want to back that up. I don't think I want to move into Huslia area or Galena area or any area like that and say, I want this and just cause [sic] I need to make some money or whatever, I kinda [sic] -- I have to say these things because of (distortion) the people I'm representing, and I want to make it straight there. Thank you.

 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you, Tommy. I appreciate your comments, you know, that's what I was asking about. I wanted to know what the Advisory committees were -- I asked, where did this boundary come from? That's -- I had you know, there's really no description, who submitted it. How did they draw this boundary? That was -- those are questions that were coming into my mind.

MR. KRISKA: Yeah, this came up last year and it was a big, almost upriver against down river for no reason, just for one personal gain. It got stomped all over in the Kaltag and Nulato, Koyukuk meetings, so.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay. So, we'll hold off on that one. So, we're not gonna [sic] go anywhere with that. So, Nissa.

MS. PILCHER: This is Nissa, for the record. I would also like to point out that further on down your agenda, under action items, there is Alaska Board of Game Statewide proposals that you guys can choose to take up. If you do want to comment on any of the proposals, including this one that is going before the Board of Game at their March meeting. Not saying you have to, just saying you can.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Right. Well, we did submit a Statewide proposal for eliminating age count on dall sheep. We should at least endorse our proposal, if, at the least if the adoption of the proposal. I think it's proposal 95. It should be for -- with at least a five-year sunset, because we're trying to recover these dall sheep population. And if the Board of Game and the State doesn't understand, there are very few sheep that don't reach full curl and a lot of the sublegal sheep are getting killed, that's in the data. And the Arctic Refuge urban back there is -- and the Arctic refuge they had from 1986 to 2012, they have a in-depth composition survey of rams in the Atigun

Valley. And it shows when they hit three quarter curl, 1 they start disappearing, that is only human harvest. Those sheep are bulletproof against predation, at that age class. So, it's that if the State doesn't want to 5 read the numbers and they don't do comp work, they don't 6 do age composite, they don't do composition of the ram component, which tells you your age classes. The public 8 -- I'm on Facebook and there's a sheep page, and those 9 hunters can have a sheep laying in front of them and 10 still can't count the ages of them. They get -- I would say between 50% to 80% of hunters advocate people that 11 12 are sheep hunting advocates or hunting crazy. Guys, they 13 can't age the sheep laying in front of the camera for 14 me to Tommy, let alone 150 yards over there through the 15 rifle scope. There's no way they can do that. So, (indiscernible) I think I see eight rings, it's three-16 17 quarter curl, boom. They shoot it. What happens? Oh, 18 walk away. They don't show up in their -- there are ethical hunters that shoot sublegal sheep, and they turn 19 them in, but they're not the majority of those kills. 20 21 So, I feel that we should submit a comment to our State 22 Proposal 95 that says, they should at least adopt a five-year elimination of counting rings until the sheep 23 24 population is recovered to carrying capacity. That's 25 what the comment should say. So, they should have at 26 least a five-year moratorium on allowing the public to 27 count rings in sheep for five years and in five more 28 years, the sheep that might have gotten -- never gotten 29 to a full curl who can get shot in five years. Which 30 that's gonna [sic] be a while. Sheep don't drop dead at 31 eight years of age. Sheep routinely get -- in ordinary 32 winter conditions, most rams get between 10 to 12 years 33 of age, and I've seen sheep as old as 15. So, they don't 34 drop dead at eight years of age. It's not like we are 35 gonna [sic] lose them or anything. So, we should comment 36 on that State Proposal 95, which is the Western Interior 37 Council's proposal. And I also submitted an additional 38 one just for good measure to get the Advisory committees 39 in Alaska to discuss that issue. So, I do feel that they 40 -- we should submit a comment endorsing the Proposal 95 41 and whatever the other proposal is, my proposal. And so, 42 they -- that they at least consider taking a five-year 43 moratorium on elimination of eight-year-old count that 44 would allow the sheep population to recover to breeding 45 population and then we would get on the road to getting 46 back to carrying capacity again. Robert.

47 48

49

50

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Like I said earlier, I didn't hear about this. You know, I just got back on the RAC Board, but all of a sudden, I

got bombarded like 20 phone calls. What is going on down there? What are you doing? Why are you taking our land? Why? It was like whoa, hold on a second here, guys, let me find out what's going on. So, I did find out and I was -- took a stance on I said, I am not on the AC Board, I'm on Federal RAC Board, Western Interior. The only thing we could do is we could say yes or no and that's it. We can't say we support it or we don't support it. That's what I would say, I would say I wouldn't support it anyway because I don't think -- because if we're gonna [sic] start taking boundary lines and changing them, what's gonna [sic] happen after this? Everybody's gonna [sic] just get in the line here and start changing their boundary lines. So, once it starts, it's a domino effect. I think we got to take a stand here and just say no, period.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: You would like the Council to oppose the Unit 21E, 21B boundary? Now which proposal is that? No, no not 95.

MS. PILCHER: 119.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: 118? 119? You can make a motion to oppose if you want to do that. You're closest to it and so is Tommy. So, we can -- you can make a motion to -- we're talking about State proposals. If you want to oppose Proposal 118, say you make a motion to adopt Proposal 118, and we'll vote it down.

MR. WALKER: What?

(Simultaneous speech)

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: That's because when you -- yep, if you submit a recommendation that you oppose, that you support -- oppose the proposal. You got to make it in the positive.

MR. WALKER: Right. Okay, I remember now, that's just my thought. That's just my thought that, you know.....

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, you make a motion to adopt 118 and we'll vote it down.

MR. WALKER: Okay. I make a motion to adopt 118.

1	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: And that's State
2	Proposal 118
3	•
4 5	MR. WALKER: State Proposal.
6	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: And that's for
7 8	their whatever what meeting is that Nissa?
9	MS. PILCHER: It's the Statewide Board
LO	of Game. It's proposal 119 on their March 2025 Statewide
L1	Board of Gaming.
12	board of daming.
13	MR. WALKER: Okay.
L 4	
L5 L6	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: 119.
L 7	MR. WALKER: 119 I (indiscernible). So,
L 8	yes, I do. I make a motion to support
L 9	yes, I do. I make a motion to support
20	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: To adopt, proposal
21	119.
22	
23	MR. WALKER: Adopt proposal 119 for the
24 25	boundary change of 21D and 21E.
26	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay. We have a
27	second?
28	5000.00
29	MR. KRISKA: Second.
30	
31	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Seconded. We've
32	discussed this proposal extensively and I'm personally
33	I actually proposed to it. So, I intend to oppose the
34	proposal. So, when we come to vote, I'm gonna [sic]
35	oppose the proposal, the motion to adopt. So, any further
36	discussion? (Indiscernible) Oh, Jenny.
37	
38	MS. PELKOLA: Question.
39	
10	CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Oh, questions
11	called. Those in favor of adopting State Proposal,
12	Statewide Proposal 119, signify by saying aye. Those
13	opposed same sign.
14	
15	IN UNISION: Aye.
16	
17	So, unanimous, opposition to Proposal
18 19 50	119, with the discussion that we had here. So, regarding Statewide Proposal, I think it's 95, and I don't know what the other one is. They're both the same. They should
) ()	what the other one is. They ie both the same. They should

1 be in the same.....

MS. PILCHER: Yeah. The proposal you submitted individually was 95. And the proposal that the Western Interior submitted is 96.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: 95 and 96. So we -- I feel that we should support those proposals, 95 and 96, which say exactly the same thing and that -- then our discussion that the Board should seriously consider if they have consternation about it or they're reluctant to do it, that they should at least adopt it for a five year -- with a time frame to eliminate counting rings for eight-year-old sheep as a criteria. Criteria C for five years with a sunset. Then it would reopen to people, and our population should be healthy enough by then to do that. If it's not, somebody else might submit a proposal to maintain that. So, I feel that a five-year moratorium is reasonable with the condition that the sheep populations are in the state of Alaska, Statewide. So, the Chair will entertain a motion to support Proposals 95 and 96 with the comments to the State Board of Game that they should -- if they're concerned about a permanent elimination of criteria C, counting rings on annuli in dall sheep that they should at least contemplate a five-year elimination and -- for five years with a sunset. So, that would be the comment to the State Board of Game.

MR. HONEA: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Go ahead, Don.

MR. HONEA: Thank you. Before we -- this is kinda confusing enough. I think to make it easier, you know, and this is not just today. It's been the whole process, every meeting when we come up with these proposals. To me, the confusing part is we're not mentioned, hey the wording on this, what it intends to do and stuff like that. So, it would -- I don't know if it would make it easier for Nissa or somebody to explain what we're doing. Does that make sense? I mean, I don't know if it's the other Board members or it's just myself, but it makes it really hard to try to explain, you know, if you would say Proposal 96, the intent here and this is the wording.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Can you....

MR. HONEA: Thank you.

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

1 2 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Can you put up 3 Proposal 96 on the screen? 4 5 MS. PILCHER: Yeah, I sure can. And 6 just.... 7 8 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Well, we discussed 9 this, submitting this proposal back in, it was at our 10 spring meeting. Last year is when we..... 11 12 MR. HONEA: Okay, I.... 13 14

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, she's gonna [sic] put it up again. You prob [sic] -- you may have missed it when we were doing it. I thought, you know.....

MR. HONEA: Yeah, well, I guess you got to realize I wasn't on the Board at the time, so.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay.

MR. HONEA: Yeah, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: It's good to put it on the screen. So, Nissa is putting it up onto the screen. There's the -- it's the -- repeal the age criteria or definition of full curl for -- oh, excuse me, I got too far back. To repeal the age criteria for definition of full curl ram as follows, and which it gives the three criteria. One is full curl; one is both horns broken, and the other is counting rings, and you got to scroll up to number three there, Nissa so we can see that. So, there it is there. So, number three is at least eight years of age determined by horn growth annuli. That's the problem, most hunters on Facebook cannot count rings on sheep. They don't know what they're looking at. And they're killing some -- killing sheep that are not actually full curl. They're not actually the age class that the department desires. They're actually killing the sublegal recruiting sheep. So, that's what the proposal does. So, there's the proposal right there and what I'm saying is, I would like to entertain a motion to adopt this proposal, 95 and 96. But we also -- I would like the Council to comment that they should at least, if they're not going to oppose it permanently, they should at least think about it, to eliminating age count for at least five years, with a sunset. Does that make clear?

 MR. HONEA: That makes perfect sense. Mr. Chair, I guess I myself, I lean on you to you know, if what your stance is on that because I don't know anything. It's all Greek to me. I mean, if we were talking about moose in 21B or D or C or whatever you know, I would -- so, I think even as a Council member, I just sit here and we -- I myself rely on you know, your support. I mean, what is your view on this, and I appreciate putting that up there because, and explaining it a bit because, I'm not -- you know, I just don't like sitting here and not understanding what the proposal is about. If it's not read or put up there and making a decision on it.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Yeah. You're exactly right.

MR. HONEA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: I -- my fault. I should have had Nissa draw that up and put it on the screen. So, let the record reflect that the proposal submitted by the Western Interior Regional Council is on the screen. So, 95 and 96 are exactly the same proposal and so -- but I do feel that in the comments that we should have the -- if the Board is -- doesn't want to go for permanent elimination of criteria three that they -- determining by age class that they go for at least a five-year closure until the sheep come -return to carrying capacity. They're not -- they're nowhere close to carrying capacity. And so, we need to have -- we still need to have healthy harvest of sheep and eliminate the opportunity of hunters killing younger rams. That's what's happening a lot that's happening, not a little and there's hunting guides that are taking, having to turn in sheep that are sublegal because their -- even assistant guides cannot determine -- they're trying to count rings, and they screw up. So, that's a comment I feel that if we're gonna [sic] comment on Statewide proposals 95 and 96, so. Jenny.

MS. PELKOLA: Thank you, member Don, for that -- whatever you just said. But I too -- I don't really know about sheep and all that stuff up that way or wherever they are, and that's why we like to have members from different area on our Board so, that they can speak up for their area or, you know -- and let us we learn from that. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: It's happened just 1 2 sitting here in the last hour. Tommy told us all about what his deliberation in the Middle Yukon on that boundary change for 21A and 21E, if we have to have 5 membership. But I live in the northern part of this 6 region. I live in the sheep hills. I'm underneath sheep when I'm trapping wolves, I know where the sheep are at. 8 I know where the wolves are going, I know, I live with 9 them all the time, year-round. There's hunters, oh I 10 know all about sheep. Yeah, you go up in the fall time. You don't know anything about sheep. You don't know where 11 12 they're going, you haven't the slightest idea what 13 they're doing. I watched -- what drove this, my 14 opposition to that counting rings and when I watch 15 hunters climbing a mountain before the closure, going 16 after three quarter and seven eights' rams, two sheep, two hunters, both with bows, gonna [sic] go kill those 17 18 sheep. It's like, those were five- and six-year-old rams. That's what showed me that they hadn't the 19 slightest idea what they were looking at and I watched 20 21 him two days in a row, and they tried to kill -- both 22 days they tried to kill those sheep, but the sheep got 23 away from them. But their intention was to kill them. 24 That's why I -- and the data shows in the Arctic Refuge 25 from 2000 -- or correction 1986 to 2012, there was a 26 sub, three quarter curl ram started disappearing beyond 27 that age class. That's a problem, it's a management 28 problem. So, we should at least comment that they should 29 think about a five-year closure as a final comment on 30 our proposals. So, the Chair will entertain a motion to 31 submit those comments on proposals 95 and 96 to the State Board of Game, Statewide meeting, which is in 32 33 March. Coming up.

34 35

MR. HONEA: I make that motion.

36 37

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Motion by Don. Do we have a second?

38 39 40

MR. KRISKA: Second.

41 42 43

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Second by Tommy. Any further discussion? We have a question. Questions called. Those in favor of the proposal, submitting those comments to the Statewide Board of Game meeting on proposals 95 and 96 signify by saying aye.

46 47 48

44 45

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Opposed, same sign. And that's an affirmative for Tim. Opposed, same sign. Motion adopted with those comments, and you register the comments, Nissa and you'll submit those soon. Because I think the comment time is very soon. So, that would be the -- any other proposals, Statewide proposals we -- I don't see any that we should -- Do you have any Brian, do you have any Statewide proposals that we should address? So, I think we're good. So, let's see here. Nissa, comment?

MS. PILCHER: Nissa Pilcher, for the record. I just did want to note you guys did jump ahead an agenda item if people are keeping track on the agenda. So, we ended up just talking about agenda item 12E. So, we did that, but we were under 12A, which I believe you guys also finalized when you kind of shifted into talking about E. So, one thing to note, it is 3:37 you do have a time certain at 4:00 with the Tanana Chiefs Conference Tribal Resource Stewardship Department and the Kuskokwim River Inter Tribal Fish Commission. So, I don't know if you guys want to take a break before that happens or if you want to launch into WP24-01. I'm not gonna [sic] say that that one would be quick. It could be quick, it could not. So, it's up to you guys.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: I said -- excuse me. That'll put us too close to our next thing to even cover this. I think we can -- I think Liz can go over this. I think we can deal with this one fairly quickly. This has been before us before, and this is the Statewide sale of Brown bear hides deferred by the Federal Subsistence Board and so, Liz has a handout. We're gonna [sic] look that over and then she's gonna [sic] give us a presentation on that. This is just a review of a proposal that the State, or correction, the Federal Subsistence Board wanted us to review again. And so, go ahead, Liz.

MS. WILLIAMS: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair and members of the Council. You have seen this proposal before and it's in your book. It's WP24-01.

MS. PILCHER: It's in the manila folder.

MS. WILLIAMS: Oh, that's right. So, while you get to looking at it, I'm gonna [sic] start telling you it's been to the Board twice now. And the first time it went to the Board, they deferred it because the State could not provide the permit needed for Units

1 with bears that had a one bear limit. So, the -- there is a -- sorry, there is a permit that you need to harvest these bears, and the Fish and Wildlife Service has authorized the state of Alaska to issue these permits. 5 And the state of Alaska can only issue this permit if 6 it's in a Unit that allows a two-bear harvest. Because if there's a one bear harvest, they may or may not have 8 conservation concerns or just lack of knowledge on the 9 bear population. So, this permit is called 10 Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species 11 and we in the government call it CITES. So, this is 12 about the sale of brown bear hides and what we did --13 or actually what the Board asked the staff to do is to 14 go back and see how can they make this work and so, what 15 the analysts did and it's not me, it's Pippa Kenner. But 16 they found out that maybe instead of getting a CITES 17 permit or a permit that allows you to sell it 18 internationally, OSM makes its own permit just to sell 19 it for personal use only within the United States. And 20 because it's not going to an international sale, you 21 could sell a brown bear hide harvested under Federal 22 Subsistence regulations only, which means you take the 23 meat. And so, this is a way for especially the proponent 24 who was from McCarthy, who lives in a one bear harvest 25 Unit area, to harvest a brown bear for subsistence and 26 sell the hide and instead of having to get a permit from 27 the State for the Convention on International Trade in 28 Endangered Species, you would just get a permit from OSM 29 saying you're doing customary trade. Now, the other 30 aspect of it is, you still have to get the bear sealed 31 by the State, because that's how the State keeps track 32 of bear harvests and bears aren't tracked the way other 33 species are but with fish, moose, caribou declining, 34 many more people are relying on bears and so, the Board 35 said, this sounds like a good idea, but because the 36 Councils haven't heard it before, we want to take this 37 back to the Councils to make it clear that under Federal 38 Subsistence regulations, rural Alaskans, 39 qualified subsistence users, can harvest the brown bear 40 and sell the hide. And the reason the proponents 41 suggested this is just to offset some of the cost of 42 subsistence harvesting, cause it's expensive to buy gas 43 and ammo and go out and harvest a bear. Now in Alaska, 44 brown bears are not endangered, but the populations are 45 very small and low in a lot of the lower 48 States. So, 46 I saw some hands go up in confusion. I've seen some 47 nodding heads. So, we may just want to switch to questions, but this is what the OSM staff has come up 48 with, showed it to the Board, they said okay, but we 49 50 have to make sure the Councils are okay with it. So,

like the Chair said, you have looked at this before and you may not remember. But anyway, I'll stop there and see if there's any questions.

