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CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Good morning everybody. I will call on Sue to go ahead and, again, check to see how many Board members we do have on officially so we can start the order of the business for the morning.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Sue Detwiler. Starting with the roll call of the Board, Don Striker, Park Service.

MR. STRIKER: Good morning everybody.

MS. DETWILER: Good morning, Don.

Fish and Wildlife Service, Greg Siekaniec.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Good morning, Sue, and everyone. I am present.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Greg.

Gene Peltola, BIA.

MR. PELTOLA: Roger, Roger 10-4, good morning everyone.

MS. DETWILER: Chad Padgett, BLM.

MR. PADGETT: I am here, thanks, Sue.

MS. DETWILER: Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

MR. SCHMID: Good morning from sunny Juneau. Dave's here.

MS. DETWILER: Thanks, Dave.

Public Member Rhonda Pitka.
MS. PITKA: Hi, I'm here.

MS. DETWILER: Good morning, Rhonda.

Public Member Charlie Brower.

(No comments)

MS. DETWILER: And, Chair, Tony Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, I'm on.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you, Chair. Mr. Chair, we have seven of eight Board members or -- seven of eight Board members online now, we're still waiting for Charlie Brower. Would you like me to run through the list of Regional Advisory Councils to see which Chairs are online.

(Pause)

MS. DETWILER: Mr. Chair, did we lose.....

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, no, no, I'm still here, Sue.

MS. DETWILER: Sorry. Would you like me to go through the list of Regional Advisory Councils to see which Chairs are online.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, especially since we have a few that want to be recognized this morning to report out and share their concerns so we will reach out to make sure. And, also we did get a couple, you know, reports that, you know, some people had issues with their lines yesterday and if those people still had something, you know, we'll provide an opportunity this morning as well.

So, thank you, Sue.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. I will -- I'll quickly go through the roll call and see who's on then.

Southeast Chair Cathy Needham.

MS. NEEDHAM: I'm present, thank you.
MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Southcentral Chair. I understand Greg Encelewski was not able to join us today but is there somebody else speaking on behalf of Southcentral Council.

MS. PERRY: Yes. This is DeAnna Perry, Council Coordinator. I'll be present to submit the Southcentral recommendations.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, DeAnna.

Kodiak/Aleutians, Della Trumble.

MS. TRUMBLE: Good morning, I'm here.

MS. DETWILER: Good morning, Della.

Bristol Bay, Nanci Morris Lyon.

MS. MORRIS LYON: I'm present.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Yukon Kuskokwim Delta, Ray Oney.

MS. PATTON: Good morning, Sue. This is Eva. Ray Oney will be joining us a little bit later this morning.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. Thank you, Eva.

Western Interior, Jenny Pelkola.

MS. PELKOLA: Yes, I'm here.

MS. DETWILER: Seward Peninsula, Louis Green.

(No comments)

MS. DETWILER: Seward Peninsula.

(No comments)
MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

Northwest Arctic.

MS. WESSELS: Good morning, Sue. This is Katya. Northwest Arctic Chair, Enoch Shiedt, hopefully will be joining us later today.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

Eastern Interior.

MR. KRON: Good morning, Sue. Yeah, Sue Entsminger should be joining us later today. I will give her a call if I don't hear from her soon.

Thanks.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Tom.

And, finally, North Slope.

MS. PATTON: Yes, good morning, Sue. This is Eva. We won't have North Slope representatives but I will be on to read their recommendations for the few crossover proposals.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. Thank you, Eva. And I also just want to check, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Ben Mulligan, are you on.

MR. MULLIGAN: Yes, Sue, we are here.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, great, thanks, Ben.

And, Ken Lord, are you on as well.

MR. LORD: Ma'am. Yes, ma'am, I'm here.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you. So we have someone from our DOI Solicitor's Office. And, finally, Jim Ustashesfski, is there anybody from USDA Office of General Council.
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MS. DETWILER: Okay. So that concludes the roll call of the other -- some of the other key people, Mr. Chair, so back to you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, thank you, Sue. And like we begin every meeting this week, before we do public comment period on non-agenda items I would like to call on my brother, Orville Lind, if he could do invocation for the day and bless the proceedings in hopes that we do the best we can do for the people we serve.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Orville, are you available?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, it sounds like Orville might have gotten dropped, Sue.

All right, I'll do it. All right, if everyone just wants to take a moment, bow their heads and close your eyes or find a relationship with God.

(Invocation)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, with that, we'll go ahead and start the public comment period this morning on non-agenda items. This is an opportunity available at the beginning of each day and this is also when we would ask the Operator if anybody is online to be recognized and then make sure that this is the comment period for non-agenda items and so with that we'll go ahead and open the floor.

After we provide the public comment period, we will open up the floor for the Regional Advisory Council Chairs to a report out if they weren't able to yesterday or to bring concerns to the Board.

So that will be the first two orders of business this morning.

Thank you.
OPERATOR: Thank you. We will now begin the public comment session. If you have a public comment, please press star one. You will be prompted to record your name. Again, press star one.

One moment please.

(Pause)

OPERATOR: We do have a public comment from Jessica Black, your line is open.

MS. BLACK: Thank you. Good morning everyone. I'd like to start by thanking the Chair, the Board and the rural members.

For introductions, (In Native).

Good morning, everyone, my name is Jessica Black. My family is from Fort Yukon. And I was also raised in Nenana, Alaska. I'd like to talk a little bit about my experience as a fisherwoman, and also I am a Professor at UAF and a lot of my work concentrates around fisheries.

I wanted to start by sharing that this past 2020 season was really rough for us in Fort Yukon. Our food security needs were not met, nor was there adequate subsistence opportunity. We did have a few calls to discuss this but not enough meaningful participation with the subsistence users in management decisions. And I'll just tell you it was really, hard, the fishing season. Days and nights and days and nights out at camp, preparing for the fishing season and then fishing, and I will be honest with you, we caught a few fish in the weeks that we were at fish camp. And that was just really disheartening because, again, our food security needs were not met, but also we, as you might all know, enter into these relationships with salmon in a very spiritual way and it's very disheartening when you spend all of this time out at camp and preparing and you just basically get a few fish. And let me tell you we were very grateful for those few fish and we do not take that for granted.