4 5

6

8

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

1

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, Council members this clean this proposal up. I think this was the best direction that the OSM. Most people are not gonna [sic] -- you know, most of the people that are gonna harvest bears under Federal Subsistence regulations are gonna [sic] get the meat, they could sell the skin. They'd have to get the State to seal the skin, the State likes to seal bears. They got to get certain data, you know, count them and all that. I think that it would address the State's concern about the harvest levels and so forth. They would be able to track the bear harvest. They're not opposed to harvest at all about bears. They would be able to track the harvest. So, I think this is a win-win proposal. So, I'm supportive of this WP24-01 with the OSM language to use the permitting system of Federal Subsistence permitting system and the sealing by the State. I think that addresses all of the issues. Any comments? Am I misunderstanding anything here, Brian? Go ahead.

232425

26

27

28

29

30

MS. WILLIAMS: Oh, thank you, Mr. Chair. The permit has not been created yet, and so, you wouldn't be able to do this until it's actually codified in regulation. So, the OSM staff with the regulation specialist within OSM will come up with a permit. So, that hasn't been decided yet of what the customary permit -- customary trade permit would say or look like.

31 32 33

 $\label{eq:CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, that clarifies that. Go ahead, Robert.$

343536

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Liz, you know, I think it was 20 some years ago that we put a proposal into the State about customary use of brown bears hide that where the tribes could take them and I think it was -- we asked for two, but I think the State shot us down on that, if I remember right. They said that we cannot because it's considered not a fur bearing animal or something like that, not to be to be sold. And now they come back 20 years later and say, we can do this. And my other question it was, when I -- we did talk to them, there was four of us, myself, James Walker, Carter Morgan and Ron Sam, were the ones that put that in. But the biologist for the State says, well, you're gonna [sic] have to be careful now, because north of the Yukon, it's grizzly bears and south of the Yukon is

brown bears. Okay, grizzly bears swim across the river.
Okay, now he's a brown bear. That's true, yes, or no?

 $\,$ MS. WILLIAMS: Now they consider them all $\,$ the same species.

6 7

MR. Walker: Well, that's what we were

8 told.

MS. WILLIAMS: Yeah, well.....

10 11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

MR. WALKER: I think sometimes, you know, having two species - you know, I always tell that as a joke because it's the Fish and Game State. And I always come here and these guys could never could quite understand that. That's just like me being an Indian going down the Anchorage, now I'm a white guy and that don't work, you know, because I am still who I am. But to have something like this, I mean, maybe you could clarify it or try to. Thank you, Liz.

202122

23

24

25

26

27

MS. WILLIAMS: Yes. Thank you, Council member Walker, through the Chair. Both I believe I could be wrong, but the State and the Federal Government now consider black and brown bears as fur bearers. No? Okay, we'll fix it then. But the other thing is, some of these regulations have changed since you spoke to those people 20 years ago.

28 29 30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48 49

50

WALKER: Well, yes. I mean, I understand, but you have to be specific when we do say this, because a brown bear is a different character from a grizzly bear. So, I mean, I would put both species in there if I was gonna [sic] be making this proposal because we could look at both, because they're both very carnivorous. They're just an eating machine, that's all they are. And one of these years, you know, we have our own feelings with our tribe. Just to be specific with what I'm going to say is that, now we have them roaming through our villages at night. And if somebody is gonna [sic] go visit somebody, somebody is gonna [sic] get eaten one of these days and whose responsibility is gonna [sic] be? It's not gonna [sic] be the tribal, it's not gonna [sic] be the city because the State wildlife trooper came to us and told us they belong to us. Okay, who bears the responsibility? That would be my other question for you. I mean, I'm not running this hard on you, but I wanna [sic] have answers to when I go home and talk to the tribes that I'm going to emphasize the point what is brought here. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Under the Federal Subsistence Regulations, they don't have brown and grizzly bears. They just have brown bear; they're now recognized as brown bears. You know, they're — they used to call grizzly bears. A lot of people still say grizzly bears, but they're brown bears. Ursus arctos, they're the same animal. And so, the — I'm looking for the State regulations here. They say brown grizzly bears, so maybe the Federal Subsistence Board or OSM should put brown/grizzly bears so that the public knows what they're actually talking about. So, that's a suggestion in the reg book part. That's what Robert's talking about. It's just the same animal. So, it's just — it's a — it's just the description.

15 16 17

18

19

MR. WALKER: It's not the same animal, Jack. Have you ever seen a characteristic of them side by side. You can tell a difference there between a brown bear and a grizzly bear, we could.

202122

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Yeah, there, you know, there are certain morphological differences. But as far as they can breed together, you could have them breeding together. They would produce fertile offspring. They're pretty much the same thing. Their, you know, habitat has a lot of bearing on how much fish they eat and stuff like that. But I feel that this proposal WP24is worth supporting by the Council because it addressed the issues. We were supportive of this proposal, and this is what the Federal Subsistence Board does because it's a one bear area the State doesn't go along with. The State only has sale on two bear -- brown bear areas. So, we -- I'm supportive of what OSMs solution to this problem is and I feel that, you know, if somebody takes a bear and you gonna [sic] skin this bear out, you're gonna [sic] take it home and eat it. You should at least be able to sell the skin because the State is -- has very liberal bear harvests for brown grizzly bears. So, there's -- it's not like that we have a huge problem with bears and brown bear grizzly bears in Alaska. So, my feeling about this proposal that it's a worthwhile proposals [sic] and I would like to vote in favor of the proposal with the amended language for this -- for the permitting system. So, any.....

45 46 47

48

49

50

MR. WALKER: I mean. Mr. Chair, I am not going against this, but I just -- you know, I want to have -- or I'd like to see that these are two different species. Because I think if you're gonna [sic] sell a

grizzly bear and sell a brown bear, they're -- the brown bear is a lot bigger than grizzly bear when you stretch it out. It's something like maybe six foot five for a grizzly, and you can get like an 8.5 for a brown bear, nine footers.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, I mean but they're gonna [sic] reg it [sic] -- they're gonna [sic] manage them. The State is managing under brown/grizzly bear. They have the same brown/grizzly bear in Unit 24, that they have in Kodiak Island. So, they're -- it's -- there's -- they're not differentiating. And so, for this....

MR. WALKER: Tim, are you still online? Could you tell us the difference between a Kodiak bear and brown bear?

MR. GERVAIS: Brown bear from what area?

MR. WALKER: From the Yukon.

MR. GERVAIS: My take on it, it's all the same species. It's a naming convention based on the geographic location of where the bear lives.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, Boone and Crockett Trophy Club delineates brown bears as within 75 miles of the coast and interior of that are referred to as grizzly bears. It's just for discussion. But as far as the Board of Game or the Federal Subsistence Board, they're gonna [sic] manage in the Unit, they're gonna [sic] manage that general kind of an animal all the same way. They're not gonna [sic] differentiate between grizzlies and brown bears inside of the Unit. So, this proposal is for the sale of brown bears hides or grizzly bear hides under Federal Subsistence regulations in bears where there's — in Units where there's only one brown bear. So, you had a comment there, Nissa?

MS. PILCHER: I did, I just wanted to read something real quick from the analysis. And in the analysis, it does say we and I'm assuming by we, we mean OSM, classifies all Alaskan brown/grizzly bears as the same species, Ursus arctos, but refer to them differently depending on where they are found and their diet. So, in general.....

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Page 8.

MS. PILCHER: The common name brown bear refers to those Ursus arctos found in the coastal regions, and the common name grizzly bear refers to those brown bears found in the interior. So, commonly they are referred to differently. It's just OSM and I believe Fish and Game, even though I hate to speak for them, do classify them as just one species, even though it is recognized that there's -- they have different characteristics.

MR. UBELAKER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Go ahead, Brian.

MR. UBELAKER: Just hopefully a clarifying point, definitions of the State Regulations Guide. Grizzly bear is defined as, the terms brown bear and grizzly bear are synonymous. Fur bearers, under State regulations, are black bears, they're not grizzly bears or brown bears. Federal regulations - fur --definition of fur bearers under Federal regulations, does not cover any species of bear and then the only definition of bear in the Federal regulations is black, brown or grizzly.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, the -- Glen Stout might be able to answer the question for this discussion. How is the State categorizing brown bear, grizzly bears when they're sold? They're not furbearers or they're like just there -- that's part of the management of the brown grizzly bear. Since black bears are fur animals and grizzlies aren't, that seems to be a sticking point here. So, that Glenn's the guy. All right. Go ahead, Glenn.

MR. STOUT: Well, I don't know if I'm the guy. But no, I think you pretty much have it. The grizzly bear, brown bear in regulations, they're more or less synonymous. They're locally referred to brown bears, typically along the coast. Boone and Crockett, I think the 62nd parallel north, everything north of that is actually considered a grizzly. Those are common names, but it's the same species, and the regulations don't differentiate the two.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: This whole thing about black bears under State regulations are furbearers, grizzly bears are not, but they're still sold. So, they're just -- it's the sale of brown grizzly

bear parts, is part of the management of grizzlies under State regulation. It's not that they're fur bearers, it's just part of the hunting regulations.

MR. STOUT: That's exactly right, they're not a fur bearer. They're a big game animal.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Right. So, that clarifies the record. That's what the point of discussion is about. Thanks, Glenn, appreciate that. So, Don.

MR. HONEA: Oh, yeah. Mr. Chair, I'm really kinda confused about this. Can we actually pass this with modifications, or is that an option? I mean, I think the confusing part to me is the brown bear hides, as opposed to grizzly or black or whatever. I -- you know, and I mean -- actually, you know, I do support this because what are you gonna [sic] do with it? I mean, if you could eat it, I mean -- if you take it, I mean, what's the sense of taking it? I mean, if there was value to doing that, then so be it. It'd be better for -- to take her.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Don, go ahead.

MR. HONEA: You guys talking about brown bears and grizzly bears. And from what I'm hearing is in these Units. So, why don't you just voted for any bear, any brown bear or grizzly bear or whatever they may be, inside the Units that they're talking about. And whatever is in that unit, just leave it as is, as that at that end. Problem solved.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Right.

MR. HONEA: Brown bear or grizzly. They're both, they're there and that's what you're looking at. That's what's going to be sold anyway. So, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: And those Units would be either two brown bears or subunits would be two brown bears or one brown bear limit. This would allow it in the one brown bear Unit. So, we can adopt the amended proposal. This is the amended proposal by OSM. We're gonna [sic] adopt this amended proposal. If you're really stuck on this brown grizzly bear, we could go brown -- grizzly/brown bear in the title there and we could discuss, put that in there. That would be the

modification is to change brown grizzly bear and then adopt the amended language and then we're good. And it would be strictly for Units that are one brown bear units. That's what the sticking point is two versus one. And Robert.

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I support it too. But you know, if a buyer comes, say, hey, this is grizzly bear. I'm not gonna [sic] give you much for this as I would for a brown bear. That was my question. So, but if we're gonna [sic] declare it like we say we're gonna [sic] do, that's fine with me. But I still know the difference, you know? And I'll tell them, you know, this is the same price. Whatever it is we're gonna [sic] sell it'll cost you \$10,000, even though it's a grizzly bear, so.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Right.

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

 $\label{eq:CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, the Chair will enter -- oh, Tommy. \\$

MR. KRISKA: Oh, yeah. I have a lot of pictures of the bears that we shot, and I could tell some of them are brown bears and way in the interior and some are grizzlies that are in the interior. Maybe 50% of them are brown bears, there's some big bears. And so, it's like I said, it's -- go ahead with the Unit, whatever is that in the unit is go with that. Because you're never gonna [sic] tell -- they're never gonna [sic] give you a chance to figure if they're grizzly or brown bear. They're gone in a minute.

 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, the proposal is about Units. It's about bear -- Game management units that only have one brown bear limit. That's what the proposal revolves around. And so -- and just a general sale on Federal Subsistence regulations.

MR. KRISKA: I guess it was just two bears in whatever those Units were, right? It's only allowed in where there's two bears?

 MS. WILLIAMS: So, every Unit -- this is Liz Williams, OSM. Every Unit has a limit in the Federal Subsistence regulations and the State regulations. And the State could not issue the proper permits for a one-bear Unit. But under Federal Subsistence regulations,

you can harvest it in a one-bear Unit. And so, different Units have different amounts as their limit depending on the population maybe. And so, there are -- I think there's a few Units with even more than two, maybe not. 5 anyway, you can't get the Federal --International Sale Permit for a one-bear Unit through the State. So, OSM wanted to make it accessible to one bear Units as well as the two bear Units, and both brown and grizzly are included.

9 10 11

6

8

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Go ahead, Tommy.

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

MR. KRISKA: Yeah, that's kind of a touchy deal, that when you allow bear hides and bear all this stuff to be sold, and you're gonna [sic] have to watch it, because they may be a lot of bears out there, but there's a lot of ambitious people that want money. And it's going to end quick. So, we've got to be prepared to put a stop to it in some way. I'm not sure, but I'm [sic] kinda....

20 21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31 32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: They were -- I want to clarify that they're gonna [sic] have to get them sealed before they can sell them. So, they would -- the State would be tracking the number of harvests. And Glenn has a specific number of bears that can be harvested by Game. Right, Glenn? You got a -- pretty much each Game management Unit has a specific amount of bears that's harvestable surplus for that Unit. If that starts to get out of control, then their proposals could eliminate that. But right now, nobody's shooting bears. There's hardly -- the bear population keeps getting bigger, which shows the harvest is not restraining the bear population. And Subsistence -- this is a Subsistence proposal. The number of Subsistence eligibility is actually way smaller than the general population. So, I don't see where that's gonna [sic] be a big problem. I -- but if it does, it can -- they do have to be sealed to be able to sell them. You have to bring it to Glenn to get it sealed. He goes like, well, gee whiz, you guys are getting 25 bears out of your subunit here. We're gonna [sic] shut -- we're gonna [sic] have to throttle this down. So, that's - but I would be surprised.

43 44 45

MR. HONEA: Mr. Chair.

46 47

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Go ahead, Don.

48 49

MR. HONEA: Is there a motion on the

50 floor?

1		
2		CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Not yet. I'm trying
3	to get one.	ominimum non number. Not yet. I m erying
4	oo goo ono.	
5		MR. HONEA: Okay. I make that motion to
6	support.	4
7	11	
8		(Simultaneous speech)
9		,
10		CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: With the amended
11	language?	
12	J J	
13		MR. HONEA: With the amended language.
14		3
15		CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: And so, with
16	the	
17		
18		MR. HONEA: Thank you.
19		-
20		CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: With the caveat
21	that these are b	rown grizzly bear. So, we got a second
22	for that?	
23		
24		MS. PILCHER: Can I offer
25	clarification	••
26		
27		(Simultaneous speech)
28		
29		CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Sorry, correction.
30	Go ahead, Nissa.	
31		
32		MS. PILCHER: I just wanted to in the
33	- so, you moved	to support the revised OSM conclusion
34	in the addendur	n, which would be that new that
35		you guys were just talking about. So,
36	I just want to m	make sure that that is clear and on the
37	record.	
38		
39		CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Right.
40		
41		MS. PILCHER: Don, is that what you
42	wanted? So, that	's what we were just talking about, the
43	new permit.	
44		
45		MR. HONEA: Exactly.
46		
47		MS. PILCHER: Okay, there we go. So, we
48	just need a seco	nd. Thanks, Don.
49		
50		

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, the motion should read for WP24-01 February 25, OSM addendum with all of the supporting language, support with modification language. That's what we're talking about. Do we have a second, Tommy, was that you?

MR. KRISKA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Seconded. Further discussion on WP24-01 with addendum Modification Language. Questions called. Those in favor of the proposal as modified, signified by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

Opposed, same sign. Motion is adopted. So, now we're gonna [sic] go to break. Oh, go -- you got to find.....

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chair, thank you. Could we have the people -- could they get this permit online rather than have to go to find an office out in rural Alaska?

 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you, member Walker. Through the Chair, this is Liz at OSM. I don't know. We hope so, but that hasn't been determined yet. The Board is waiting to find out the Council's wishes related to this, and I -- as I understand it, the permit will be created after.

MR. VICKERS: I'll just add Liz is very correct in everything she says. I'll just add that — this is Brent Vickers, OSM, for the record. That we are working on an online database. That is something that OSM is working on. I'm hoping it goes live at some point soon but still working through a lot of the kinks and it's quite possible that if this particular proposal is adopted, it might take a little while for that permit goes into effect. Because, of just government stuff and trying to get a new permit started and everything. So, we'll have to — once this gets adopted, we'll have to get back to you on how soon we can start the permit and how — what the status of the online database is at that time.

MR. WALKER: Yes, that sounds like a perfect plan. You know, that's another thing with our government-to-government consultation with the tribe. So, if you can keep this up with the tribes and out in

rural Alaska. Just send them flyers or whatever. This would be so grateful. That way we wouldn't have to ask questions or call people up, which a lot of times people don't get to happen because it's the same question over and over and over. Thank you, Mr. Chair. 7 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: We're gonna [sic] 8 have to go to a timeout for ten minutes, and then we 9 have time certain Tanana Chiefs Conference Tribal Resource Stewardship Department and Kuskokwim Inter-10 Tribal Fish Commission joint presentation on the chum 11 12 bycatch. And so, I'm sorry we got bottled up here with 13 -- we're running a hair behind schedule, but we need a 14 ten-minute break. Ten. We're gonna [sic] be back at 15 quarter after four. 16 17 MS. PILCHER: We say five, but we know 18 it'll be ten anyway 19 20 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Let's say five. 21 22 (Off record) 23 24 (On record) 25 26 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, we're gonna 27 [sic] be coming back to order. We're past our ten 28 minutes, aways -- five minutes or so over. So, Tommy, 29 let's see who else we need here. Where's Robert? Robert 30 and Don. Where'd they go? 31 32 MS. PILCHER: They might be outside. I 33 can go look for them. I just want to..... 34 35 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So..... 36 37 MS. PILCHER: I can go look for him out 38 in the hallway. But just so everybody knows, Krystal 39 just helped me by passing out a green folder. The green 40 folder is intended for this presentation and then also 41 information regarding the session this evening. I didn't 42 want to get them mixed up together. So, her PowerPoint 43 is in there. I will be putting it on the screen, but I'm 44 gonna [sic] go pop out in the hallway. 45 46 (Pause) 47

48

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: You can introduce yourself if you'd like. Turn the mic on.

49 50

MS. LAPP: Good afternoon. I didn't know if we were still waiting for people to get seated. But I'm happy to introduce myself. I'm Krystal Lapp, I'm with Tanana Chiefs Conference in their Tribal Resource Stewardship Department. I am the natural resource policy analyst. So, I'll be providing a quick presentation today that kind of preludes into the special engagement session with the North Pacific tonight. And through the Chair, just let me know when you would like me to get started on the presentation.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Council members in the room. So, Robert, Don, we're getting the presentation here. So, go ahead and proceed.

MS. LAPP: Thank you, Chair and members of the RAC. Let me just make sure it's up. We're still working on getting the presentation put on the projector. However, you guys did receive a handout of the hard copy presentation, so. And there are print outs available for members of the public over there on the resource table. All right, so since I already introduced myself and I'm going to go through my little spiel here. So, good afternoon, everyone. Today I'll be discussing the ongoing environmental impact statement process for the chum salmon bycatch management in the Bering Sea. My presentation will be highlighting the role of tribal cooperating agencies through this process. The tribal cooperating agencies include Tanana Chiefs Conference, and the Kuskokwim River Inter Tribal Fish Commission. I'm the only one up here today. My co-author with the Kusko Fish Commission is on vacation, which I fully endorse.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Who is your co-

author?

MS. LAPP: Her name is Teresa Vicenti

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay.

MS. LAPP: And on the very last slide, it does include both of our contact information. Which is why I'm going off of the script here, cause they're not here to answer questions. But again, this presentation is intended as an overview of the contributions made by the cooperating agencies and a high-level overview of the revised five alternatives, TCC and KRITFC to the chum salmon bycatch process. It is not meant to provide detailed technical explanations

6

8

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

or advocate for specific policies on alternatives. However, the opportunity to ask those types of questions will be available this evening during the special RAC North Pacific Council engagement at 6:30. And so, as we go on to slide two, page two, this is a brief overview on what a cooperating role means. I do want to highlight that the cooperating agency agreements that we've entered into with NOAA NMFS is pretty unprecedented, and we've both been navigating this environmental impact statement process going forth. So basically, cooperating agency means is that we were identified as having specific expertise and our specific expertise as cooperating agencies, our role is basically to ensure that traditional knowledge and scientific data and lived our experiences of communities are accurately represented within the Chum Bycatch Environmental Impact Statement process. While we will highlight the impacts of salmon declines in key areas of concern, the final policy decisions will be made through the formal regulatory process, with input from multiple stakeholders.

212223

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

As cooperating agencies within the EIS, and KRITFC have provided again traditional knowledge, scientific data and lived experiences to ensure the voices of our communities are heard in Federal decision making. We've contributed to key sections of the draft EIS focusing on the environmental, cultural, economic impacts of the salmon declines specific to chum salmon. I want to highlight that this EIS process formally began in July 2023 and is currently ongoing. The average time of this process is anywhere from one to three years, and potentially more, depending on the complecixity [sic]. As far as, when we became cooperating agencies, KRITFC became a cooperating agency in October 2023 and in April of 2024 Tanana Chiefs Conference became a cooperating agency. The other cooperating agency is the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and currently the National Marine Fisheries Service, or NOAA fisheries, is lead agency in the EIS process. And just to expand a little bit on the specific special expertise that we were identified as in our MOU. It's regarding the life cycles, including freshwater and marine stages of chum salmon management and Subsistence use in the Kuskokwim Yukon River, environmental, economic and social importance to the Kuskokwim and Yukon River regions. Our expertise also includes traditional knowledge, local knowledge, scientific data and experience as salmon management agencies within the Kuskokwim and Yukon areas. KRITFC

was also identified as a special expertise to include 1 traditional knowledge, local knowledge and Western science expertise in the Bering Sea ecosystem, including impacts of salmon bycatch on the Kuskokwim River ecosystem, community and economies. So, if you go to 5 6 page three. This is just a general highlight of direct contributions that TCC and KRITFC provided to the body 8 of the EIS. We also have some appendices, which is on 9 page four. But I want to highlight that our focus has 10 been on incorporating traditional knowledge historical data and scientific analysis to ensure that the lived 11 experiences of our people along the Kuskokwim and the 12 13 Yukon rivers and its tributaries are reflected in the 14 decision-making process. Our contributions 15 critical areas such as the cultural, economic and health 16 implications of chum salmon declines. The role of chum 17 salmon and subsistence economies, and the cumulative 18 effects of environmental changes as well as bycatch policies. If you go to page four, you'll see that within 19 20 the body of the EIS as cooperating agencies, we've contributed to over 18 sections in the main document, 21 22 as well as provided seven appendices. Those appendices 23 serve as additional and supplemental information to the 24 co-authored sections within the chum bycatch, EIS, and 25 or points that we wanted to make sure were put forth for 26 decision making that were not in the main document. And 27 I just want to put a note out there, if you would like 28 me to send any of our appendices or the specific sections 29 within the EIS that we've co-authored, I can get that 30 to your coordinator, and she can distribute those and 31 then also at Tanana Chiefs, we are happy to provide 32 printed materials as well, if that would work better. 33 And so, we go on to page five. And this is just a basic 34 overview of the February 2025 North Pacific Fishery 35 Management Council. They held a special meeting on this 36 is EIS in February. So, just a few weeks ago. That was 37 because the second preliminary draft was published 38 December 20th of 2024. And so, what happened there is 39 we had tribal members, we had tribes, we had tribal non-40 profits, tribal consortiums, as well as allied 41 organizations attend this meeting to help guide the 42 regulatory process as we move forward in finalizing this 43 draft and getting it ready for publication. I do want to highlight that TCC and KRITFC provided presentations 44 45 to the Advisory Panel as well as the Council, and then 46 we were available for questions with the Scientific and 47 Statistical Committee. Overall, our presentations were 48 well received. We received a lot of great questions from 49 all of the committees and Council members. And then 50 ultimately some decisions were made based off of

testimonies. And just for reference, we had over 80 1 people testify to the Advisory Panel and over 180 people testify. And this is in person to the Council. I do want to highlight again that we had testimony from tribal 5 members along the Yukon-Kuskokwim, Bristol Bay, Norton 6 Sound, and Southeast Alaska. They all sent tribal representatives and there was a big amount of unity 8 amongst all of the tribes that were there, even those 9 who were not experiencing the chum salmon declines that 10 we are on the Yukon. (Pause) Oh sorry, and I just want to note that again, based on the feedback, the Council 11 12 has now revised some of the alternatives for the chum salmon bycatch management. And I'll go into that a little 13 14 bit further as we go into a few other -- well, the last 15 page, trying to make it short and sweet for everybody 16 here. So, the next page contains and it's the last page, it contains a lot of information. And again, we know 17 18 that you guys got a lot of paperwork, so we wanted to 19 keep it pretty short and sweet and to the point. The 20 first section goes over the summary of alternatives to 21 be analyzed. As we move forward, there are still five 22 alternatives. There have been slight revisions to a 23 couple of those. We did our best to summarize those but 24 again, this evening in the special engagement, more of 25 those technical kinda [sic] nitty gritty information 26 will be provided. As the process continues, there's 27 still several critical steps that lie ahead. The North 28 Pacific Fishery Management Council, National Marine 29 Fisheries Service and the cooperating agencies will 30 continue refining the analysis of the Environmental Impact Statement, which is set to be 31 32 published with the Federal Register sometime in August, 33 is the anticipated date. Once released, there's gonna 34 [sic] be opportunities for public comment and we 35 strongly encourage tribal representatives, tribal 36 members, community members and members of Boards and 37 commissions such as this RAC to remain actively engaged 38 and participate. Additionally, NMFS remains open to 39 requests for tribal consultation. This is to ensure that 40 Indigenous perspectives are fully covered or considered 41 in the final decision-making process. On the bottom 42 portion of this presentation, it does not provide dates. 43 I did not have that at the time that we drafted this 44 presentation. However, I do have that now. So, the next 45 phase or phases involves finalizing the draft EIS, which 46 again, once published, a public comment period will open 47 for that. This process helps refine the proposed 48 alternatives as we go through the finalization process 49 and ensuring that the final policies align with 50 community priorities while promoting sustainable

1 fisheries management. That is the goal of cooperating agencies. We also urge everyone to continue to stay informed, participate in discussions contribute to shaping the final EIS through public 5 comment. Or you can always reach out to myself or Teresa Vicenti if you have specific questions or you would like additional tribal input put into this final draft. So, 8 going forward, August 2025 is when we anticipate NMFS 9 will be publishing the final draft to the Federal 10 Register. There will be a 60-day public comment period on that. December 2025 is the anticipated final action 11 12 of the North Pacific Fishery Management Council. Which 13 basically just means that they're going to hopefully 14 choose a preferred alternative or a combination of 15 alternatives and approve the draft EIS as final. As we go into the next year, we're gonna [sic] be looking at 16 November 2026 of the issuance of the final EIS. The next 17 18 month, in December, the issuance of record of decision 19 in roughly six months, depending on the complexity of 20 what's chosen, regulations would be implemented on that 21 record of decision. Please keep in mind that this 22 timeline is per the NEPA process and doesn't necessarily 23 reflect the urgency or the motivation of the North 24 Pacific Council to actually get this record of decision 25 going. So, we are hoping that we can fast track this a 26 little bit because we do want to ensure that our salmon 27 populations are being protected in some way in the Bering 28 Sea. But again, I want to just thank you guys for your 29 time and allowing me to come up here. I have a lot of 30 information that I could be up here for a whole day. So, 31 I apologize if there's holes in this presentation. But 32 I do, again, encourage questions and I encourage you 33 guys to reach out one on one.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, does any Council members have questions on Krystal's presentation? Okay. I have Don. Go right ahead.

MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Krystal I -- oh there's a lot of questions, actually, but so, the alternatives like alternatives one through five. Is that the timeline on there or this will be done or something like that. I mean I see you got bycatch, I see you got numbers in there. So, how does that work with -- where are you on the alternatives? Is that a appropriate question? I mean, I'm just wondering, you know, how does that work? How does your alternatives work? If you could explain that. Thank you.

49 50

34 35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

5

6

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

2425

MS. LAPP: Through the Chair. Thank you, Don, for that question. It is quite a confusing process. And as someone who came into this process a few years ago as an advocate and delegate and now the policy analyst, I will let you know that I'm still always continuing learning this process. So, with that said, the alternatives were not picked by the cooperating agencies they were formed by this Environmental Impact Statement. And so, these five alternatives came about from public comment, from analysis and from the data. So, the reason why we listed those out is because we wanted you to be aware of a very vague or a very short summary of those alternatives. As far as where we're at in the timeline of those that's not something as a cooperating agency, we would be able to pick a preferred alternative and be able to have the North Pacific implement that in. That's where that public comment comes in. In your quy's packet over here, we do have Chief Elias Saylor's position statement on the preferred alternatives that TCC has put in. What we're looking at as far as when an alternative or combination of alternatives would be chosen that would be anticipated in that December 2025 meeting. And so, that's where that would be chosen, Don. I hope that answered your question. Sorry, it's a pretty loaded question. I'm trying to keep it real short and sweet.

262728

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

MR. HONEA: Mr. Chair. Yeah, thank you, Krystal. I realize it's a loaded question. If it wasn't your alternatives then, you know, I don't know how you'd answer that, but this whole thing is -- I've actually haven't been with the what is it, the Inter-Tribal Fish Commission. I've actually missed a few of their meetings this winter. And so, I'm kind of behind on, you know, where we are, the projected chum, kings, whatever. So, I'm just coming in kind of blind here, but I thank you for that.

37 38 39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

MS. LAPP: Oh, sorry. Through the Chair. Just some additional information, as we move forward into the finalization process of this EIS, both the cooperating agencies, as well as other tribal agencies throughout Alaska will be providing webinars, handouts, and we have a list of policy people that you can reach out to, one on one to get clarification on this process and to get caught up. We also have some resources listed on the Kuskokwim Fish Commission website and TCC's website as well.

48 49 50 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Any other Council questions for Krystal? You're still there, Tim Gervais.

MR. GERVAIS: Yes, I am. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Krystal, this is Tim Gervais. Can you explain briefly why there isn't EIS being developed for this management plan, and how often these management plans are developed?

MS. LAPP: Through the Chair. That is an excellent question. I'm actually going to defer that to the special engagement tonight. Just because we as a cooperating agency, we do have the history on how this came about. But I think some of those questions will be answered as well in their presentation. I do have a timeline slide of kinda [sic] how we got here. And I can definitely pull that up and send that over to Nissa to make sure you guys get it as well. It's highly detailed, there's a lot of information in there. And again, just to be courteous of time, I could probably spend hours talking about that timeline as to how we got here. This has been a few, quite a few years in the making, and we still have quite a few years to go before we get this record of decision. So, if that's agreeable through the Chair and through the members, I will be happy to send that off right now.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay, thank you. Did that answer your question, Tim?

31 MR. GERVAIS: (Indiscernible) question, 32 Mr. Chair?

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Oh, go ahead, Tim.

MR. GERVAIS: Krystal, I'm looking on, let me see what page this is, page 18 of 104. I don't think it's your presentation. It's the actual draft EIS and you have a pie chart showing that about three quarters of the bycatch is from either Northeast or Southeast Asia. And I'm wondering, based on your interaction with North Pacific Management Council, what — how does the Council and how do these Asian countries — what's their response to that level of bycatch from their homeward fish?

MS. LAPP: Just clarifying question through the Chair, for Tim. You're asking, you are looking at the EIS, and I do understand that. I believe you're looking at an analysis that was not part of the

cooperating agency analysis regarding the percentage amount of chum bycatch that are coming from foreign countries and what the North Pacific feels or thinks about that? I just want to clarify.

MR. GERVAIS: Yeah, I'm wondering if they regard, like obviously they're -- they get feedback from Alaskan groups that are concerned with chum salmon bycatch. But what does -- what are the concerned parties such as North Pacific Management Council and the two cooperating agencies, TCC and Kuskokwim Inter-Tribal Fish Commission, what degree of concern is there regarding these non-Alaskan bycatch components, which are extremely large.

MS. LAPP: Through the Chair. Yes, thank you for clarifying that. So, I definitely can't speak on behalf of the North Pacific Fishery Management Council. Or NOAA NMFS. I do want to note that on our, let's see, that'd be page three of our little presentation. In one of those bubbles it talks about, like the cumulative effects as well as, like the ecosystem and things like that. Kusko Fish Commission and TCC are highly concerned with the amount of non-Native chum salmon to our area and how much that is making up the bycatch. So, we did address some of that briefly in our appendices as well as in the body of the EIS. It is a concern but I would definitely say, hold that question as well for the North Pacific this evening. I think that they would be better able to state their position on their side. But in a nutshell, yes, it is concerning how many fish are coming from those areas.

MR. GERVAIS: Okay. Thank you for your presentation and thank you and the Kuskokwim International Travel Fish Commission for getting involved with this important matter. That's all I have, Mr. Chair.

 $\label{eq:CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay. Thanks, Tim.} Any other questions?$

(No response)

I appreciate your presentation, Krystal. It's -- I see your discussions here from TCC about the various options alternatives. And for years I've -- I felt that they -- there should be area closures and time, and the setting bycatch limits in this. When we got these kind of stock returns like, there's not a

lot of data about the -- I took genetic samples on the 1 Koyukuk River for chum salmon. We got a big data set, but we're not actually taking it at Area M we're not actually looking at what the genetic makeup is moving 5 into the Bering Sea. And so, they're basically going to 6 track across the Bering Sea, and they need to move the fleet out of that -- out of the direction of that travel. 8 There's certain time frames, the trigger could be when Area M begins to harvest and when they start catching 10 significant bycatch of chum salmon. That's your starting point when you're going to have fish intercepted in the 11 Bering Sea with the trawl fleet. The -- you know, when 12 13 you take the big pie of all the bycatch throughout the 14 entire year. And so, the fleets fishing on some hatchery 15 fish from over from Asia. And that's mixing apples and 16 oranges. We're trying to get our fish back to the 17 spawning grounds and whether the -- their travel time 18 is in the summer. So, area time of enclosure is a big 19 deal. And I see that you know, that's more supported by 20 TCC.