Our tribes and our tribal members are best situated to help provide management decisions and accurate real-time run and harvest information. And there's a real opportunity that exists here for us to
enter into agreements, .809 agreements with the Yukon
River InterTribal Fish Commission to help collect data
and real-time harvest data and also just speak with the
people one to one, understand what's going on out
there. We really look forward to working
collaboratively with Holly Carroll to develop such
opportunities and really enjoy working with her. I
think have a good relationship with her, able to
discuss things, but we are hurting, you know, this is
so much a part of our life, we are salmon people.

And so I just wanted to share that
experience with you.

I also wanted to say that we have, at
UAF, myself and Dr. Courtney Carothers, are launching a
program called Tamanta, which means all of us in the
Suqp'ik (ph) language and we'll be working to train
three to five indigenous graduate students in fisheries
for the next five years, and we're really excited about
it. Because not only will they be trained in fisheries
but they'll be bringing their indigenous knowledge to
the table to help inform management decisions and also
educate others.

So I just want to thank you for your
time. I wanted to let you know about my experience and
hopefully we can help to share in the governing
decisions and have better seasons ahead.

So, thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for
taking the time to call in this morning and share the
concerns of your area. And hopefully the season gets
better for all of us. Any questions from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right.

Thank you, and appreciate that. Operator, will you
please recognize the next person online.

OPERATOR: Certainly. Our next
question or comment comes from Christine Brummer, your
line is open.

MS. BRUMMER: Okay, thank you. Hi, Mr.
Chair. I have a comment that I'd actually like to make
on an agenda item but I'm going to ask for permission
to go ahead and do it now because I have to work this
afternoon and so I'll be missing, unfortunately, the
Moose Pass proposal when it's done, probably this
afternoon.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have
the floor. I appreciate making time for people who are
busy.

MS. BRUMMER: Oh, thank you so very
much. So good morning, Board members. My name is
Christine Brummer. And I'm a UAA graduate student
who's been working on my Master's thesis titled, Who is
Rural Alaska, a Case Study of Rural Community Practice.

So Moose Pass has been my case study
community and I just wanted to share some preliminary
findings with you guys in hopes that the information
will assist the Board in making a more informed
decision regarding the community of Moose Pass.

I conducted my field work from November
2019 through January 2020, a total of 24 Moose Pass
area residents participated in my study. And I define
the Moose Pass area as that area from Mile Post 37
where the Sterling Highway and Seward Highway meet to
Mile Post 15.5 of the Seward Highway, which is the
location of the Snow River Hostel breaking down these
numbers into CDPs the participants are as follows: 1
from Primrose CDP; 8 from the Crown Point CDP and 15
from the Moose Pass CDP. I'd like to remind the Board
that the CDPs are census designated places, not places
in which the residents distinguished for themselves,
but that of the U.S. Census Bureau.

My field work consisted of three
components including a mapping exercise, a survey and
an interview. Each participant was given the same copy
of a Moose Pass area map and asked to draw what they
considered their community boundary to be. 23 of the
24 participants completed the map. The participants
boundaries varied, however, but a majority of the
participants extended the "Moose Pass" boundary from
Mile Post 37 with, again is where the Sterling Highway
and the Seward Highway intersect, to Mile Post 16.9,
which is the area of the Snow River Bridge.

All 24 participants were surveyed and
restrictions I'm just going to go ahead discuss the

residents and how they defined rural as nonrural

and urban were often suggested as being the opposite of

participants stated they're from Moose Pass. I asked

what community means to the participants and if they

could define their community. They stated that Moose

Pass is a tight-knit community where people choose to

live a rural lifestyle. People cooperate for the

common goals with defined interests and they're always

there for one another even everyone actually values

their privacy. And some people may not know each other

very well but everyone comes together to discuss and

make decisions to celebrate.

There are a lot of personalities in the

community but the residents bond together to enhance

the community.

Participants explain the following as

unique characteristics of the community.

A melting pot of different people from

various places that are very outdoor oriented. It is a

shut-in mainly year-round community that is spread out

over 20 miles where people are self-reliant, creative

and share with one another. And sharing includes meat

and fish that are caught, berries picked and vegetables

that are grown in their gardens. Residents have driven

-- they have to drive a lot to get to services,

amenities and activities. The community is created out

of choice and necessity. And response times for

utility and medical services is long. It is a place

that is largely unregulated and quiet and the community

interests are accomplished through people giving their

time.

One participant commented about how

their geographic extent is unique and there's nowhere

to build except along the highway.

I asked participants to please define

rural, nonrural and urban. But due to time

restrictions I'm just going to go ahead discuss the

residents and how they defined rural as nonrural and

urban were often suggested as being the opposite of

rural by participants.
Rural was explained as that which is 
not urban, a place that is away from services like gas 
stations, stores, restaurants, bars, medical 
facilities, pharmacies, child care and daycare 
opportunities. A place with no stop lights. Where you 
have to wait for DOT to plow the road for long periods 
of time. A place that is far from urban centers in it 
makes getting amenities and services is inconvenient. 
A place that there is a lot of undeveloped land and 
sparse population. Rural means a lot of sacrifices, 
missed opportunities and you have to create your own 
entertainment. One lives in a geographic location that 
is less human created and more natural. Like if your 
house catches on fire it's going to burn down before 
anyone comes to help you. You have to work with what's 
around you and the residing location. And you have 
limited factors in a rural place.