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

But your -- as your State it's -- we're still a long ways out on their development of, you know, they -- they're gonna [sic] want to keep bumping these caps up. And I'm not real excited about seeing really high ceilings on those caps when we have such abysmal returns. I mean, some of these -- there's discrete stocks, you know, you're talking about discrete stocks. There's discrete stocks that can be completely obliterated with -- if harvest occurs at heavy times of the year. So, this is -- these are some of the questions I have. I have questions about the pink and chum salmon release in the North Pacific, and the competition for our stocks in general. There's these other issues that the North Pacific is gonna [sic] have -- Pacific Fisheries Management Council is gonna [sic] have to take a more holistic outlook on what this problem is. It would actually behoove them to actually analyze, they have the staff to analyze. NOAA takes trophic level inventories on the Pacific Ocean. They could correlate that to marine bird die offs and other declines in populations. And they could set, they could have suggestions of hatchery release in the North Pacific, Bering and North Gulf of Alaska there has to be a bigger outlook on this. And so, I feel that you're looking at all of these various issues and the, you know, the inseason warm water effects with the size reduction. There -- this has gotta [sic] -- this puzzle's been busted open, and it's got a lot of little pieces that all fit together. And so, but some of the big glaring pieces

that are just sitting there in plain view, you can see 1 the picture is too many stock fish, hatchery fish moving on to the -- out into the marine system, when we have marine declines like this. And so, North Pacific, it 5 behooves them to actually -- they have a lot of political power to leverage for reductions in hatchery to get more fish back. So, they don't come under spotlight, killing the last returning fish. That's what I'm gonna [sic] be 8 9 talking to the North Pacific about myself personally. 10 So, I really appreciate all the work. And you have a lot of stuff rolling around in your head, and I can see 11 12 that, and you would just, would love to just talk to us 13 for hours. But I'm pretty short on time here because 14 we're gonna [sic] have to go to dinner break pretty soon. And because we gotta [sic] be back here at 6:30 15 prompt. We gotta [sic] get this council at this table 16 17 at 6:30 p.m. cause we got two hours to talk to the North 18 Pacific Fisheries Management Council and make some.....

19 20

UNIDENTIFIED: (Indiscernible)

2122

23

24

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: I don't have any money. And the OSMs broke, they took their cards away from yesterday. So, I do appreciate your discussion. You have any final comments?

252627

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44 45

46

47

48

49

50

MS. ERICKSON: No, I just want to say, some of the points that you had brought up when it comes to time, area closures and caps. During the last two North Pacific meetings where we had strong testifiers come in there, the revisions made, or new alternatives added was a direct result of that interaction amongst our people and our allies. So, my biggest thing is, you know, keep engaging as RAC. I do appreciate all of the letters that both the Eastern and Western Interior RACs submitted to the North Pacific. And then individually, make sure that you go home and tell your people that this is an important thing. The things that do happen in -- when our juvenile salmon are out there, you know, living it up in the world. They need to be able to go live it up, but they need to make it sure they get back home. So yeah, we do know that this is a multifaceted issue. I want to just make that loud and clear. We know that it's typically, like most other things that fall, it isn't just one thing that makes it fall. It's a cumulative effect of many different things. But as humans and as people who are stewards of our land, and our fish, and our wildlife and our waters both in the interior and those who make the regulatory decisions out in the ocean. They're stewards too,

whether they want to believe it or not, because they 1 make those decisions for the people. So, my biggest thing is, while there's many different things that we can't control as humans, we need to look at the things we can 5 control. And where can we change those? And so, 6 throughout this whole EIS process that I've been through, that's really what we're focusing on. And when 8 we look at our traditional knowledge and we look at our 9 knowledge holders and our elders, that is a big thing 10 that they hone in to me, every single time, is we can't 11 control everything. We can only control what we do. So, 12 I want to definitely say, Chief Green from Galena Loudon 13 over there, when we were down at the North Pacific, he 14 asked the question of when you leave today, did you do 15 everything that you possibly could? Whether that leads 16 to something that you want or not. But did you do everything you possibly could? And if you say yes, then 17 18 you did. But if you say no, then you didn't. So, I just 19 wanted to leave that there cause [sic] that definitely stuck in my brain, on those days where I feel like I'm 20 21 not doing enough. And yes, you're right I definitely 22 have tons of stuff bouncing around my head, and I could 23 take a whole week if I would like to go over everything, but unfortunately, I can't. And that's why, again, feel 24 free to reach out and if I don't have the answer, I'll 25 26 find someone that does have the answer. So, senii.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay, thank you.

Don.

2728

29

30 31

32 33

34

35

36 37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44 45

46

47

48 49

50

MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Krystal, I'm a little confused here. So, you -- there's nobody in the audience here that is representing Yukon River Intertribal Fish Commission. Is that Eva Dawn? I mean so, I mean, it's kinda interesting that you know, the -- you guys' position or something I'm trying to figure it out. Is that hunting and fishing and stuff and -- because it you know, it changes so often, the Boards or the seats change so often. So, if we - so, it seems like you guys got a pretty good handle on the chum and stuff like that. But isn't that the job of the Yukon Intertribal Fish Commission? I mean, is that even on am I mixing it up here, because I -- last I know, it was the gal from Eagle. What's her name? Karma. Yeah. And so, I've been out of the loop since then, but I was just --it's kinda confusing, under what umbrella everybody -- and I don't wanna [sic] take too much time on this, but I just thought if I had the fish questions like this. Do I go to Yukon Inter Tribal or you guys? Thank vou.

MS. ERICKSON: Yeah, I could just give a quick update. So, Karma, chief Karma Ulvi of Eagle was the Chair up until about end of November for the Fish Commission, and she was also the Acting ED. She stepped down from that role and they had an executive Council meeting, and they appointed Charlie Wright as the Chair of the Fish Commission. He's now the Acting ED also. And they're in the process of becoming their own 501C3 standalone entity. And they had a meeting early January and I believe they have another meeting date set for end of April. We did have representatives, Eva, and they hired Jazmyn Vent as their outreach coordinator, but I think they stepped away. But we could talk more after, too, about touching base with them more.

MR. HONEA: Okay, just one quick question here. So yeah. So, even though Charlie and Eva and them, they're still in there, you guys support them, supplement them with help in the fisheries?

MS. ERICKSON: Yeah. So, the Fish Commission and TCC will remain like sister orgs, similar to how we work with Denakkanaaga and F&A and Doyon as sister orgs working towards similar goals. Yeah, and so, we will continue to work on fisheries issues at TCC. Our chiefs won't let us not work on fish so, we'll always remain in that arena also.

MS. LAPP: I just wanted to add that per our MOU that we signed, the Yukon River Intertribal Fish Commission is listed as a sister organization and has contributed to the EIS in the appendices. So, we do work closely with them on this process.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay. Final comment Tommy?

MR. KRISKA: Yeah, thank you. Thank you, guys, for all you do. And I've been there for a lot of years with you guys, and I really appreciate everything that you're doing. I'm sorry I missed the last few meetings. I'm like Don a little bit, kind of bouncing around and you get into a lot of other things and then — but never give up. And just you guys are doing a great job from what I can see and thank you for that. And I know something will happen. Thank you.

MS. ERICKSON: Thank you, Tommy.

1 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you, Tommy. 2 Thank you. 3 4 MS. LAPP: Thank you. 5 6 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, we're gonna 7 [sic] go to break, dinner break. And we're gonna [sic] 8 be back here at 6:30 p.m. sharp. We can leave these and 9 we're gonna [sic] come back here. We're gonna [sic] have 10 a.... 11 12 (Off record) 13 14 (On record) 15 16 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Oh, what time is 17 it? Oh, we're two minutes late. Are you there, Tim? Tim 18 Gervais? 19 20 MR. GERVAIS: Yes, Jack. I'm here. 21 22 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay. And just 23 maybe get a little close to your mic. So, we're gonna 24 [sic] to bring this meeting to order, cause [sic] I got 25 to by talking about different issues and lose track of time. So, I got 6:34 on my watch here. And so, I would 26 27 like to go around the room and for the record, and 28 introduce our various North Pacific Fisheries Management 29 Council and, through our Council to introduce ourselves 30 and then down to the your staff, down on the other end. 31 How would that be? So, we'll start over here on the left 32 corner. I can't read your name. 33 34 MS. VANDERHOEVEN: Ηi, I'm 35 Vanderhoeven. I'm a North Pacific Council member from 36 Washington State. 37 38 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay, cool. 39 40 MS. BAKER: Hello, I'm Rachel Baker and 41 I work for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. I'm based in Juneau, and I serve as commissioner Doug 43 Vincent-lang, designee on the North Pacific Fishery 44 Management Council 4.5 46 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you and then 47 yeah, just continue to introduce yourself. Don, where 48 are you from? 49

MR. HONEA: Check. Don Honea, Jr. Village of Ruby, Western Interior.

2 3 4

1

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Robert.

5

7

MR. WALKER: Good after -- good evening, Robert Walker. I'm also a tribal chief here, and I work with the Western Interior and welcome.

8 9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, Ι'm Reakoff, Chair of the Western Interior Council. I've been on this Council since 1993, when they inseminate, the inception of these Councils. And I live in the Central Brooks Range in Wiseman, Alaska. I've lived in the Brooks Range since I was three years old, I was born in the Territory of Alaska in 1957. Got the seal of the territory on my birth certificate. Like a lot of other people in this room here, and so I have a lot of interests, and I've worked on fish and wildlife issues as Chairman of the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee. I am also on the Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission. I can talk Fish and Game with various biologists. So, that's me. And here is.

232425

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$ PELKOLA: I'm Jenny Pelkola from Galena and I'm on the WIRAC.

26272829

30

31 32

33

34 35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44 45

46

MR. SIMON: Pollock Simon Sr. is my name. I live in Allakaket, Upper Koyukuk River. And I'm a fisherman, hunter, trapper, and dishwasher, subsistence and Allakaket. In the last several years there hasn't been any salmon (indiscernible) but, we were restricted from taking salmon, and chinook salmon chum salmon. But we have whitefish and sheefish that we depend on. But life is kind of different with no salmon, like up and down river to chinook salmon is the main fish diet for our peoples. We have whitefish, which is good too but not quite as good as chinook salmon, so. We've been out trying, working together, the different agencies, peoples up and down river has been listening to Fish and Games and Wildlife, the rules and regulations. We abide by these rules even though we (indiscernible) that chinook salmon swim upriver. But when you're sitting on it cause we want to reach. (indiscernible) built up again. He will get fish from reaching the (indiscernible) they don't have chinook fish. But it's not the same as the ones we pulled from the river....

47 48 49

50

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, Pollock, they're gonna [sic] give us a report on the Bering Sea.

1 2 MR. SIMON: Okay. 3 4 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: And so, they're 5 gonna [sic] be talking about that. 6 7 MR. SIMON: Thank you. 8 9 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you. So, 10 appreciate those comments, Pollock. Pollock is a long standing. He was also on the Western Interior Council 11 12 in the inception. And so, Pollock has got a lot of, you 13 know, compassion about -- and we have to hear about the 14 compassion, about this issue. So, thank you very much, 15 Pollock appreciate that. Tommy? 16 17 MR. KRISKA: Tom Kriska, originally from 18 Koyukuk, live in Nulato. And I'm in Middle Yukon Advisory 19 Committee. The WIRAC, Yukon River Drainage Fisheries 20 Association and Fish Commission, so. 21 22 MR. MOLLER: Yeah, thank you for having 23 me. John Moller, originally from Unalaska. I'm a Council 24 member on North Pacific, Alaska one of the Alaska Council members. I was appointed this last summer and recently 25 26 completed my third meeting as a Council member so, I'm 27 happy to be here. Thank you. 28 29 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Welcome. Steve. 30 31 MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah, good evening. Thank 32 you for having me. My name is Steve Williams, I'm the 33 Oregon representative to the North Pacific Fishery 34 Management Council. 35 36 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you. 37 38 MS. HAAPALA: Hi, everyone. My name is 39 Kate Haapala, and I work on Council staff as an analyst, 40 and I'm one of the staffers who work on the Bering Sea 41 Chum Salmon Bycatch Actions. So, thanks for having us 42 and glad to be here. 43 44 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you. 45 46 MS. MARRINAN: Hi. My name is Sarah 47 Marrinan. I'm also Council staff and with Kate worked 48 on this EIS, and I'm happy to be here. I'm based out of 49 Anchorage, and I've worked with Council staff for little 50 over ten years now. So, appreciate you having us.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you. I really appreciate the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council and staff attending this meeting. It's a very important issue to us. And so, I'm very appreciative that you've taken the time to come here to speak to our Council about your various options on chum bycatch. I also have Tim Gervais on the phone. You want to introduce yourself, Tim.

MR. GERVAIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Tim Gervais from Ruby. I've been on the WIRAC for, I don't know for sure around 15 years. I hold a commercial user's seat. I have not been able to commercial fish on the Yukon since 1998. I have not subsistence fished on the Yukon since 2017. I would like to get our chum and king salmon runs returned, and our escapement goals met on an annual basis. Thank you for showing up to discuss the chum salmon plan with us.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay. Thanks, Tim. So, I'll turn this over to your able staff here. That's gonna [sic] give us a presentation and you have PowerPoint that accompanies this?

MS. MARRINAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, there's a PowerPoint. I passed out some paper copies to RAC members and North Pacific Fishery Management Council members, and I believe there's a pile of them for people in the public too, if you want a paper copy. I'm gonna [sic] be providing a presentation here and I also wanted to note within the paper copies, there's a lot of extra slides and content as well that I can reference and if you have questions, I can move to some of those slides as well. But thank you again for having us. One thing I wanted to note before I walk through this presentation is that on the outreach trips that we're doing, including this one, we don't have a quorum of our Council members here. So, it's not a formal meeting of the Council that these members represent. I just wanted to make sure to highlight that. In terms of what RAC members and the public can expect, staff and Council members are gonna [sic] keep track of key themes and reoccurring questions and topics that come up during these sessions and we're gonna [sic] provide a written report to the full Council on all of the RAC outreach at a future Council meeting. So, that will be forthcoming. And Nissa, should I just tell you when I -- next slide. Okay. So, next slide. So, to just quickly walk through the plan, the presentation here. I'm gonna [sic] start with an overview of NPFMC

1 and the decision-making process. The main content for this presentation is focused on (distortion) the current 2 chum salmon bycatch action and the proposed alternatives that are being considered at the Council. Should the 5 RACs wish to continue to provide input to the Council 6 on this issue. I'll also cover some of the more 7 substantial changes made to the alternatives in 8 February. Krystal alluded to some of those earlier, and 9 if you have more questions or you want to talk in more 10 depth of those, we can certainly speak to that. And in the final part, we'll walk through the next phases of 11 12 the action timeline, what you can expect and how to be involved. So, next slide. The North Pacific Fishery 13 14 Management Council and National Marine Fisheries Service, or NMFS, jointly manage U.S. fisheries in 15 16 Federal waters off of Alaska. Those waters are 3 to 200 17 nautical miles from shore. In terms of process and 18 relationship, the Council is not a Federal agency. The 19 Council makes management recommendations to NMFS and the 20 U.S. Secretary of Commerce. And its NMFS responsibility and, 21 to write, approve implement and enforce 22 regulations. Lastly, the Council does coordinate and at 23 times jointly manage fisheries with the state of Alaska. slide, please. The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery 24 25 Conservation and Management Act is the primary law governing Federal fisheries management. This established 26 27 eight regional fishery management Councils, including 28 the North Pacific Council. It established the nation's 29 200 nautical mile exclusive economic zone, as well as 30 the national standards.

31 32

33

34

35

36 37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

The national standards are principles that must be followed in any management -- fishery management plan to ensure sustainable and responsible management. There are ten of them and the Council must consider all of them. Next slide, please. The Council's jurisdiction covers four regions the Arctic, Bering Sea, Aleutian Islands and the Gulf of Alaska. There's no Federal commercial fisheries in U.S. waters in the Arctic. The Council primarily manages groundfish, so that's, pacific cod, pollock, flatfish, sablefish, rockfish, for example. Also, shellfish and halibut, allocations and it includes a management of bycatch in the groundfish fisheries. Next slide. In terms of composition, the Council has 15 members, 11 of them have voting rights. Of those 11 seats, seven are appointed by the governors of either Alaska or Washington. The other four voting seats are held by various agency officials, and there are four non-voting seats that are held by different agency representatives, as well as the

U.S. Coast Guard. Next slide. The Council has five 1 meetings each year that typically run eight days in length. Three meetings are held in Anchorage and one in an Alaska community. Then there's one meeting that's 5 either held in Portland or Seattle each year. At all the 6 Council meetings, the -- and Council Advisory body meetings, they're all open to the public. Written 8 comments can be provided in advance of each meeting, and 9 the Council meetings are hybrid. Testimony can be 10 provided in person or virtually on agenda items of interest, and staff also stream the meetings over 11 YouTube for a low bandwidth option. Next slide, please. 12 13 So, the Council is currently considering management 14 (distortion). Our actions are focused on the Pollock 15 fishery because this fishery encounters the majority of 16 salmon caught as bycatch in Federal groundfish 17 fisheries. In one of those slides in the background 18 speaks to that point. So, the purpose of this action is 19 to reduce chum salmon bycatch to the extent practicable, 20 particularly Western Alaska chum salmon bycatch. And 21 this action is being considered in light of recent and 22 ongoing declines in Western Alaska chum 23 abundance. Next slide. So, this is a little hard to read 24 on the screen. You may be able to see it in the printed-25 out version, but the timeline provides milestones of 26 current action -- the current action aiming to minimize 27 chum salmon bycatch, and the impetus for this action 28 really came from tribal representatives and subsistence 29 fishers. In October 2021, the Council received public 30 testimony on chum and chinook run crashes in that year. 31 For which chum salmon coincided with a high bycatch year 32 as well. So, following that meeting in June 2022, the 33 Council received -- requested information and bycatch 34 reports. At that point, the Council requested the 35 industry take immediate action for the upcoming B season 36 to reduce bycatch. And it also initiated the Salmon 37 Bycatch Committee. So, there was a question that spoke 38 to this. I think Tim mentioned this earlier when he was 39 speaking with Krystal, that Salmon Bycatch Committee 40 made recommendations to the Council on the Purpose and 41 Need Statement. That was a consensus recommendation 42 which the Council adopted and made recommendations for 43 a set of alternatives. So, that Salmon Bycatch Committee 44 was composed of tribal representatives 45 representatives from the pollock fishery, and they 46 brought together concepts that were forwarded on to the 47 Council. The idea of the overall bycatch cap and came from the tribal representatives and the alternatives 48 49 four concept that I'm gonna [sic] speak more to came 50 from the pollock side of that. Since then, the Councils

received three different iterations of the analysis, 1 most recently, earlier this month. Next slide, please. I mentioned before, the Council makes recommendations to the National Marine Fisheries Service 5 and NMFS is the lead agency for this chum salmon bycatch action. There are three cooperating agencies providing special expertise to the analysis, ADF&G, Kuskokwim 8 River Inter Tribal Fish Commission and the Tanana Chiefs 9 Conference. Next slide. This slide depicts the range of 10 alternatives being considered. The Council is required by law to consider a no action alternative, which is 11 12 alternative one, and it would retain the existing chum 13 salmon bycatch regulations for the Bering Sea pollock 14 fishery. The Council is considering four action 15 alternatives, which are different ways to modify bycatch regulations. So, broadly, these changes include bycatch 16 17 caps that would close part or all of the Bering Sea pollock fishery if the limit is met. All regulations 18 would only apply to the B season or summer fishery of 19 20 the pollock fishery, because that is when they encounter 21 the majority over 99% of the chum bycatch, which is 22 during this season.

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

Next slide. Alternative one retains the existing bycatch regulations. So, this includes a rolling hotspot program and a chum salmon savings area. The hotspot program identifies areas on the pollock fishing grounds where chum salmon encounters are high. These areas are closed for three to seven days. Typically, the vessels are required to move elsewhere. The program is managed by a third-party entity. So, the figure on the top here shows all the hotspot closures from 2017 to 2023 under that program. The chum salmon savings area is on the bottom, that's shown in pink. This is a time area closure that's triggered by a bycatch cap. This area continues to exist in regulations, but it's really serves as a backstop measures if vessels choose not to participate in the rolling hotspot program, but that's never happened. So, the vessels participate in the top panel and the lower chum salmon savings area then doesn't apply to them. Next slide. As I mentioned, the impetus for considering regulatory action is due to declines in chum salmon abundance that are being seen throughout Western Interior Alaska and the critical significance of this species. I'm not gonna [sic] go into detail here because I know you are all intimately aware of this context, but just to inform you, the analysis captures data and information on stock status from Kotzebue Sound down to Bristol Bay on subsistence and commercial chum salmon harvest trends

on the importance of chum salmon across many dimensions 1 of human salmon ecosystem existence. And there -- these are sections that had substantial contributions from the cooperating agencies, Kuskokwim River Inter-Tribal Fish 5 Commission, TCC and ADF&G. And also, I'm highlighting 6 here their appendices that Krystal spoke to earlier, appendix seven to the paper from KRITFC in appendix eight 8 from TCC. So, this information provides context for 9 current conditions and a dynamic baseline under which 10 action is being considered. Next slide. So, focusing on 11 the action alternatives here, alternative two would modify existing bycatch regulations by including an 12 overall hard cap during the B season summer fishery. If 13 14 the cap is met, fishing must immediately stop and all 15 bycatch all bycaught chum salmon count towards the 16 limit. The range of the cap amounts being considered is 17 100,000 to 550,000. There are four options being 18 considered to divide this cap among the four sectors 19 that fish pollock. The approach, the approaches are based on bycatch history or the sector's pollock 20 21 allocation. Next slide. Alternative three is similar to 22 alternative two in that it includes a hard cap, but the 23 hard cap is associated with abundance indices. The hard 24 cap under alternatives three can turn on and off based 25 on returns in an area. Here, the policy choice for the 26 Council is really whether the cap would be in effect at times of higher abundance or not. There are two options 27 28 for indices being considered, but only one would 29 ultimately be selected for use. So, the first option is 30 a three-area index, and the second option is Yukon area 31 index. Next slide. Alternative four that's being considered would add six provisions to the existing 32 33 regulations for salmon bycatch Incentive Plan Agreements 34 or IPAs. The incentive plans are civil legal contracts 35 among certain members of the Pollock industry. Federal 36 regulations hold specific goals for salmon bycatch 37 avoidance that the contracts must design measures to 38 respond to, so to meet those regulations. The incentive 39 plans are approved by NMFS and the Council receives 40 annual reports on performance as accountability 41 measures. The proposed changes would require the 42 incentive plans to use historical genetic data to more 43 rigorously evaluate catch and bycatch data, to inform 44 closures more frequently, and ensure encounters are not 45 increasing without vessels responding by moving and 46 closing larger areas when encounters are high. The 47 incentive plans have been voluntarily amended in recent 48 years to include measures that largely respond to the 49 six provisions that would be added here. 50

5

6

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

This slide speaks to alternative five as it was written and analyzed prior to this February Council meeting that happened earlier this month. This alternative includes three different in-season corridor or time area closures. The corridor would close when a bycatch cap was met. The cap ranges are unique to each corridor, and they're shown in the figure here. The location and timing of the closure windows are based off of historical genetic information indicating Western Alaska chum make up a higher percentage of the total bycatch closer to the Alaska Peninsula and from June to mid-August. So, this slide reflects some of the changes that the Council made to alternatives five. This corridor cap option in February. It still includes the concepts of the in-season corridors, the three different options being considered. There are three different options here that are being considered. So, the table on the left shows the closure window, the cap range that triggers a closure, and a description of how that closure could work, and the managing entity for each option. The main thing to call attention to today are that, compared to what was considered previously prior to the February Council meeting. The corridor area is larger, and the range is correspondingly increased as well. Depending on the option the actual area that would close varies. So, the option in the -- on the left, in the middle of the slide is shown in orange. If the corridor cap is met, the entire area closes from that day until September 1st. An option one one which is shown on the right in blue and grey. Here, NMFS would be managing the corridor closure still, but rather than closing the entire area, it would close 75% of that corridor. The grey squares would represent areas that could remain open to fishing. So, these changes reflect the impact analysis that was presented in February that showed for some areas -- that showed that there could be a risk of the fleet moving into areas with higher chum in Western Alaska, chum bycatch with the smaller corridor closures. So, this approach also allows for some areas to remain open, and it's intended to provide flexibility for smaller vessels based on safety considerations.

41 42 43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

Next slide. So, those are alternatives. I have three slides here that capture some high-level points within the analysis. And I wanted to bring these forward to the RAC because some -- they may have some kind of counterintuitive results, and it may the RAC consideration of the proposed alternatives. So, this slide highlights that not all chum salmon that are being caught as bycatch in the

1 pollock fishery originate from Western Alaska. They originate from countries all across the North Pacific Rim, Asia, Russia, other parts of Alaska and the Pacific Northwest. They include hatchery chum from some of those locations, and we also have some of the extra slides, 5 6 point to more of this information. But so, the black bars in this figure demonstrate the total chum salmon 8 bycatch in the pollock fishery from all sources and the 9 blue bars are chum salmon caught as bycatch that were 10 estimated to be of Western Alaska origin. So, from Kotzebue Sound down to Bristol Bay and on the Middle and 11 12 Upper Yukon. So, a hard cap on the total chum salmon 13 places, a cap on the upper limit of the number of chum 14 that can be caught as bycatch. So, it either motivates 15 the fleet to lower that black bar, or it would be a 16 ceiling for it. When they reach that cap, they would be required to stop fishing. What's less clear is what 17 18 happens to the blue bar with a cap on all chum. So, the 19 analysis needs to consider what would fishermen do 20 before a cap is met? So, the incentive structure created 21 by the hard cap for fishermen could be to go to areas 22 with the lowest rates, lowest encounters of all chum 23 salmon, not necessarily where the lowest historical Western Alaska chum salmon have been. So, these 24 25 incentives to fish differently, as well as the cap 26 amounts, among other factors, could affect the scope of potential reductions when we're focused on Western 27 Alaska chum salmon. If the reductions in Western Alaska 28 29 chum salmon bycatch occur, and they result -- as a result 30 of any of the action alternatives that are being 31 considered, and those changes increase the number of 32 Western Alaska chum salmon returning to their natal 33 systems, there could be much broader benefits. And this 34 is another area where we worked with the tribal 35 cooperating agencies to characterize some of these types of benefits that could manifest. The analysis also 36 37 captured some of the other intervening variables that 38 add another layer of uncertainty and complexity in 39 whether these benefits would be realized.

40 41

42

43

44 45

46

47

48

49

50

Another consideration raised in the analysis is the timing of chum and Western Alaska chum encounters on the fishing grounds during the B season, and how they're different from encounters with chinook. Chum, in Western Alaska chum are more prevalent on the fishing grounds from June to mid-August. But chinook encounters increase in September and October. So, this dynamic can create challenges if the fleet is responding to increased chum salmon bycatch avoidance by delaying the start of their B season if they're moving more

5

6

frequently or taking more stand downs, and it ends up pushing them further later into the fall. There's a possibility of increased chinook salmon bycatch rates. The Council is also legally required to balance costs and benefits of a proposed action that would implement regulatory changes. The analysis uses different methods to evaluate the potential adverse impacts of costs on the pollock industry and communities, and some of that scope is captured in this slide.

9 10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

27

28 29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36 37

8

This slide provides an overview of other changes the Council made to the proposed alternatives in February. I wasn't planning to walk through these bullets in detail, but the full motion is available on the E-agenda, there's a link here. I think Nissa has some copies and we're happy to speak more to it and I'm sure Council members can answer questions from the most recent motion as well. Next slide, please. So, wrapping up, this is the tentative timeline moving forward. The Council recommended that analysts revise the document based on changes in input in February and for NMFS to publish the revised document as a draft EIS. Right now, document is tentatively being planned that publication in August. Then there would be a 60-day public comment period, and this would be the next first opportunity for written input. The August publication date reflects the time needed to accommodate a final recommendation being made by the Council in December 2025. Pending the Council's action at that time, we'd expect the agency, National Marine Fisheries Service, to begin the rulemaking or reg writing process. Next slide. So, here are other ways to get connected if you want to learn more about the issue. You can always reach out to Kate or myself. We have our email addresses that were listed at the beginning of the slide deck and as I mentioned, there's quite a few extra slides in the packet. Happy to talk more or speak to any of those and also happy to answer questions.

38 39 40

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, Council members have questions of the presentation? Oh, Tommy.

41 42 43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. KRISKA: I am just following along here and seems like you guys have a lot of information about your bycatch, your numbers, the salmon that caught and everything like that. I was just writing a little bit so, so much info and seems like you guys know your numbers and are -- and that are used to write up your presentation here, and -- but still, we don't even have salmon at all for the last seven years, and I don't know

if it's too late or you keep on waiting till 2025 to redo some of your recommendations or whatever you try. I'm just kinda lost, maybe baffled a little bit about this whole thing. I sure like to have salmon. Thank you.

5 6

1

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you. Any other questions or comments? Questions or comments, Tim?

7 8 9

MR. GERVAIS: Not at this time, Jack.

10

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

2425

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 REAKOFF: Okay. So, questions go back to -- under, you know, alternatives one. It shows a chum salmon savings area, small pink area. This correlates to the highest incidence of take in north of the peninsula in the B season. So, it's very apparent I -- that that's a critical area that should -- and alternatives. The various alternatives show that there could be some inshore areas in gray that could be fished in option 1.1 here. But the reality is, the (distortion) returning from the North Pacific are moving through the South Alaska Peninsula. The caps should be revolved around the corridor that the (distortion) I feel that these options one and one-one that's alternative five, is a very important aspect of trying to get this passage through without -- the -- my main questions revolve around -- I don't know if your staff actually has the answers to them are, if the -- if in the B season option one is implemented, there's complete closure during that time, when the option is -- when the fishery is released in August, the Pollock are still there aren't they? And so, you just harvest the fish that would've been caught earlier in the season. You're just displacing the harvest timing. But the fleet will amass on that once that's open again. So, I don't see where that's gonna [sic] be a hardship to have option of alternatives five option one as the corridor that's closed when we have chinook or coho moving through there. And so, then when they're re -- continue the season that it's wide open that the fishery can be fishing the western portion of their area outside the option one alternatives five and then they move on to that and they still harvest the fish. We were trying to get every last fish on the spawning ground. We're hardly getting any escapements into the spawning grounds. So, that's our problem. So, there's -- that's not that the fleet is completely precluded from fishing. They can fish the western portion of their shelf area that they're fishing on. When that -- when the fish have stopped moving through, they just move on to that sector, and they'll amass on that, and they'll take that. Take a large

5

6

8

9

10

11 12

13

portion of the harvest, will be after the critical period of passage of -- it's not just the chum that's also the cohos2 are passing through there also. And so, you know, we're getting passage of chinook that are coming through or they're a little earlier in the season, but still they're still (distortion) chinook that come in shore, seven in the late July, early August. So, I don't -- I feel that you have developed some corridor of remedies here. I think that there's times when you can - but the caps you know the -- I -- another one of my questions is, your -- the caps of 100 to 300,000 or whatever it was, whatever it's those caps levels, those -- that's for the whole sector? The -- that's the entire of bycatch or is it just strictly the problem area? Is the cap?

14 15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

MS. HAAPALA: Mr. Chair, I can answer that last question first. So, there are different caps that are being considered under different alternatives. So, under alternatives two, that's an overall cap across the entire Bering Sea for all sectors. So, those numbers would be -- that are being looked at are 100,000 to 550 and -- 550,000 and those numbers would be divided among the four sectors. If a sector met its cap, it would be closed for the rest of the season. So, that's the overall cap option. Alternative three is similar, if it's in place triggered by abundance, and then alternative five, including the new version of it, is a cap for a specific corridor. The chum that accrue to that cap are chum that are caught in that area, and it would close that area until September 1st. So, the fleet could continue to fish outside of it during that period. Or they could wait and fish after September 1st in that area.

32 33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44 45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay. So, I feel -- personally I feel that that's the viable option. But I've seen the various alternatives with all different kinds of programs. And so, then they start mixing and matching things. And so, I feel that the corridor is the fish in question. Those are AYK stocks that are trying to get into either Bristol Bay or all the way up into the -- into Norton Sound. So, that's the corridor of passage. So, we should be -- the Council should be focusing on that particular area. Yeah, there's not enough genetic work and so, I think that the Council should talk to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game about instituting additional chum salmon genetic passage through the South Alaska Peninsula, Shumagin Island fisheries so that we know what stocks specifically. They were doing a little bit of that work, but that's not happened recently. Am I still correct on that one, Tim

Gervais? There's not a lot of genetic stocks being --1 genetic work being done in that where the destination of these fish. I took samples from chum salmon on the Koyukuk River. I know we have a DNA profile for the 5 Yukon River stock -- systems. So, we got -- and so, we have these genetic profiles. We need to know, to help 6 you analyze which stocks are being primarily targeted. 8 We need better genetic stock -- genetic analysis the -in the South Alaska Peninsula is here -- is your sample. 9 10 That's where you're gonna [sic] get your samples from, cause sic] they have this bycatch of chum in the South 11 12 Alaska sockeye salmon fishery. So, I do feel that there's 13 some data lacking there. Also, there's some huge 14 questions about where these chums go in the North 15 Pacific? Where are they all going out there? Are they -16 - where are they actually all feeding? There's a huge difference between a fall chum salmon and a summer chum 17 18 salmon. A fall chum salmon doesn't really even hardly 19 look like a summer chum, now you cut salmon -- plenty 20 of salmon to ask these people right here, they cut them 21 all the time. Summer chums are either yellow or pale 22 colored meat, whereas fall chums got pink -- real nice, 23 pink to red, as red as a sockeye. So, they're feeding 24 in, they're feeding higher and they're getting more 25 keratin somewheres [sic]. Where are these various 26 stocks? We have two different stocks. It's not just 27 overall, you know, chums are chums. There's fall chums 28 and summer chums, and summer chums came in a little stronger this year than the fall chums. Fall chums were 29 30 almost non-existent this year on the Yukon River. So, 31 there's a real need for information about what -- where 32 these chum salmon are going in the North Pacific. And 33 the Council, the North Pacific Fisheries Management 34 Council needs to really get involved with addressing 35 this overutilization, this over pasturing of hatchery fish on the Pacific Ocean, it's affecting the wild 36 37 stocks. And so, when the stocks are in suppressed state, 38 people start screaming because we can't fish. Yet we 39 know little about what this hatchery release is doing 40 and it's apparent there's some studies around. I agree, 41 I'm reading different ones right now. I've had to go to 42 this meeting, but there's rhymes and reasons. There's 43 scientific basis of how the alternating cycles of pink salmon naturally affect the wild stock fish. They have 44 45 odd years. The high numbers of pink salmon highly affect 46 the coho salmon and suppress the coho salmon and on the 47 low pink salmon cycle that allows the cohos to survive 48 at a higher rate. So, that's why you get an alternating 49 cycle on coho. And so, then we get -- you get into this 50 whole hatchery -- static hatchery release of the Alaskan