The last question I asked participants 
was to define their community. All 24 participants 
stated that Moose Pass was rural. Reasons they gave 
include that Moose Pass is in the woods but the 
closest grocery store 35 miles away in one direction 
and 90 miles in the other direction. Moose Pass does 
not have a lot of modern conveniences. With no law 
enforcement, the community actually depends on the 
State Troopers. No trash service. No local 
government. Residents rely on one another. And you 
have to travel to get food, gas and medical services. 
A participant stated that Moose Pass is rural because 
when your truck battery dies, you end up tinkering with 
it instead of driving to Anchorage to get a new one. 
It is easier to deal with the hassle than to deal with 
the service. Some of the participants stated that 
Moose Pass can easily be cut off from other places, 
including urban centers due to road closures and they 
have to be self reliant when these things happen. It is 
common for people in Moose Pass to drive around with 
sleeping bags and safety gear in case of an emergency 
or road closure. One participant stated that they felt 
Moose Pass was rural during the winter months but more 
nonrural in the summer months when the tourism 
increases the population in the area. After Labor Day 
the weather starts to change and the residents living 
in Moose Pass area have less of a desire to go into 
town for things so many just do without. No one feels 
sorry for themselves, it's just that they don't want to 
spend the time or the fuel on bad roads to go get 
things that are nonessential.
So this wraps up my primary findings of
the Moose Pass case study. If you have any follow up
questions I'm happy to answer them, and thank you so
much for your time.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
Appreciate that for you calling in and sharing with us.
Any questions from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And we will
make sure that we recognize those comments during the
time of the proposal that you called in for. So thank
you.

MS. BRUMMER: Thank you, I appreciate
it.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Alrighty.
Operator, can you please recognize the next person
online.

OPERATOR: Yes, thank you. And that is
Jim Slater, your line is open.

MR. SLATER: Thank you. And thank you
for letting me testify today. My name is Jim Slater. I
live in Lisianski Inlet with my wife and three school-
aged children. I've lived here since 2000.

We live a subsistence lifestyle
focusing on fishing, hunting and foraging.

I'm calling in to testify about the
increased pressure from outside parties on the
resources we depend on for daily life. There are
groups, several groups that live outside the area and
state, who come seasonally and target some of our key
resources here in Lisianski Inlet. These include the
coho run in Lisianski River and Sitka black-tail deer
hunting in the habitat surrounding Lisianski Inlet and
Straits. In addition to this, this year there is
predicted to be well over 500 to 750 charter visitors
to Lisianski Inlet. We are extremely concerned about
the expansion of these charter numbers, especially bare
boat charters which will target our local rockfish and
groundfish populations.
This outside pressure has affected our ability and especially the ability of our older community members who depend on easy access to resources to harvest food sources on which we all depend.

This year several community members were not able to harvest a deer at all or saw very limited success. Other community members avoided fishing in Lisianski River for fear of further depleting the coho run which we feel is threatened by the several groups that fly in every year to focus on the coho run. This is exacerbated -- exacerbated by the fact that our ferry service has been intermittent and food supply has been undependable.

I encourage the Federal Subsistence Board to consider some means in which to protect these limited resources and ensure access by our subsistence community, here in Pelican and the surrounding areas.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Jim, for calling. Appreciate that and hopefully we could find some way to help you resolve that. Any questions from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. And we do strongly encourage you to write proposals to the Board to address the issue and we do have Staff that can help with crafting that type of stuff and so hopefully we can help find a remedy to the situation you have on the ground there in Pelican, so thank you for taking the time to call in.

MR. SLATER: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Operator, can you please recognize the next online.

OPERATOR: Yes, and the next one comes from Heather Bauscher, your line is open.

MS. BAUSCHER: Good morning, Mr. Chair and good morning Federal Subsistence Board members. My name is Heather Bauscher, I'm the Tongass Community
Organizer for the Sitka Conservation Society. Some of you may know me because usually when the meetings are in person I show up with a group of youth students so I wanted to give everybody an update on the youth program that we've been running out of Sitka and through the University of Southeast Alaska.

Usually in other years we've had trouble finding funding to make these programs happen but I want to say a big thank you, in the last year with a lot of help from the Forest Service and the Office of Subsistence Management we did manage to get some good funding for the next couple of years but then Covid happened so I just want to let folks know that this hasn't gone away. Part of the key component of that course is always the experiential learning component of having the students there in person and being able to witness how these things work and move through the process. So we are working with the schools and as soon as things are safer and we can do these things in person we are hoping to bring that back and hoping that the funding should be good through that. So thank you to everybody who has helped to build that program up and I look forward to, when we have meetings again in person, to bring the youth back.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Heather. We always feel good when the youth shows up and hopefully we can continue to support that and we all are looking forward to seeing each other again so keep up the good work and we need to train a lot more of these members to get applying for these seats and it has been a hot topic here is filling seats. So thank you for your work and look forward to the future RAC members.

Any questions from the Board.

MR. SCHMID: Dave Schmid.

MS. PITKA: Rhonda here.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Dave you have the floor.

MR. SCHMID: Yeah, hey, thanks, Chairman. And thanks so much, Heather, I just want to
add on my thanks here as well and your commitment and your organization here to these students. It's just a delightful program. I have benefitted and I learn as much from the students as they may learn from us. And so please just keep up the good work and we continue, at least our agency here, to the extent we can support this we will in the future. It's a great program.

Thank you.

MS. BAUSCHER: Thank you so much for your kind words.

MS. PITKA: Hi, this is Rhonda. I definitely miss seeing the high school students and having our annual lunch with them. So when we get back to in-person, I look forward to seeing them all again.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any other Board comments, discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, Heather, thank you for calling in. Appreciate, again, your work and taking the time to call in today.

MS. BAUSCHER: Thanks for your kind words. Good luck with your work today.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Operator, can we recognize the next person online, please.

OPERATOR: Yes, and that's Jack Reakoff, your line is open.

MR. REAKOFF: Hi, good morning, Mr. Chairman Christianson and Federal Subsistence Board members. Jack Reakoff in Wiseman, Alaska. I had my application in for appointment to the Western Interior Council and the Western Interior was passed over, and I have comments on that.

I feel limited by your deliberations for the Park Service regulations. I would like to have commented and if I were able to I would have. But I
feel that the Federal Subsistence Board can submit a letter to the Secretary of Interior, Secretary of Agriculture. I do feel that the Board is an arm of the Secretary of Interior and Agriculture. The past Administration's Secretary violated the appointment process by not appointing these three Councils. This is a violation of agreements with the public on appointing these very knowledgeable people.