1 hatcheries. Washington State is releasing on alternate year. They have a 200 million release one year on the high year. And they have a blank year, but we're not doing that in Alaska. We're just statically 5 releasing across the board millions, hundreds of 6 millions, 750 million pink salmon, which is on a static release, is having a giant effect and it's having a 8 delirious [sic] effect on the wild pink salmon, also. 9 And so, you need to know more about you know, that 10 somebody else's jurisdiction. No, you need to know more 11 about these fish so that we, as in your realm, the 12 pollock fleet is getting beat up because of bycatch. But 13 that's because the low returns. If we had more healthier 14 returns, you wouldn't hear nearly that. You'd modulate the problem; you'd turn the squelch down. So, those are 15 my comments. There is lots of data lacks [sic], you have 16 a ton of data lacks [sic]. You don't know where these 17 18 chum salmon are really over rearing at. We know that 19 they pass through the Bering Sea eating jellyfish and 20 stuff as smoke. But then they go off and where do they 21 go? And we got two different stocks, we got summer chum 22 and fall chums. So, you got to differentiate between 23 that. Some have higher years, and some have not so good years and some -- so there's a bunch of data lacks [sic]. 24 25 I wanted to put all those data lacks [sic] on the record for the Councils to direct your staff on NOAA or NMFS 26 27 or whoever it may be. You know, there's trophic. I know 28 that NOAA does those trophic inventories of the North 29 Pacific. They basically know how much plankton is in the 30 water and can calculate the trophic level. When you got 31 marine birds washing up on the beach, that means that's 32 the canary in the mine. That means that the ocean is in 33 decline. That's when we should've -- as Alaskans, I will 34 say we should've cut our hatchery release in half when 35 we had marine birds washing up on the beach, period. It 36 stressed the entire -- all stocks, even the hatchery 37 fish are coming back really small. They're all stressed. 38 They don't have the fat reserves. They're flying sockeye 39 salmon out of Bristol Bay and out to these villages and people are saying, I don't like these fish, they're 40 41 really skinny. Yeah, have you ever -- have you gotten 42 any of the sockeye from this year? 3.8-pound sockeye on 43 Bristol Bay. They have hardly any fat reserves. I don't even know if they've made destination up for spawning. 44 45 Those things are nothing. I fished in Bristol Bay for 46 years; two ocean fish are typically five two to five six 47 and three ocean fish are generally five eight to six eight. That's what -- and they got large -- especially 48 49 adult males got large fat reserves. People here are 50 getting these little, teeny skinny fish that are,

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48 49

50

they're over competing among themselves, and they're 1 also over competing with a lot of hatchery pinks. So, there's a lot of data lack [sic] and so, I think that the Council should start investigating. I am fully in 5 support of option five, and I'm fully in support of option one on the amount of time and I think the cap 6 should be geared strictly to the area of passage, the 8 area that the chums are gonna [sic] go through. That's 9 just me. I felt that I had to speak to this Council 10 while we had them sitting at the table, cause [sic] I don't have the time to travel. I live in the Brooks 11 12 Range. It's hard for me to leave, to get out and talk. 13 So, you're not taking testimony, you're not under 14 quorum. But I think that you should think there -- you 15 should mold these things over in your head. You got 16 real, really involved fishery people, I'm really happy 17 to see the make-up of the Council, and I'm really happy 18 to see that we have fishery people that understand fish. 19 Not a lot of people understand fish. But there's some 20 real issues going on here. I'm concerned that we'll go 21 to endangered species status, and somebody's gonna [sic] 22 close down the entire corridor forever or whatever. And 23 so, I don't want to see that. I don't want to see it; 24 we're already in crisis. We're not getting enough 25 spawning escapement right now. And then we don't have 26 enough trophic in the in system. We're not getting enough 27 feed of nutrients in the in system to support chinook 28 and the stocks that stay in the river for two years, 29 one- and two-years chinook and coho, they stay in the 30 river. If you don't have a lot of chums coming back, 31 we're not -- our Upper Yukon is going to go flat cause 32 we can't -- we don't -- we're not actually going to be 33 able to raise smolt anymore if we don't have enough 34 nutrient flow into the freshwater system. So, there's a 35 lot of problems here. I can really empathize with what 36 you got to wrestle with, but I think you're on the right 37 track for these closure areas with alternative five. Any 38 other input to the Council? Robert. 39

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I did testify when I was down in Anchorage here at the North Pacific fisheries. And I kind of brought up today in our meeting that we're looking at some of our side streams on the Yukon. There's no more chinook salmon there, where there would be like 1,500, maybe 2,000 that we could go and spawn. They're gone, they're not there anymore and being a food base for what I talk about, that's all I deal with, is food for our tribal people. I don't deal with money, any -- that's somebody else's job to do, and I spoke for the animals, so. When we do talk something

like this, I brought it up saying that maybe our tribe 1 is looking at something where we would have to put a resolution or something into the North Pacific fishery and also the Eastern Interior and Western Interior. I'm 5 saying that we're gonna [sic] have to take a hard look 6 at saying the chum salmon and the chinook salmon are gonna [sic] be extinct and this is where we're going 8 now. Everything we got here for last ten years has went 9 downhill. Our food source now, not only for Anvik but, 10 the other communities too. You're looking at dry streams now, no more fish. We have a fishing lodge up above 11 12 Anvik. Every year they bring in 100 to 200 fishermen and 13 they have jet boats with 200 to 300 horsepower, engines 14 that would tear up all this gravel and people have brought to our attention that we have passed on, that 15 16 they're digging up all the salmon, eggs, the roe. You 17 go to the ripples, it's just red light, unbelievable. 18 So, I heard -- this is a hard thing for tribal people too because we have a right to eat. That's our way of 19 20 life. We don't have Fred Meyer's cars right down in our 21 street here. We don't have anything a lot, just a lot 22 of basic food, with the store with basic material for 23 the people. Coffee is \$22 a pound, a gallon of gas is between \$7, \$7.50 and \$9 a gallon, depending what kind 24 of octane you want to get. So, where do we go from here? 25 26 Look at the animals, they're the ones that are suffering, 27 too. We had to shoot over 30 bears in two years. For 28 what reason? There's no more food for them and this is 29 true. We don't want to shoot them, for 10,000 years 30 there was a mutual agreement with tribal people. We don't 31 bother you; they don't bother us and it was just a 32 natural thing but now it's not natural, an upset a 33 balance has been done to our side streams. And even when 34 the chum salmon has died, spawned out, and they float 35 along the shore. You'll go see ducks, mother ducks with 36 their baby ducks that go up that salmon, open it up and 37 they sluice that juice out. And they teach their young 38 ones how to do that. That's nutrition for them, that's 39 food, even in death, they're still giving life. So, I 40 mean, you know, we have a way of looking at things. This 41 is how we are, the bottom line, and if you can't help 42 us by doing a seven-year moratorium on the Bering Sea, 43 I'm not threatening you. This is pretty hard, so.

44 45

46 47

48

49

50

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Robert, I would like to ask you a question. You're talking of these -- I want this Council to review these options, and I want -- I would like to ask to write a letter to your North Pacific Fisheries Management Council with our discussions that we're having here. But I would like --

I -- we're not gonna [sic] write the letter until we get more public comment tomorrow. So, we gotta [sic] get more wider [sic], we gotta [sic] you know, we're gonna [sic] [sic] hear all sides of this issue, and then we're gonna [sic] -- would like to write a letter to your Council in regards to this thing. So, this Council is supposed to be focusing tonight on these options here.

MR. WALKER: Okay, just one more thing.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Go ahead, Robert.

MR. WALKER: You know the Fish Commissioner, Doug Lang. I know you guys know him. He's the one that came to us and said, we're doing a seven-year moratorium on Yukon River, without even consulting the tribes or anybody. It was just, here we are, this is what it is and this is what's gonna [sic] happen, so. And that really put the knife where it really hurts. So, that's just something, like what I said down in -- and I testified. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, members of your Council.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you, Robert. So, you'll withhold your opinion about these options until later on in our meeting to where we -- I would like this Council to write a letter of recommendation to your North Pacific Fisheries Management Council. That's what I would like this Council to do. And so, Don you're willing to look at this a little further tomorrow, and we're gonna [sic] write a letter about these options. Are you....

MR. HONEA: Mr. Chair, certainly, I mean, well, earlier, I guess maybe Krystal mentioned it in bringing this whole thing, the options, the overview of those things and options. And so, I guess it didn't actually come from TCC. It actually came from North Pacific. Okay. So, I'm a little confused about this and so, I was asking about what the -- is there timelines on this thing, or are you posing to us to choose one of the options or what? How does that actually work? I mean, it's kinda confusing to me. I mean, because I didn't realize that you had four distinct areas in the State, right? Exactly, I mean, the Beaufort Sea on down or something like that. So yeah, I would like a little more clarification on that. And certainly, I'm willing to, you know I might put in my own opinion too, but maybe it, maybe that's not what we're after here. But I would like to know that and you know, just as a thought

here, you know, heck we were right. Met 10, 15 years ago, and we gave up and I guess the whole river gave up the kings. But we always, always you know, had that fall chum 500, 700,000 down to 200, whatever. So, any kind of option that we -- if somebody could explain to me, Mr. Chair, what are we doing? Are we taking one of the alternatives, or is this time sensitive? You know what I mean? Thank you.

9 10

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Staff. Sarah or

11 12

13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

2425

26

27

28 29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

Katie?

MS. HAAPALA: Yeah, sure. Through the Chair. So, Kate, with Council staff I think I can take this on, and I'm happy to have Sarah jump in, and Council members can, too. But the gist of what we're trying to do here is to talk about the Council's process and how it makes decisions and then also this existing action for chum salmon bycatch management in the Bering Sea pollock fishery. And so, yes, the Council has before it five different alternatives or basically four different ways to change the existing bycatch regulations. So, alternatives one that Sarah walked through is what exists in regulation now and then. The four other alternatives are ways that the Council is considering changing those alternatives. Sarah and I, our job is to analyze the impacts of those different regulatory changes. So, on environmental components, economic components, social and cultural components and what that looks like. So, at the outreach meeting and what we're doing today, I don't think we, the Council or staff are asking for the RAC to pick an option or an alternatives. That's your prerogative. You can write a letter to the Council and weigh in on that and that's part of why we have slides at the back of this presentation that Sarah provided that indicate different ways that you can be involved and how to do that and what the timeline of the action is. But it's also a time for the RAC to have dialogue and discourse with North Pacific Fishery Management Council members as well as staff. So, if you have technical questions about the analysis or timeline and process, we can answer those things. Other questions might be appropriate for Council members, but I'm not sure if that helps us or helps you.

44 45 46

47

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: My question is, are -- what is -- we want to write a letter and what is our timeline to get that letter in?

48 49 50

2

5

6

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

MS. HAAPALA: So, if the RAC would like to write a letter to the North Pacific Fishery Management Council, the next opportunity for that letter to be received would be at the Council meeting during either final action, or if you were to submit your letter on the agency's publication of the draft EIS. So, at this point in time, the draft EIS would be published in mid-August. That's the tentative for the goal timeline. So, then would begin a 60-day public comment period window and you could provide a letter through the -- to the agency at that time. In addition, another letter may be provided to the Council at final action, which at this point is scheduled for December 2025. So, right now, after the February action, Sarah and I, our job is to analyze the new alternatives, option 1, 1.1 that we were talking about earlier, and then publish that and bring it back.

17 18 19

20

21

22

23

2425

26

27

28

29

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: I see why you have 1.1, but, if the large fleet is fished in the B season outside of the savings area, let's just call it option one savings area. Then you can prioritize the in-shore fleet to have more exclusive use of the in-shore in the squares there when it opens later on. And so, I feel that the in-shore fleet, you know you got these -- but that's right where the travel is. I mean, that's actually where the travel is. You know, in option 1.1. So, the economic impact to them would be lessened if you allocated them to a higher use during the opening after September 1st. Go ahead, Steve.

30 31 32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44 45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. WILIAMS: Thank you. I -- Mr. Honea, your question was a good one. You had a similar reaction to what I did when I first saw this as an individual Council member and saw the analysis in the packet was given to us. I have gotten to the point where you view this as a -- it's a broad range of alternatives. You'll notice each of those alternatives have got -- the cap ones have broad ranges of numbers, and the areas are broad. What we're trying to do here is provide that range of options that then, in some cases they can be mixed matched, some cases they can't. But look at it as the ingredient -- I know this may not be the best example, but it's an ingredient to a pie that you're trying to put together and there are parts and pieces. Some will make it work; some will make it so that you'd like it, and some of it maybe not so much. But I mean, that's -- it's a range to try and give you and us as individual members of the Council an opportunity to look and in the end hopefully arrive at something that works.

You made one comment, Mr. Chair, about genetics, and you 1 were mentioning at our February meeting, we had a fairly extensive report on some of the genetic work that was being done with the fleet and out in the Bering Sea. And 5 it was encouraging, there's some very interesting things 6 coming. I don't think we're quite there yet, in my personal opinion. The silver bullet isn't quite there 8 yet, but the improvements in our ability to understand 9 genetics and hopefully someday get it down where it will 10 be able to do it real time or not, I don't know. But get it down so that we can use it to make some decisions 11 about some of these things. It's coming, I don't think 12 it's there yet, but it's coming. 13

14 15

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Alright.

16 17

MR. WILIAMS: Yeah, thank you.

18 19

MR. GERVAIS: Mr. Chair, may I comment?

20 21

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Let's let Tim talk for a second. Tim.

22 23 24

25

2627

28

29

30

31 32

33

34

35

36 37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44 45

46

47

48 49

50

MR. GERVAIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Tim Gervais. In recent discussions we've had with Dr. Stram, within the last two years, she was indicating that to get the genetic information on salmon bycatch can take upwards of two to three months. And at the time, she was saying that it was already been established that with like, to test fisheries, genetic test fisheries that's going on in Bristol Bay. They're doing the genetic testing on the catcher vessel. They know within 16 to 24 hours with the -- what the genetic stock is of the sample. So, that was distressing to hear that, you know, a fishery that's supposed to be guided by best available science. Your genetics is, I don't know if it's purposefully delayed or what, but really, to say that it takes over a month or over two months to get genetic feedback on what you're catching when the other genetic work on salmon in the State is occurring within 24 hours is unacceptable. And we -- all these like -this Council represents Western Interior of Alaska so, Koyukuk River, Yukon River, Kuskokwim River. All the residents and users in this region are -- had a really bad experience with the Council's, North Pacific Management Council's response to king salmon. I'm sorry, but when the local term in Western Alaska for chinook is king salmon. So, the purpose of this discussion would be interchangeable. We basically went from a viable king salmon fishery where subsistence's were met. There were

some commercial fishing going on, and now we have moratorium, and it doesn't even look like within the lifetime of anybody sitting on the Western Interior Council that chum salmon stock or excuse me, king salmon 5 stock would be able to return so that is -- as this Council has written in previous letters to the North 6 Pacific Management Council, direct violations 8 National standard eight communities and National Standard nine on bycatch. And it feels like to these 10 villages and subsistence users that the main attempt of the actions taken with salmon conservation for the North 11 12 Pacific Fisheries Management Council is to delay action 13 or take very little action. Try to allow the trawl fleet 14 to continue business as usual, as much as possible and 15 the meantime, our stocks are getting destroyed. The chum 16 salmon stock was always a backup fishery. The most 17 significant part of our subsistence economy in Western 18 Alaska was king salmon fishery and that's gone, that's 19 off the table. Our older age classes, seven-year-old, 20 eight-year-old age classes, the kings are biologically 21 extinct, okay. We as a country, as a State, have 22 completely failed in maintaining the viability of that 23 salmon stock. And now, as our backup source of salmon 24 now we're getting closures with this and I'm not seeing a sense of urgency from North Pacific Management 25 26 Council. Like, there's -- I've heard other Council members such as like Mr. Tweet or Tweit -- I'm sorry, I 27 28 don't -- I can't remember the correct pronunciation on 29 his name. Talking for the State of Washington and saying 30 that the amount of money that's invested in the 31 harvesting sector and the processing sector is so much 32 that we can't afford to slow that back. But from our 33 perspective, for the economy for the people that live 34 on these communities along the rivers, we basically lost 35 40% of our subsistence economy, with these depletion of 36 salmon stocks. So, I think I would like all the Council 37 members and the Council staff to understand that there's 38 way more involved with communities and economies that 39 just how many million dollars your boat is, or how many 40 billion dollars of surimi or whatever they call that 41 McDonald's fish sandwich. That's in my opinion, in the 42 opinion of people who live on the river. That's -- those 43 economic impacts are not as great as the economic 44 distress that these communities have felt. I mean, it's 45 more than just calories, it's the quality of calories. 46 These king salmon stocks, chum salmon stocks, they're -47 - they represent where we can get high quality lipids 48 in the diet. The alternatives foods available that are 49 in these community stores or come into the tribal 50 Councils in these villages through the USDA food

program. Those are not acceptable replacements for food that's low calorie, ultra-high processed, highly refined foods that create a lot of sickness and mental health problems for the residents of our area. I also --5 throughout the years -- I mean, we've been for decades, 6 we've been trying to get North Pacific Management Council to be more aware of and more reactive to salmon 8 conservation and we just, we seem -- when we've talked previous meetings where North Pacific Management Council 10 comes to meet our RAC or other RACs along the river that -- excuse me, I just, okay. They've just not been willing 11 12 to understand the extent of our -- of the depletion of 13 -- the extent of the cultural and economic impact of 14 having our main subsistence resources taken away from 15 us. So, we've heard a lot in previous years where Council 16 members or North Pacific Management Council members are 17 saying, well, we're not responsible for what happens in 18 the river environments like the three, inside three miles and in the rivers. Like, literally when Dr. Stram 19 20 was presenting salmon information to the Council in 2009 21 over Amendment 91, they -- she said there was absolutely 22 no analysis of in-river salmon stocks. And I would 23 really like the -- some kind of memorandum of 24 understanding or some kind of agreement made where, 25 instead of what we've had up to this time, where National 26 Marine Fisheries Service, North Pacific Management Council saying that's when the salmon hit net fresh 27 28 water, they're out of our jurisdiction. And then from 29 our side, the Western Interior Regional Advisory 30 Council. When we talked to the Federal Subsistence Board 31 or have correspondence with Secretary of Interior or 32 through our -- shoot, I lost the -- our legal counsel. 33 I can't remember what -- Mr. Chair, what's the official 34 name for our legal adviser?

35 36

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: You mean for the Office of Subsistence Management? That would've been Ken Lord.