It is incumbent upon the Board during this meeting to point out this violation issue to the new Secretaries. The Board should request a review of the applications that are in right now and complete the appointments for the three outstanding Councils. As a resident of the Western Interior region, I feel the current representation of the Council is a direct violation of ANILCA, Title VIII, Section .801(5), which states: that an administrative structure be established for the purpose of enabling rural residents who have personal knowledge of local conditions and requirement to have a meaningful role in the management of fish and wildlife and of subsistence uses on the public lands in Alaska. Western Interior Regional Council has been severely hindered by the Secretary's office not making timely appointments of qualified applicants for at least the last two cycles, and not even an appointment this cycle. Without any appointments, this year, 2021, the current Council, with only four members will only have 40 percent of the membership. They cannot represent the region in a meaningful role.

And so respectfully I would request that the Federal Subsistence Board would send a letter to the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture and the new Secretaries will have to be confirmed, all that, but I feel that it's a very important issue, that we do not skip a cycle of representation of the Western Interior region and any other regions of Alaska.

Thank you, Board and Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Jack. Thank you for calling in. And I echo your concerns as well and hopefully we can find, during this process this week, a way to formulate some language like you described that will ensure that this gets elevated to the highest level as soon as possible and is a priority so that we can continue knowing that the issues we face in rural Alaska through the testimony
we've heard yesterday, today and have continued to hear as an office through special action requests, and that it's being played out already, we hope that we can fill the RACs and get the people and the voice back in the appropriate administrative seat to bring that to -- so we can do our job to help you do yours. So thank you, Jack, or bringing that.

Any questions from the Board.

MS. PITKA: Jack, how many years of service did you have on the RAC?

MR. REAKOFF: I was appointed in 1993 and I was serving until I was unappointed this cycle. I was a founding member of the Western Interior Council. The first meeting was in McGrath.

REPORTER: Correct.

MR. REAKOFF: I was current Chair. I was Vice Chair from about 2004 or '03 and became Chair in 2007.

MS. PITKA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Well, I know, Jack, that.....

MS. PITKA: Thank you for your public service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, definitely.

MR. REAKOFF: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And, Jack, like I say, I've benefited a great deal from your expertise and information that you provide at the meetings and the detailed form that relates directly to Title VIII and I've learned a lot in the process from that and I just want to say thank you, and thank you for your service, and hopefully we can rectify this situation before too much time elapses.

So thank you, Jack, for calling in, appreciate it.
MR. REAKOFF: I really appreciate the Board's work and the diligence so thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other Board comments or discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, thank you, Jack, for calling in. Operator, will you please recognize the next person online.

OPERATOR: Thank you. The next one is from Darrell Vent, your line is open.

MR. VENT: Good morning.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Good morning, Darrell.

MR. VENT: Yes, I'm here speaking on behalf of the Huslia Tribal Council. I just had some issues here with -- the same comment as Jack. I was Vice Chair on the Federal Subsistence Board along with Jack there and all of a sudden I wasn't elected back in. Whether it was political or had to do with some other issues that I was dealing with, such as the Ambler Road, I don't know. But I think that because we live in rural Alaska that we should be able to represent not because of our political affiliation. I think that some issues that might be affecting our areas, we -- we are supposed to represent, you know, the hunting and the fishing and the gathering of our areas and we are not able to do so because of what's going up higher on the ladder. I think what Jack was talking about there kind of leads towards that is that, you know, we have to represent these areas. If something is going on above us and we can't represent our areas maybe there's an issue there that needs to be addressed.

I'm not naming names or anything, I just want to let you know that I don't think that's right for our people. I mean we have to live out there and we have to live on the land with what we got to eat and if we can't represent our areas, that means that somewhere along the line that we are being under-represented. I think that if there's something going on somewhere and they could deal with their issues but
leave us out of the loop as we represent our food needs
then that would be easier to do if we don't have to
deal with these issues.

I just want to bring that out because I
was a representative. I was doing good on the Western
Interior. I was the Co-Chair and all of a sudden I
wasn't the Co-Chair no more. So I just like you guys
to recognize that maybe there's some other issues
that's involved with what Jack is talking about and we
need to make sure and try to address these issues
whereas it doesn't limit our ability to represent what
we eat.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, I
appreciate you calling in today, Darrell, and
expressing your concern and we really are hopeful to
support those of you who have supported the Program and
hope you have patience and continuing to want to play a
role because your knowledge is critical to doing our
job and, you know, without you guys out there that have
all of that local knowledge and expertise it's almost
impossible for us to make the right decisions so thank
you guys for your service to-date, and look forward to
hopefully seeing you in the future.

Any questions from the Board.
(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
thank you for calling in today. Operator, would you
please recognize the next caller, please.

OPERATOR: Yes, it comes from Bruce
Irvine, your line is open.

MR. IRVINE: Hi, can you hear me okay.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Gotcha loud and
clear, Bruce, you've got the floor.

MR. IRVINE: Hi, my name is Bruce
Irvine. I'm Upper Tanana Den'a from Northway. Thank
you, Chairman and members of the Board. I appreciate
all your hard work and I realize that you're often
faced with difficult choices.
I would also like to thank you for the decision on Organized Village of Kake special action request being approved. The Organized Village of Kake's success is a great example of how tribes only take what it is needed and sharing what was harvested with the community.

I'd like to see Koyukuk and Stevens Village show how they take care of their community because they would definitely show a great respect throughout the whole process.

During the last few days we heard that the process was paused so I hope with this new Administration someone hits the play button because better action and care needs to happen instead of pausing a great need. I further stress and think we need to listen more to tribes on what they need. Respectfully, tribes know best what they need, not someone in an urban area who has probably never been to any rural Alaska communities off the road system. I would also like to see more tribes involved in selecting the Regional Advisory Council members. The Regional Advisory Council's impact tribes greatly all over Alaska in 10 regional ways. I would also like to know why the State is on the InterAgency Staff Committee and can pull proposals off the consensus agenda early in the process, whereas tribes have to wait until consultation and the scheduled meeting to do so, this is problematic given that the State does not follow the mandate of ANILCA, Title VIII and has made no forward movement in an attempt to do so.

In closing, I would like to mention the memorandum on tribal consultation and strengthening nation to nation relationships with the State "history demonstrates that we best serve Native American people when tribal governments are empowered to lead their community, and when Federal officials speak with and listen to tribal leaders in formulating Federal policy that affects tribal nations."