38 39 40

41

42

43

44 45

46

47

48 49

50

37

MR. GERVAIS: No, but what's the position called? Solicitor. The solicitor saying that anything, any actions that are available for us to take they don't—like based on ANILCA, they don't apply to what happens in the EEZ. And what really needs to happen is the chum salmon stock and the king salmon stocks, they need to, they need full life cycle protection and need to get out of this mode of whether it falls under jurisdiction of Department of Interior, Department of Commerce, that switching jurisdictions is creating a lapse in the protection and conservation that's necessary to maintain

these stocks correctly. I don't mean to offend any of 1 you folks. With me being critical of what's happened on the North Pacific Management Council side. But we're in a really desperate situation with our salmon stocks 5 because I think there's been too much emphasis on trying 6 to maximize the fishing time and the economic benefit of the fishing, pollock fishing and pollock harvesting 8 sectors. And it's -- and the actual economic damage and cultural damage to the individuals and communities along 10 these rivers has been ignored. And not appropriate to have the Subsistence users along these rivers sitting 11 12 down and not fishing while a commercial fishery that 13 every day that they're out there, they're catching chum 14 salmon or king salmon are out fishing. I don't know why, 15 out of these five alternatives, why there's not an alternative that says when fishermen along these, 16 Kuskokwim, Upper Yukon, Koyukuk rivers are not fishing, 17 18 that the BSAI trawl fleet is not fishing like that's --19 to me, that would be an equitable thing. If we're not 20 able to fish, if we can't meet escapement goals, why is 21 salmon allowed to be harvested in the course of a 22 commercial fishery? That's about all I have for right 23 now, Mr. Chair.

2425

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 REAKOFF: All right. question in this, on this meeting is, which of the alternatives and the options are you leaning towards? That's what I would like, as -- with Council members here, that's what I wanna talk about. I wanna talk about your options. So, which of the options are you leaning towards? We're gonna [sic] for -- I would like to formulate a letter that's going to be transmitted by August 15th immediately to get it in the hopper. And so, but I want, I would like to -- we're talking about this issue right now. I'm encouraged that North Pacific Fisheries Management Council even has these kinds of options before us. And so, I'm encouraged by that. I do feel -- I feel strongly that there should be complete closure. But you should prioritize the small vessel fleet as to have an opportunity to harvest at a higher rate in the -- in this closure area, in these -- in the saving -- this savings area. But I do feel that this is on the right track. I do feel that we need to talk about this on the record. So, what do you think about the various options, Tim? That's the question before us tonight. I'm sure the Council is aware of the impacts of the lack of fish. They probably heard that a lot. So, I -- do you have a opinion about alternatives before us? Then you have the have the document online, you're looking at it. You're still there, Tim?

MR. GERVAIS: This is Tim, I was trying to unmute.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay. So, I want you to kind of like basically which op[sic] -- which of the alternatives are you leaning towards and what are the options. And what I don't see here is I see on page 18, slide 18, I would guess you would call it, it shows option one, option 1.1 and option 2. But I don't see a diagram for option two. What -- why is that?

MR. HAAPALA: The reason that there is no diagram for option two is because that's a -- it's a very different management structure. So, the way that option two would be set up is that it would be managed under the incentive plan agreements. And so, the options -- if I'm remembering rightly, are to have 50% or 75% of the corridor area closed and the stat areas or the small gray boxes that you see within the figure that would close would be determined by the Incentive Plan Agreements submitted to NMFS for review and approval prior to the season. They could not be changed within season, but they could change over time. And the reason for that is because the chum salmon savings area and the chinook salmon savings area. We've only spoken to the chum salmon savings area today, but that exists as a backstop measure, and the rolling hotspot program was developed because it -- environmental conditions and fishing conditions on the grounds changed. So, encounter rates were higher hire outside of the chum salmon savings area as opposed to within it. So, the Council's rationale and sorry Council members, you can -- I'm used to having to answer questions, but the rationale for that is to try and provide some flexibility as conditions may change in the future. So, we don't have a diagram that we can provide you because those areas would be selected by the IPAs. And I think that's -- yeah, I think that....

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: That answers my question. But the -- but that still begs the question if the encounter rate is higher outside the savings area, wouldn't that be the Western Asian stocks that -- those are 75% of the hard take. But, what we -- what we're trying to protect in the savings area is the stocks moving through this you know, B season and you know, we want to protect those stocks, that's the objective. So, rolling it around or having any kind of harvest inside of there is counterproductive (indiscernible) it's my

5

8

9

10

11

impression and my opinion that pollock do not move off of their grounds. They're gonna [sic] be there when it opens on September 1, you could fish it through November the rest of the B season. You're fishing before then when the chums aren't there. The reality is, we want protection of the returning stocks cause [sic] we have limited returns. So, we're trying to save everyone. The fishery, the fleet will still be able to harvest the fish, they'll amass on the savings area after it opens, you know, they will, I would. Those fish when they'll open that closed area, I'll be on top of it. So, the reality is - yes, go ahead, Anne.

12 13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2526

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

MS. VANDERHOEVEN: Thank you. Pollock do actually move quite a bit over the course of the year, over the course of the season and over the course of their size and age. And so, that's why the fleet moves as much as it does, in or annually and even within the season. Part of the problem with -- all of these alternatives have benefits and disadvantages, right? And one of the issues with the corridor concept, yes, you could close down that cluster area for the time period. Even with allowing for some near shore opportunities for smaller vessels that operationally can't get out beyond the cluster area. You can't get all of the fish in in time when that cluster closure releases on September 1. At that point fish have scattered, we rely on pollock being schooled up to be able to harvest them efficiently. When we harvest efficiently, we have less bycatch. There's not enough time in the season, the season closes November 1 so, if you push off half the season to later in the year, you're not necessarily gonna [sic] be able to get it all in. And when you fish later in the season in September and October, you're likely to encounter more chinook and more herring in the bycatch. And that's something that we're also trying to avoid. So, those are some of the tradeoffs that we're trying to evaluate when we look at alternative five. Each of the action alternatives have different tradeoffs that we have to evaluate and that's where our amazing staff does a great job helping us understand those impacts through their analysis. But each of them have their tradeoffs that we have to evaluate.

43 44 45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, the B season would be the fleet's premier time to fish, and especially during that time frame, that's when the main cluster is. In the warm water, they cluster in the summer season more. Is the -- is there a food resource flowing through there, why the pollock would be more concentrated in

these savings areas at that time?

1 2 3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

MS. VANDERHOEVEN: It's not necessarily that they're concentrated there. For example, the offshore fleets, the mothership fleet and the catcher processor fleet can't even legally fish in a lot of that area during the B season. They're closed out because it's set aside for the smaller inshore catcher vessels to be able to harvest. You don't always know when you're gonna [sic] find fish, you know, 6 hours outside of town or 36 hours outside of town. And so, with the rolling hotspot system and the communication on the grounds within the fleet, because it's a rationalized fishery, it's not a race for fish anymore, there's more communication on the grounds. We've used the rolling hotspot system to reduce how much salmon we're getting. We're also balancing, you know, herring is another limiting factor, cod can be a limiting factor, sablefish can be a limiting factor. As well as, you know, can you find the right size fish for what product form you need to be making? So, all of these vessels have a lot of different competing objectives. The inshore fleets all need to have their fish back to shore within a certain amount of time for fish quality issues. So, it's all really complicated and that's why we rely on the analysis that we get and that's part of why it takes so long in our process.

272829

30

31

32

33

34

35 36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Well, I'm happy to see that you have at least some saving areas and you're considering the chum bycatch. I'm happy about that. That that's part of the analysis, not just herring, not just the size of the pollock. It's a major problem and as you're well aware. So, I -- we will still make - I -you know, maybe it's depth. Maybe it's, you know, the chums and the salmon are closer to the surface. They're not -- it might be depth, it might be, you know, there's a bunch of various things that are going on, but we're -- you can just tell we're super frustrated. And so, we -- we're -- I'm happy to see these options here and so, your expertise will probably play out in the end and with your able staff and so forth. But the -- you know there's -- when does the B season open? June 10? June 10th?

44 45 46

 $\,$ MS. VANDERHOEVEN: The B season is June 10 to October 30 -- 31.

47 48 49

50

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, yeah, that's just as the salmon start to return through the -- they're

starting to move towards destination at that time. Go ahead, John.

MR. MOLLER: Yeah. Thank you, Chairman. I just want to back up a little bit here to a comment you made cause [sic] I completely agree that more genetics would be a helpful tool all the way around. And just to elaborate a little bit more on my colleague Mr. Williams here on the program that we were made aware of here more recently in terms of getting better and quicker genetic results. If I remember correctly, maybe my fellow colleagues can remind me on the time frame here. But it seemed like they were down to within a five-to-seven-day turnaround time for the genetics. And they're hoping to get it down to like two days in the near term but last year, I believe was the first year of the program. But I think there's a lot of us that are hopeful that, you know, we can have some closer real time data relative to the genetics because it plays right into the action that the Council has in front of it right now in terms of addressing the problem statement of avoiding Western Alaska chum salmon. So, if we can identify that on a more real time basis, it will be a useful tool. Just wanted to add that.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: I appreciate that, you know, the Department of Fish and Game on the Yukon River, they're getting — they're making genetic analysis of which stocks are which, even summer chum stocks. They're making almost getting close to like within I think it's close to 24 hours. They know what's actually coming in. Bristol Bay is doing the same thing. Like as Dr. Stram was saying several years ago that they were sending samples out. And all this rigmarole, it's like, well, times have changed. There can be some — I think there's some methodology, maybe that's red tape. How do I know what it is. Anne.

MS. VANDERHOEVEN: Thank you. So, this was the first year that BBSRI did a pilot project in Dutch Harbor for the shoreside fleet, and they were.....

UNIDENTIFIED: Can you say what BBSRI is?

 ${\tt MS.\ VANDERHOEVEN:}$ Oh, Bristol Bay Salmon Research Institute. They do the Port Moller test fishery, also.

CHAIPERSON RAKOFF: Yeah.

 MS. VANDERHOEVEN: So, they did a pilot project this year. They had some pretty good successes. It's only applicable to the inshore fleet. The offshore fleet fishes too far away, and the genetic composition of their bycatch over the years is consistently very different from what the inshore fleet gets. There is a lot of promise with the BBSRI project. They are seeking additional funding. That is an ongoing issue, as it is for everybody with everything and with it being a pilot project, we don't know and because this was such a low bycatch year for chum, we don't know if the results can be replicated in years that are -- where there's a lot more bycatch coming in.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Yeah. But I do think that genetic composition work, you know, when NOAA is doing offshore work and, you know, they incidentally catch pink and chum in their offshore inventories which they have -- we need to know what markers those are, what -- are these AYK stocks in the North Pacific. And where they're at, where they're actually catching them, we need to get a little more fine-tuned on when we're -- you know, they do these various inventories, even the smolt out biodegrading, you know, Alaska Department of Fish and Games don't work with that. They need to be a little more fine-tuned to this genetic work. And so, that's -- as time goes on, I mean, this is almost getting real time. I mean, we're getting -- so, you can tell your genetic pedigree to where you came from in the world almost these days for humans. And so, I think that there's -- this is a critical factor of how this is gonna [sic] be, you know, how you're gonna [sic] prosecute this fishery with this genetic work, with whether you got a lot of AYK stocks there. You might have a whole bunch of chums, but maybe there's a hatchery fish from over in Siberia. How do we know where the -- you know, those Asian stocks. We're concerned about the AYK stocks. Yes, go ahead, Rachel.

MS. BAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Rachel and I, just to sort of complement that point, I think you're absolutely right about the promise of the more real time genetics. But I just wanted to add that the genetic information we do have for, in particular chum salmon bycatch and chinook (distortion) bycatch in the pollock fishery, we've had -- we've been collecting that information since 2011. And so, we're getting a time series, even though it's not real time and just pointing out if -- I think you -- many of you in the presentation are looking at the figure of alternatives

five, which has the option 1 and the option 1.1. Those areas are based on the genetic information that shows about 85% of the Western Alaska chum salmon bycatch in the pollock fishery comes from these areas. So, we're basing this action on that genetic information that we have in terms of the corridors that you're talking about.

6 7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

5

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: I'm extremely happy about that. It's just, it's intuitive that this where they're at. And so, I'm -- but I super appreciate your presence here to have discussions. I fully empathize with the complexities of the various types of fish that you're trying to avoid. But I do feel that you're on the right track. So, has any other Council members. Jenny, do you have anything to say about this? Jenny, go ahead.

16 17 18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

2728

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40 41

42

43

MS. PELKOLA: I'm in a daze. But anyway, I testified in Anchorage, also. But when I was sitting there and looking at all the members, I sort of lost my train of thought. But anyway, I just want to thank you all for being here and this is something that we have to work out together. When I heard people testifying, there were people for number one, number two, number five, they were just, you know, they wanted this one and they wanted that one. But for myself, I don't know that much about it than -- I just want to thank Krystal for the little training that I had on this, that I think, I feel I don't want to be pressured into choosing something that I might be sorry for later. For our area, I don't know how much the counselors know about this. It's something that I just recently heard, but maybe it's been around for a while. And I don't know if the Councils, the tribal Councils really know, you know. So, I would encourage the Councils to try to get someone to at least help them understand some of these options. It's -- I feel sorry for your Council because, you know, you've heard so many different options, people want this one and people want that one. So, I don't want to be in your shoes. But anyway, thank you for being here with us and I think we have to work together because one of these days there will be no fish for anyone. That's the way I feel and that's the way it looks like it's going. So, thank you again and that's just my cents.

44 45 46

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you, Jenny.

47 Pollock.

48 49

50

MR. SIMON: Thank you, Chair. Pollock Simon Sr. I live in Allakaket. I just want to take this

time to share some thoughts and memories with you. Well, 1 everybody working together tried to bring the fish back. The salmon might come back, but not in great numbers, not like it used to be. King salmon is something that 5 maybe that we enjoyed in the past. There was a time when 6 years ago, where we were in a log cabin, hot water on the wood stove for hot tea, was forty below out there 8 and we would go out to the fish camps and bring dried 9 fish in and have to chew on dry fish and hot tea. These 10 days are gone now. They're beyond the good memories, but I was glad to see all of you people come here to talk 11 12 about the salmon with us. It's good, everybody working 13 together and thank you, Mr. Chair.

14 15

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you, Pollock. Appreciate those comments.

16 17 18

MR. SIMON: Yeah, I have to go. I got things to do.

19 20 21

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay. And Tommy, you got a comment?

22 23 24

25

2627

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. KRISKA: Well, I always have things to say, I guess. Fish was once upon a time where my -our main diet for our families. We had a lot going back in the days and teaching our kids everything. I was taught a lot about fish. Never taught about how to argue about fish, but. I try to figure out how to keep our fish. Like, I really have a heavy heart for myself, my family, for all the people in interior Alaska, all over in Alaska. It's sad to be sitting here, even with the best of fish managers, I guess. And can't they -- they gave us options and everything like that and then it's like a guessing poll, guess number one or number two or whatever, you might get the right one. I'm not sure, it's very frustrating to be a Alaska Native and in the God and the Lord's land, it's a beautiful country. But you know, without the salmon and all the things that we live upon and enjoy and enjoyed, it's not there anymore. And I thought, oh well, maybe that's okay. At first it started with the kings and then the chum, summer chum then it went to the fall chum and we're down to whitefish. It's really bad and then for you - I like I said earlier, no offense, but for you to be sitting here and giving me, telling me take a choice or what alternatives you want? The only alternatives I have is I -- we need some fish for the future for our kids. It's --I mean, you know, if -- what if it was your kids? You guys have you know, your way of fishing and everything

you're on that side of the line. The border line of the 1 beaches of Southeast Alaska, you're on the other side of it. You have all the fish in the world, we don't have that. We're on this side of it, where the fish can't 5 come through there because the too much fishing 6 commercially. I have a lot to say, and I don't really want to get into you know, being the bad guy here, I'm 8 already -- I don't know how the heck I wound up the bad guy at the first place. You know, the Lord, he provided 10 us with a lot of good stuff, the berries, the bears, the 11 moose, the fish, everything. We had everything. Once 12 upon a time, I used to say, you know, a lot of people 13 keep coming into college and they were -- forgot about 14 there -- that's probably possibly what happened. They 15 forgot to turn around in their country and everything 16 was there, the berries, the moose, the fish, everything. All you had to do was turn around and live the lifestyle 17 18 that the Lord put you there for. But they all turned 19 away and went toward development and you know, the 20 industry, the money. And this is what it costs, money 21 and on that side of the line is what you're gonna [sic] 22 continue doing. You have no control over what you're 23 doing and what you're being paid for to do, to provide 24 fish for everyone else and in -- and if we had money to 25 buy fish, we'd probably be okay. But we don't have that 26 kind of choice around here. I can go on and on. I'm 27 kinda very upset that we were put in this situation and 28 you're asking us to make a decision. Why can't you guys 29 make a decision and help us? You have all the tools. You 30 have the tools, we don't. It's frustrating to be sitting 31 here and listen to -- I mean, I listened to the Board 32 of Fish, Board of Game, everybody. I don't know where 33 this -- the, you know, we talked to Board of Fish, Board 34 of Game in a lot of meetings we talked to here, right. 35 And it's supposed to be getting to Washington, D.C. that 36 stuff never gets to Washington, D.C. it runs into the 37 industry, who's making all these plans and from what I 38 see our word never gets to where it's supposed to be 39 going. So, a lot of our chiefs and everything fly directly to DC, and they're asking them about the 40 41 questions that they were asking here. They said, what 42 questions? We never heard about this stuff. 43 technically it is all run into this Board and that Board 44 and slowly dwindle it, throw it in the trash or whatever. 45 I don't know where it goes, but this is -- the situation 46 that we're in and I guess -- you guys have power to do 47 things, and I really wish you would use it and do it. 48 Because....

49 50

3

MR. KRISKA: I don't know, I -- like I said, I just, I'm kind of frustrated about it, but I'm hoping there is a way you can help us.

5

7

8

9

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

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you, Tom. Again, people have -- you can feel the deep pain that people have here about this whole fishery thing going over a cliff. This is like thousands of years of use of this resource and it's going away. They're working on it, this document here shows they're working on it. They were -- there was no cap, there was really no savings of chum in the pollock fishery. So, I feel that this is a real big step forward. I'm really happy to see that the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council is weighing these various options, these various things. I would like, you know, the genetic analysis of the stocks that are coming into the bycatch in the B season. I would like to know the -- whether they're in condition of maturation, are they actually spawning stock -- are they spawning fish moving back to the spawning grounds. That should be a consideration of you know what is this bycatch, is it feeders, is it this small little, little smolt or you know, small fish that are moving out? It's -- there needs to be an enumeration of the maturation of the fish that are moving through the savings area so that your catch -- your by -- your caps are revolving around the genetic analysis for AYK stocks and the maturation. Those are the fish that we're looking to get back on the spawning grounds. Those are some key data that's gonna [sic] -- needs to be used during this whole process of bycatch avoidance for spawning stocks, that's what we're after. And so, that we need to look, your analysis needs to be looking at that fairly closely. So, I think we've covered our Council, our Councils talked and Nissa you got a comment there.

40

41

42

MS. PILCHER: I -- this is Nissa, for the record. I might have a question. It may be helpful for the Council to consider the comment submitted via the Federal Register versus at the meeting where they're gonna [sic] be taking action. Does one hold more weight or is it the same weight?

43 44 45

MR. VANDERHOEVEN: I don't think one holds more weight than the other. They're just different forms.

47 48 49

50

46

 $\,$ MS. PILCHER: And then as a -- sorry, as a quick reminder that as they stated earlier, that draft

5

6

DAS is gonna [sic] come out mid-August for the 60 days, 60-day comment period, which is a ways away. Granted, you guys wouldn't be meeting before then. But then there's an additional option. They're gonna [sic] be taking that final action in December of 2025. So, there is a little bit of time. We're kind of rushed because of this meeting. But we're only rushed because of our time constraints. The tribes and individuals and whatnot have time to look at this and consider this.

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

8

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: This Council has to make some kind of -- write this letter of, to you at this meeting so that it's loaded in the barrel for August. Because I think sooner is better, sooner is better. So that you think about it sooner than later. I would prefer you to think about it, our comments on the EIS in August, time frame, then later right before decision. Cause [sic] it gets too far down the road. So, there's -- we've made some points for you to consider, lacks [sic] that's needed, the data the competition and working across jurisdictional about trying to get that under control with hatchery release. We've laid out a whole bunch of issues that we feel are instrumental in getting this to turn around and how that's gonna [sic] work with the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council to accomplish that. Cause 85% of the fish swim through that area, that's an important thing, that's a very important thing. And I feel that this -you're on the right track. There's some -- you got all the professionals and staff the bio mutations to actually figure it all out. But let's -- I think you're on the right track. But there's a little more data that needs to get plugged into this thing. So, I think there's a little bit more work to do with some of the science behind this, where the fish go in the North Pacific, how many of those fish are actually of this bycatch? I would estimate, I would think that most of that is -- has reared in the North Pacific. That's why they're there, that's why they're crossing that, so. They're not -they don't just go over there just for kicks. They're off course, if they are. If they're of Asians [sic] origin, they're gonna [sic] come right straight across to the -- they're gonna [sic] be north of that. So, I think we've covered everything. I don't want to belabor anything. I don't want to continue on and make you -- I don't want to get upset or anything anymore. You can -you feel the pain of losing a fishery on the Yukon River that we were -- relied on. When I lived on the Yukon, we were eating fresh king salmon, there's nothing better than a fresh king salmon on the Yukon River. That was

the longest run fish in Alaska, they're super fat, even 1 at Galena. They're that fat, that thick on them. I mean, they just ask these people the oil that pours off he's got to put buckets under them because they have so much 5 fat. That's what we're not seeing, we're not seeing fat 6 fish anymore. We got a real problem, that means they're don't have enough food. Doesn't take a rocket scientist 8 to figure that one out and this hatchery stuff has got to be the key to the marine decline and combination with 10 too much competition on the ocean, that's what the problem is. So, I really appreciate you coming to 11 interact with our Council. And so, we will be writing a 12 13 letter to -- for your review. Tomorrow we're gonna [sic] 14 have public comments with people, we're gonna [sic] have -- formulate other ideas. And so, we're gonna [sic] --15 16 I want to write a letter that's going to be of assistance 17 to your deliberation in this chum bycatch issue. That's 18 what I would like to do with this Council. So, thank you 19 very much. So, any.....

20

21 MS. PILCHER: (Indiscernible) I 22 interrupted Rachel.

23 24

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Did I interrupt Rachel?

25 26

MS. PILCHER: No, I interrupted Rachel.

272829

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Oh, you interrupted, okay. So, okay. I think we're -- have any final comments, Sarah?

34

35

36 37

38

39

40 41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49 50

MS. MARRINAN: Mr. Chair, I just wanted to highlight the dates that we provided for when public comment opportunities are open. That's our current working timeline. There's a lot of dynamics that could changing and if those change will commit to communicate those changes and timeline with your coordinators so that you know when public comment opportunities are available. And I also just wanted to highlight to Tommy's point, it's your prerogative what you'd like to include in a letter. So, if you want to comment on the alternatives the Council can do that. You can also highlight other points of information or recommendations that you want the North Pacific Management Council to understand. So, you can really include whatever you'd like to in that letter, you don't just have to focus on the alternatives. You can talk about that tomorrow if you want. But all of that information, anything you want to communicate to the

Council could be received in that letter. It's really your choice what you'd like to include there.

3

5

6

7

1

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay, well, that was my intention. It has -- it's beyond the alternatives. Is some of the data that's necessary to reiterate not that I've basically been speaking onto the record here. Go ahead, Don.

8 9 10

11

12

13

14

MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sarah, I really didn't know if you guys answered my question or not. Okay, there's five alternatives here. This is time sensitive and so, I mean, are we — is this an action item where we meet, I mean, are we choosing one of the alternatives? I'm not getting this. Thank....

15 16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2728

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MS. MARRINAN: Yes, I will try to clarify and you can let me know if I -- if you're still confused here. The alternatives that the Council is currently considering, four of them are action alternatives, would change Federal regulations. And also, I don't think I mentioned this, but they're not mutually exclusive. Two of them are but you can make recommendations for multiple options that are being considered. So, you can look at the alternatives that the Council is considering and make any statements about them that you'd want, about what you'd like to recommend. There's different, like if you're thinking about an overall hard cap, there's different values being considered. You can make recommendations on those if you want to, or you can just say, you know, we're interested in overall hard cap. You can say we're interested in a corridor cap, anything you'd like to speak to, or you feel like you want to say in a letter, you can. In terms of timing of this we are in this long Federal process that is still in the Council arena, and they haven't made their final recommendations to National Marine Fisheries Service yet. So, I mean, in terms of urgency, it's a slow process. And like we said, probably the next public comment opportunity is August. So, you do have time but I think, as the Chair mentioned, it might be helpful to think about these things while they're fresh in your mind. So, if you have comments coming out of this meeting, it might be helpful since you might have momentum now to put those on paper. You could also consider when the next version of the analysis comes out. We haven't analyzed that new corridor option yet, and when we do, I imagine we'll look at things like how much pollock comes out of those stat areas, how much chum salmon comes out of those stat areas. So, you could think about it at that time as

well. So yeah, in terms of urgency, I mean, we definitely hear concerns -- in river concerns about the urgency and the seriousness of this issue. It is still just the way this regulatory process works. Is it -- it's a slow process and we pass it over to National Marine Fisheries Service, and then they go through rulemaking. So, there are still multiple stages left. But we're at a point where public comment opportunity will be coming up soon. Does that clarify? Okay.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: That was good. Thank you, Sarah. And Robert.

MR. WALKER: Sarah. Robert Walker. I would have to talk to the rest of our tribes in our area. The poor villages will -- I'll present it to them, and I'll tell them which option they would like to work with. I know sometimes they can be very frustrated, too, but I think this is part of -- this is not a deal, but it's something to do. And, Mr. Chairman I would like to introduce Yukon River Drainage Fisheries Association Serena Fitka and the Chairman of the Board, Bill Fitka. So, I'm just glad you guys could make it to our meeting here. And so, you could see firsthand how much that what goes on here? Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: We're gonna [sic] have public comments on this tomorrow. So, that's why I want -- I will -- you will have plenty of opportunity to speak to our Council tomorrow. But this was a Council, Regional Council interaction with the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council. And we're -- I didn't want to get public comment going and - cause [sic] we have -- we're gonna [sic] be out of time here in about five minutes anyways. So, tomorrow I would really like to get the public comments before this Council. And so, the -- when would that be, Nissa that's around, that's in the morning right away?

MS. PILCHER: For the record, this is Nissa. It would be right away. So, my thought process was, is this is still an agenda item. So, what we could do is not close this agenda item out and then start first thing in the morning on this. Take testimony on this subject and then after that move to testimony on non-agenda topics.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay.

MS. PILCHER: That was my thought.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: That's what we're gonna [sic] do tomorrow. So, we're not closing you off. We're just gonna [sic] do -- we're -- it's on hold right now. Tim Gervais, did you -- I heard you speaking. Did you want a final comment, Tim?

5 6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

2425

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

4

1 2

MR. GERVAIS: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Tim Gervais. Yeah, I would recommend to the Council that they get the genetic analysis technology up to speed with the -- with what BBSRI is doing and incorporate that 24-hour genetic information into some kinda AI or machine learning algorithm and help further define what the spatial distribution of the different stocks is. And then the second comment I had in closing was I feel that the fleet, BSAI fleet should try to even avoid this foreign bycatch because, these countries are putting out, and Southeast Alaska's putting out a lot of chum stamp, chum salmon hatchery stock. And if a portion of it or a significant portion of it is getting caught and wasted in a trawl fishery, that just means they have to put out more smolts to meet their hatchery goals. So, it has a detrimental effect where there's salmon that's out there eating groceries in the ocean with all the other wild salmon, and they're not being utilized in any kind of meaningful harvesting. And so, all the food that the Asian salmon are eating is getting wasted or just destroyed in a - caught in on a trawl net. So, I want, just suggesting that just because it's foreign fish, or Washington in fish or Oregon fish, that, that doesn't mean that the trawl, BSAI trawl fleet needs to ignore that that's an impact. Thank you for coming up. Appreciate your engagement with us on this important topic. Have a nice trip.

33 34 35

36

37

38

39 40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, thank you, Tim. Bringing up that bycatch, you know, there's SeaShare of retention to share these. You know, if you're gonna [sic] do a maturation analysis and you're -- those should be flash frozen and return to river of origin. Where did SeaShare come from? From a Western Interior Regional Council meeting where we had two North Pacific Fisheries Management Councils there and we were already -- this is in like 2005. We were already starting to suppress stocks and we're talking about bycatch. I stated on the record then, when I wasn't even the Chair then that those should be -- the salmon that are caught and you know, bycatch mature salmon should be returned to the river of origin. And so, the first one of the North Pacific Council members says, well, that will cost a lot of money. I says [sic] that disincentivizes catching

5

6

8

9

bycatch. But we have chum salmon, we have chinook salmon lax and Bristol Bay micro sockeye are not satiating people's appetite for fish. Jenny likes fat fish. People are used to -- I'm telling you, these, even these summer chums or these fall chums, they're really fat and that -- people are used to eating -- and people say all the time, that's my comfort food. That's my co[sic] -- why do they say that? Because salmon fat is really high in vitamin D, and vitamin D directly affects your 10 serotonin. Of course, it's their comfort food. So, I would encourage the North Pacific -- I was off topic, 11 but I would encourage the North Pacific Fisheries 12 13 Management Council to retain adult salmon and return 14 those to river of origin. It's doing no one in the 15 affected communities any good at all. And the AYK if 16 they go to Seattle to the food bank, that's not helping 17 us. It's not helping us out. I would seriously comment 18 that, that should be a consideration of the North Pacific 19 Fisheries Management Council, that retention of adult salmon should be returned into the AYK's systems that 20 21 are, especially the Yukon. We've had virtually no 22 fishery. Kuskokwim has had some fishing but, the Yukon 23 has had no fishing, we have nothing. If people are giving 24 us jars of fish from the Copper River or something. I 25 mean, it's like, it's bleak. So, I think that's a 26 consideration for your SeaShare program. Thank you. So, 27 we're gonna [sic] close out this meeting now. One more 28 thing there, Nissa.

29 30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MS. PILCHER: This is Nissa. This will be really, really quick. One, there are some letters in the green folder you guys were handed. It includes a letter from -- they're all involving the alternatives and what other people or other organizations think about them. If you wanted to review them tonight or tomorrow morning, I realize we're all probably pretty fried. One is from Chief Brian Ridley that was given to us by TCC. One is, which I will hand out is by the Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council at their last meeting. There's one from the Fish and Wildlife Service and I do have two that Krystal just shared with me, one from Healy Lake village and one's more, looks more like that, like a ch[sic] -- not a chain, but a stock letter where you could adopt some things or not adopt others, that I will get printed, hopefully tomorrow morning. I'll email them out to those of us that have emails. But if you wanted to take a look and see what other people have done or said in relation to these alternatives you can -- maybe that'll help you guys figure out kind of what you guys (distortion) want to recommend. That is all, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: So, we're right at 8:32 p.m. We're two minutes short. Oh, go ahead, Steve. I don't wanna cut anybody off.

MR. WILLIAMS: No, no. That's all right. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to say thank you for having us. I think that you know, number on the table identified this is a complex issue. It's obvious to me, at least from my perspective, that you yourself have a pretty good picture of kinda how these things fit together. I think building off of that, you can use that to help us get an idea of, you know, the thoughts that this Council may have. But I do appreciate you having us. It's been very good to listen to these comments and hear kinda how they all fit together. So, thank you very much, I appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you, Steve. Thanks, John, for hopefully, you know, all your work to get the Council to come to the Regional Council meetings. So, I appreciate that and I do appreciate, you know, Rachel and Anne coming here just listening -- I can tell you're intensely listening and I understand your consternation with the complexity of this issue. But there is an overriding objective here of, I think we can harvest these or protect these salmon, and we can still harvest the pollock. I still think -- I'm pretty sure you can still do it. You know, the biomass is going to be there. It'll show up in the A season. There's a way to catch that fish. So, I'm concerned, you know we have all these concerns. So, we need to close this meeting out and -- oh, John.

MR. MOLLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to make a closing remark here that, you know, I don't think any one of us think that this is a one and done opportunity. And that, you know, part of the purpose for being here is, one, you know, help the Council to meet and greet folks from the region here relative to affected stakeholders here. I think it's imperative upon us to create that opportunity for relationships to build in the narrative and the discussion to continue. And as Jenny mentioned, you -- we're not gonna [sic] get through this together alone, it's gonna [sic] -- we're gonna [sic] to have to do it together. But I just wanna offer that up. I think most -- everybody has my cell phone. And feel free if you got questions and I'll be -- do my darndest to try to answer them or if I can't, I have the numbers of the staff. So, thank you.

2 CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Thank you very 3 much. Final comments, Rachel or Anne?

MS. BAKER: Mr. Chair, this is Rachel. I would just echo my appreciation for having us here this evening. And thanks again and I — the one thing I did want to stress is speaking to the frustration around your members here with the process and how long it takes. One thing that was really clear at the North Pacific Council February meeting is, when this comes back to the North Pacific Council the next time this action — there is full intention to take a final action to recommend to the National Marine Fisheries Service as Sarah highlighted for us. And that I just wanted to point that out, I'm not sure that we talked about that tonight.

MS. MARRINAN: And I also would like to thank you all for having us. It's -- I think every time we're able to meet with people outside of our normal circle of the fisheries that we deal in, it helps us get a better, broader understanding and in this forum, I think we've all learned a lot from that as well. I think one thing that you hit on a couple of times yourself, Mr. Chair, was additional information that you think would be helpful for the analysis. And I know that the Council and staff would be appreciative if you have information or know where that information might be available, that it could be included. That they would be happy to look, to see if that could be incorporated on the timeline that we're operating under. So, I would encourage if you have that information to help share it.

CHAIRPERSON REAKOFF: Okay, thank you. So, I think it was a great discussion. It was gonna [sic] be highlighted this meeting, the -- this winter meeting for this regional Council. And so, I'm appreciative of the work that you're doing and that your intention is for final action for protection of chum salmon on the Bering Sea. I appreciate that. So, any -- at this time, we're going to go into recess till [sic] tomorrow morning at 9 a.m. And so, that's when we're gonna [sic] go pick this issue back up again and we're gonna [sic] get public comments on that one, at that time. So, this will be adjournment for this evening. Thank you.

(Off record)

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	I, Rafael Morel, for Lighthouse Integrated
7	Services Corp, do hereby certify:
8	
9	THAT the foregoing pages numbered 1 through
10	171 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the
11 12	WESTERN INTERIOR FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY
13	COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME I recorded on the 25th day of February;
14	repluary;
15	THAT the transcript is a true and
16	correct transcript requested to be transcribed and
17	thereafter transcribed by under my direction and reduced
18	to print to the best of our knowledge and ability;
19	to prime to the sept of our misureage and ability,
20	THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or
21	party interested in any way in this action.
22	
23	DATED at Isabela, Puerto Rico this 21st
24	day of April 2025.
25	
26	
27	Rafael Morel
28	Chief Project Manager
29	
30	
31 32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	