Thank you, Chairman and members of the Board for giving me a chance to speak today. I look forward to future positive progress, equality, empowerment, and collaboration between tribes and the Federal Subsistence Board.

Thank you. Tenee'
MS. PITKA: Thank you, Mr. Irvine for your testimony. Is there anybody else online.

OPERATOR: At this time I'm showing no further public comments.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank you, and I appreciate you taking the time to call in. I'm sorry, my phone was blanking in and out for a second there. So, again, thank you for calling in. You know, we hope to strive to find that opportunity as a Board to get all of the rural residents engaged in providing for their communities and their families like time immemorial. And hopefully we find a way to get past the hurdles that we find placed before this Board and obstacles that we should be able to dissolve through communication and continuing to strive to provide a meaningful role for our rural residents in providing a sustained livelihood on the land.

And so I really appreciate all the comment that I've heard here this morning in the public testimony. I want you to know that it doesn't fall on deaf ear and truly appreciate the years of service that some of you gentlemen have in serving your community and providing food for your families.

Thank you.

With that I would say we conclude the public comment period this morning. If any other Board members have any comments at this time I will entertain them.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Gene, go ahead.

MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to inform you and the Board, I have to step out here for a bit this morning and Glenn Chen, our Subsistence Program Leader will be sitting in for me until I return later on in the day.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Gene. And good luck to you in your order of business today and we'll look forward to hearing you this afternoon.
MR. PELTOLA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. That brings us, I think, to the order of business for the day and I think we start with FP21-12.

MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair.

MS. DETWILER: Mr. Chair, did you want to check with the Regional Advisory Council Chairs who may not have been able to give a report earlier in this meeting.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, yeah, I just got thrown off with Jack giving his report, and I did provide that opportunity so thank you for reminding me of my own words, essentially, thank you, appreciate it.

So any Council Chairs who would like to, again, report out or speak to issues, now is your time, you have the floor.

MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Federal Subsistence Board. For the record my name is Cathy Needham and I am currently the acting Chair for the Southeast Regional Advisory Council.

I appreciate the opportunity to talk to you guys today about some non-agenda items. I do want to express that the comments that I am making today are my own comments, not necessarily reflective of the Regional Advisory Council, however, these comments directly stem from discussions that the Regional Advisory has had at the table.

In my Southeast Regional Advisory Council to the Board as you have also heard from pretty much all of the Regional Advisory Councils across the state and in public comments, there is an expressed frustration regarding late Council appointments. And I want to also make sure that the members of the Board understand that this is a long-term problem, this is not something that has just happened in this cycle.
Southeast Council, as I am sure other Councils have been suffering from having late appointments in years past as well as having Council positions cut off of their Councils for a number of cycles now. I would like to make a recommendation to the Federal Subsistence Board that you direct the Program to uniformly change the Regional Council Advisory charters. I think that this is a potential solution in heading the right direction and in terms of the charter change, the recommendation would be that all incumbents be able to retain their seats on the Council until appointments are made. This would help tremendously in bridging the gap.

Currently Council members that are up for renewal leave their seat at the beginning of December, however, Council appointments aren't coming in until the next year and it makes it really difficult for continuity of doing business when we don't have those appointments when they're made at such a late time in the game. So just by changing our charters and allowing those incumbents to stay seated would resolve an issue such as right now where I'm a seated Council member on the Council and I was elected as Vice Chair, however, our Chair, has not been reappointed yet and so he can't attend this meeting because his seat -- his term ended at the beginning of December. So for just continuity of business if he would have been able to serve out as an incumbent until the Council appointments are made then he would have been able to carry on the Southeast Council's business effectively with that continuity. So that is one recommendation as a potential solution to that problem.

Another issue, or another problem that I'd like to reiterate is for the Southeast Regional Advisory Council, our Council size went from 13 members to eight, not this cycle, but the previous cycle. In that cut we lost a wealth of experience. We lost our 25 year member, Patty Phillips, who probably knows ANILCA in and out more than anybody I have ever met in my entire life. She has long-term institutional knowledge and history. She has served in this Program longer than any current seated Board member even. And we also lost Harvey Kitka, another long-term member who has been with the Southeast Council for a number of issues that we're seeing rise again in terms of management issues, he has that knowledge of things, especially when it comes to things like Sitka Sound
herring. It's a current and emergent issue in our region. It's going to result in an extra-territorial jurisdiction petition and our one representative who was there through the last time Sitka Tribe of Alaska tried to seek extra-territorial jurisdiction, and we no longer have his voice and expertise seated at the table with us to do our business.

We aren't the only Council that has lost our institutional knowledge base.

It's devastating to hear someone like Jack Reakoff who's reapplied and wanted to volunteer his time has not been reappointed to the Council either. And whether that's a lag in a late appointment or whether his seat has been cut, both scenarios are devastating in my opinion.

These issues with fish and wildlife management are cyclic. We need to have that long-term knowledge. Those knowledgeable folks with ANILCA and also an understanding of how ANILCA has been applied to these same issues in the past, we need that as our business. These long-term volunteers of the Program, they're mentors and they're teachers to me and younger Council members. I've served on the Council for 12 years now, I still learn from them every day, every meeting. So it's important that we keep -- if they're willing to still give their time to this Program, it's important that we keep that institutional knowledge on the Regional Advisory Councils.

Unfortunately I don't have an offer to a solution on how to make it, however, I think Mr. Reakoff, himself, just testified earlier this morning that the Federal Board actually taking an active role and going and working with the Secretaries and getting these appointments done and making sure that all of the applications are reviewed is imperative, and I hope that you really heard, not only his testimony, but plan to take action on it.

My final comment today is regarding another testimony that we heard this morning. I would be remiss if on behalf of the Southeast Regional Advisory Council that we didn't acknowledge Heather Bauscher and her great work that she has done. We have been very fortunate in Southeast Alaska to have her program seated within our region and have students that
she has been able to bring to our meetings for the past couple of years now. She brings some very bright, young leaders to our meetings and when we do our work at the table they come and testify to us, it's amazing the thought and time that they are able to put into that and the value that that young perspective can bring to the table and we always -- all of our Council members continue to praise the program and we are able -- when we're seated together in the same room, are able to interact with these youth in very constructive ways. And that knowledge and that help that they give us is only something that we've been experiencing since her program has been put in place and I appreciate that the Board recognize Heather and her hard work, this morning, when she gave her testimony as well.

And with that I will close and thank you again for the time to make these comments.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Cathy, and I appreciate your comments. I think some of them are very pointed and on point and I think there are some pretty solid suggestions there, as always, Southeast comes out with an approach to resolve issues and so truly appreciate all the work that you've stated that comes forth through institutional knowledge and gaining from that experience of interacting with people, both young and old, who have a lot to provide to the Program. And so thank you for that insight.

Any questions or comments from the Board for Cathy.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, again, thank you for taking the time to call in Cathy and share Southeast concerns and filling in for the Chairman. We know how valuable his time was as well and commitment to the Program, so truly appreciate all the service and hope to resolve these issues for the Program as well and hope to restore Southeast Alaska back to 13 seats so have a good day.

Operator -- I mean, is there another Regional Advisory Council person who would like to be recognized at this time.

MS. PELKOLA: This is Jenny Pelkola,
can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have the floor.

MS. PELKOLA: Okay. I don't know if you're going in order of how the Councils appear on the agenda but I'll just jump in for now.

I also am very concerned about all the Councils with just a few -- trying to work with a few members, seated members. I just got my packet yesterday in the mail for our upcoming meeting that will be held next month and as I look at the first page of the members sitting on there, I see six vacant seats and four seated members on there. And so our next meeting I believe will be with only four members, and like Darrell said this morning, and also Jack, we're not representing our whole area. And the Western Interior has -- you know, it's all the way from Holy Cross to Aniak to Huslia to Ruby and elsewhere. But we have a large area. And with only four seated members, it's pretty hard to represent the rest of the area when we don't have people seated on our Council from those areas.

You know I am very discouraged.

I've been bringing this up forever at our meetings and as I look at the appointments I see it's declining. And next year, two more seats from our Council is going to be open and is that going to leave us with only two members if they don't do the appointments. I'm very concerned. And I agree with the rest of -- the lady, Cathy, that just spoke, you know, I think we need to change the charter maybe to closer to us, instead of Washington, D.C. It seems like, I don't know, we get lost in the mail somewhere and it's very discouraging.

So that's my comment this morning.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for taking the time to call in and, you know, this is the time for us to get these on the record so that we can elevate it to the appropriate people so that our voices can be heard. Thank you for calling in and
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representing your region.

Is there another Regional Advisory Council Chair that would like to be recognized at this time.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Operator.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hello?

OPERATOR: This is the Operator.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, I was just making sure, it got quiet. I was just making sure there was nobody else, another Regional Advisory Council Chair who would like to be recognized.

OPERATOR: Their lines are open.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, and I'm only giving you a minute because we did have issues with lines yesterday. If you would like to be recognized and I'm missing you I will provide an opportunity throughout the day to do that so that we don't miss any of the valuable input that Regional Advisory Council Chairs do bring. So at this time hearing no other Regional Advisory Council Chair, I will move on to the order of business.

Sue.

MS. DETWILER: Yes, that would be.....

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair, before we continue.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: What's that Charlie.

MR. BROWER: Before we -- just a question on the non-agenda item when the Regional Chairmans were -- did I hear right that Jack didn't get back on the Eastern [sic] Advisory?
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, that was what he stated, he hasn't been reappointed and they're one of the three that I think they were still working on vetting that didn't get accomplished.

MR. BROWER: Oh, okay. I just wanted to thank Jack for all his years of service because I worked with him in the Gates of the Arctic Commission in the early years and I know he has a lot of background information of the region and the people that he represents so I just want to thank him for all his hard work and stuff that he's done for that area, and Anaktuvuk Pass and Wiseman and so on. But I just wanted to thank him.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sorry, for going off the agenda.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No, that's exactly what we're here for Charlie, so thank you for recognizing him and your words.

Thank you.

Any other comments from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing none. Hearing no other Regional Advisory Council Chairs wishing to be recognized at this time, Sue, I'll turn it over to you to start on the order of the business FP21-12.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. So that brings us back to Item 7 on the Board's agenda and we left off with Prince William Sound proposals and, yes, confirming with you, Mr. Chair, that we're on Fisheries Proposal 21-12 and that is presented by Hannah Voorhees.

MS. VOORHEES: Good morning, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. This is Hannah Voorhees, anthropologist at Office of Subsistence Management.

Fisheries Proposal 21-12 begins on Page 216 of your Board book. This proposal was submitted by Kirk Wilson of Glennallen and requests that the Board prohibits the use of monofilament and multifilament
mesh dipnet before August 15th in the Upper Copper River district. Before the State, dipnet rigging would be limited to braided inelastic mesh.

The proponent raises concerns about the use of dipnets with monofilament or multifilament mesh in terms of its effect on survival rates of chinook salmon that are entangled and then released.

Yesterday I noted that I would be presenting multiple Upper Copper River proposals and so would not repeat background information each time. However, since we've had a break overnight I will give this background information again for this first proposal and then we'll skip it for the following.

FP21-12 would apply to the waters in the Upper Copper River district within and adjacent to the exterior boundaries of Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve. This area is in the traditional territory of the Ahtna Athabascans. Contemporary communities with a customary and traditional use determination for salmon in the Copper River drainage sockeye and chinook continue to make up the majority of their harvest of wild foods.

In subsistence interviews conducted in 2013, residents of rural Copper River Basin communities shared their observations that chinook salmon runs have declined in comparison to long-term baseline. Some residents have a practice of avoiding catching chinook when possible and voluntarily remove chinook from fishwheel boxes if those fish still have a chance of survival. In recent years, both sockeye and chinook salmon returns have experienced decreasing trends. In 2020 the sustainable escapement goal was met for sockeye, but not chinook. Low salmon passage at Miles Lake sonar resulted in closure of the commercial gillnet fishery at the mouth of the river as well as reductions in the Chitina personal use fishery and the chinook sportfishery. All Copper River Federal and State subsistence fisheries remained unrestricted through the 2020 season.

Traditionally Ahtna used rigged dipnets made from spruce roots to catch salmon but today fishwheels, rather than dipnets are the predominate gear in use by Federally-qualified subsistence users in the Upper Copper River district, those who would have
to adhere to this change in regulation. For example, in 2013, Gulkana residents took 91 percent of their salmon harvest in edible weight by fishweed.

In 2017 the Board of Fisheries rejected a proposal submitted by the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park Subsistence Resource Commission that would have prohibited the use of monofilament or gillnet mesh in dipnets in State subsistence and personal use fisheries for the Upper Copper River district.

The OSM conclusion is to oppose this proposal with the following justification.

This proposal would place an additional burden on Federally-qualified subsistence users who would likely have to replace their dipnet meshes or nets. This new gear specification would make Federal subsistence regulations pertaining to dipnet use more restrictive than State subsistence and personal use regulations. This proposal would likely not have the intended conservation effects, primarily because of the small percentage of the dipnet fishery being conducted under Federal subsistence regulations. This proposal would bring Federal regulations for the area into step with conservation practices and perspectives of some Federally-qualified subsistence users but the burden on all Federally-qualified subsistence users would be high and the conservation benefit would likely be limited.

New proposals similar to the one being considered here will be taken up at the next Board of Fisheries meeting where Prince William Sound proposals are discussed. These proposals would prohibit use of monofilament and multifilament gill mesh in dipnets on the Copper River before August 15th or year-round respectfully.

Thank you.

This concludes my presentation.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

Thank you for that presentation this morning. Any questions from the Board for Staff.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is DeAnna Perry, Council Coordinator for the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council. Members of the Board, we received five written public comments in support on this proposal. They can be found in your meeting book starting on Page 236.

A summary of those comments.

The Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission supports this proposal and states that it would promote greater survival rates among chinook salmon caught in nets and then released back into the river and dipnets constructed with inelastic seine style mesh and a traditional Ahtna style made with inelastic mesh are effective at catching salmon. The Commission further suggested a modification to this proposal, language such as "you may not use a dipnet that is rigged with monofilament, or multifilament mesh before August 15th when the majority of the chinook run has passed into the Upper Copper River." Before this time -- I'm sorry, continuing with the quote, rather -- before this time your dipnet must be rigged with, braided is struck out, inelastic mesh, deleting the word braided before inelastic mesh.

Michael Mahoney supports this proposal stating that these changes would be helpful in protecting our king salmon. All of these practices are not customary and traditional and have resulted in much higher efficiency levels of harvest.

Thea Thomas strongly supports this proposal and as stated before, she commented, that it was important to limit overharvest in the Chitina dipnet fishery and to acquire timely data on the harvest.

Ahtna TeneNene' supports the proposal to disallow a dipnet that is rigged with monofilament or multifilament mesh before August 15th because after chinook are released with this type of dipnet it causes undue harm or death and they may not reach spawning grounds if they are harmed or weakened. As management objectives weren't met in fiscal year 2020 we need to do what we can to protect them.
Bonnie Yazzie supports this proposal.

Kirk Wilson, the proponent, states that use of a dipnet that is rigged with monofilament or multifilament mesh before August 15th should not be allowed because chinook released from this type of dipnet causes undue harm or death and may prevent them from reaching the spawning grounds.

Again, for those comments in their entirety, they can be read starting on Page 236 of the meeting book.

I'd also like to share some Advisory Committee comments.

Last week, prior to this Board meeting, I received a comment from the Copper Basin Advisory Committee opposing this proposal. In summary stating that specifying a date is hard on the user who would have to switch in-season and that the depth of bag and size of mesh are more important than the type.

The Wrangell-St.Elias National Park Subsistence Resource Commission also provided a comment in opposition. Their vote of one in support and seven opposed to this proposal, stating in the experience of SRC members who have commercial fished, net material doesn't make a difference in whether fish become entangled in a net. When one member commercial fished one summer, for example, salmon were often gilled in an inelastic braided net, net or mesh size in their experience was a bigger factor than the material. Another concern is the lack of availability of dipnets made from alternate materials. The person who supported the proposal cited testimony on both sides with some saying the monofilament nets cause damage and expressed concern about avoiding any potential negative impacts to the fisheries.

That concludes the public written comments on this proposal.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions by the Board.

(No comments)
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, at this time, Operator, we will go to open the floor for public testimony if anybody is online who would like to speak to this specific proposal, now is your time.

OPERATOR: If you would like to make a public comment, please press star one. Again, to make a public comment, please press star one.

MR. KRON: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have the.....

OPERATOR: Our first comm.....

MR. KRON: Yeah, Mr. Chair, this is Tom Kron. I believe that Eastern Interior has a recommendation on Proposal 12 as well. And I think -- I'm pretty sure Sue Entsminger is on to be able to provide that and if not I can.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, Sue, either you.....

MS. ENSTMINGER: Am I online?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: .....or Tom has the floor.

MS. ENSTMINGER: Yes, Tom and Tony I am online, this is Sue.

MS. DETWILER: So, Mr. Chair, I believe the next step after public testimony is Regional Council recommendation.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So, right at this time is if we have anybody wants to publicly testify, I'm still waiting to see, and I have heard none so far Operator.

OPERATOR: We do have public comments. The first comment comes from Hope Roberts, your line is open.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: She has the floor. We'll get the Regional Advisory Council recommendations and comments after we have public testimony. Thank you. So you have the floor, public.

MS. ROBERTS: Good morning Federal Subsistence Board. This is Hope Roberts from Chugach Regional Resources Commission. Hold on a second.

(Pause)

MS. ROBERTS: From our Alliance, as we introduced yesterday, we are a regional resource commission that represents the Chugach region, seven villages Chenega, Eyak, Port Graham, Nanwalek, Kudachik(ph), Tatitlek and Valdez.

The Alliance supports Proposal FP21-12. This recommendation came from a joint Copper River Salmon Symposium in 2019 where research and conservation of the resource were two major points of agreement, that Upper and Lower river user groups agreed were necessary, we acknowledged this proposal would create a situation where Federal subsistence regulations are stricter than State regulations. But we believe the importance of these salmon runs require a cautionary approach to conservation. Identical proposals have been submitted to the Board of Fish for consideration. The Federal Subsistence Board has an opportunity to set a conservation example requested by subsistence users.

So that is the public comment that I have for the organization Chugach Regional Resources Commission.

May I make a comment, personally, for myself?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, this is your opportunity as a public member to testify.

MS. ROBERTS: Great. Okay. Yeah, I just wanted to separate it from the organization.

So my name is -- well, I'm from Circle. I'm Tlingit, Athabascan and from the public comments this morning, from Dr. Jessica Black and Darrell Vent and Bruce, I really agree that the Board and just
anybody in general who uses these resources should listen to the people who live in the area. That their comments and their suggestions are really, really important. Because I've read time and time again that some, you know, people -- people would go to these villages, scientists, and just constantly say that they were right, they were right and people who have lived there for generations would be like, no, this is not right, this is what will happen and the village -- the people who live in the villages, their theories are usually the ones that would be correct, so I just -- I would listen to the people of the communities out in these areas first. But, yeah, that's -- those are my comments.

Thank you for hearing me out.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for taking the time today. Next comment, please.

OPERATOR: The next comment comes from Karen Linnell, your line is open.

MS. LINNELL: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. I had asked for this proposal to be pulled from the consensus agenda so that we might discuss this in detail.

As Hope Roberts had mentioned this had come from our Copper River Salmon Synthesis meeting held last February before the pandemic. The Synthesis followed a couple -- two days, or three days of a Copper River science symposium where we heard from -- everything from geology to Lake Ahtna and place names and then also with Ahtna place names and -- but also presentations on the Copper River salmon. And following the work -- following that symposium we had this work session with, like I said Native Village of Eyak, Cordova Fishermens United, sports guides, ADF&G Staff, including our local manager and commercial -- CommFish Division and I don't know what division Klause Wittig is from but he's out of Fairbanks and he's actually supervisor of -- I believe he's the supervisor of our local biologist and National Park Service, BLM, subsistence users, AITRC, many folks there and we talked about what, you know, the different things and when we had -- we had these idea boards and put things out there and what we were trying to do to create where -- an opportunity to have a sustainable salmon stock.
These are some of the ideas that came forward. And Mr. Wilson was in attendance there and he took this idea and submitted the proposals, not just here to the Federal Subsistence Board but also to the Alaska Board of Fish for both the subsistence use, personal use and -- so that -- and for personal use so that it can be -- we can make changes.

I've heard this many times before and Hope just brought it up again that, you know, this will be stricter than the State. This is not a political game. We're trying to do what is best for the resource, you know, and I think it's time that we look at it in that way. I was thinking of the prayer this morning and we were talking about, you know, doing what's right for the people, but we need to do what's right for the resources as well and I thank you for the prayer. But it's not just about individuals, or one user group over the other, it's about what's best for the resource. You know we need to look at those types of things.

Just because somebody else is doing it doesn't make it right. That saying, two wrongs don't make a right, that's what we're trying to do, we're trying to implement change. And at that Board of Game [sic] -- or different meetings that I've gone to it's been brought up, well, the Federal has it this way so we need to -- you know, we need to at least do that, so let's lead by an example. You know, let's lead by an example and say, okay, we're going to do what's right for the resource here and we would expect that the State would follow.

I've heard some good suggestions about net depths and widths, those might be good things. Right now people are trolling on the river, this is not dipnetting, they're trolling. When the boat is moving that's trolling, correct, and -- and so that's what's happening. And we've put proposals in to stop that as well and they're still calling it dipnetting, but you look up the definition of trolling and this is trolling.

The folks that are on the banks and things like that and when they're walking out chest deep in the river, a fast moving river, and they're trying to release that king because there's a limit on kings with this type of net it's difficult and unsafe
and could lead to a fatality.

Anyway I just urge you, as a Board, to look at what's best for the resource, not what the State is doing, not, you know, it's a hardship for users, you folks change mesh sizes all the time on the Yukon and the Kuskokwim and those folks have to adhere to it so subsistence users there have to adhere to it and you defer to the State on those instances sometimes and their thing -- taking the biggest fish isn't always the best idea either. Our fish are getting smaller and smaller and I don't know what that is, but there's an opportunity for study on that as well.

But I just urge you to do what is best for the resource here.

I want to thank you for your time. You guys are phenomenal people and it's not easy. I've been on that side of the table for the State and it's not easy but you have to look at, you know, what your authorities are and what is right for the resource, and I thank you for that.

Good morning.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Good morning. And thank you for that, Karen, and I always have enjoyed your passion for the resource and your people land definitely have to keep that paramount in our discussions, is the survival of our brothers and sisters out there in the environment we call our homes with the animals that provide themselves to us through a whole other process of prayer and reverence, respect, generational deep. So thank you for that reminder. And it's always the forefront in my mind, here we struggled in Southeast with a fish shortage and pandemic as well and I'm a super-subsister they call it and I got eight sockeye last year, the same time the State cut is off with bottom fish and so we were between literally a rock fish and a hard place, and so (indiscernible - muffled) making sure that we keep the priorities what they are, so appreciate your comment this morning.

MS. LINNELL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other questions from the Board.
(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, thank you, Karen, for calling in and we'll -- Operator, if there's somebody else on the line that would like to be recognized at this time.

OPERATOR: At this time I'm showing no further comments.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

Then that concludes the open floor to public testimony. Next is.....

OPERATOR: We just had a comment come in if you'd like to take it.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, we'll take it, that's what we're here for so thank you Operator for recognizing that. You have the floor.

OPERATOR: Thank you. And, Gloria Stickwan, your line is open.

MS. STICKWAN: Good morning.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Good morning.

MS. STICKWAN: Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I just want to say that Kirk Wilson used to work as a local guide on the Klutina River and he told us he saw a lot of -- he -- as a guide he saw and helped people on charter -- on his charter boat to land king salmon, sockeyes and he was a witness to these -- he saw what happens when they took kings out of these dipnets with mono -- monofilament and he told us about it and he said they got tangled up and a lot of destruction to the king salmon and they were destroyed by -- they got tangled up in these dipnets and -- and then there were some of them, because they were under sized, were released, into the water and they were damaged because they were long enough for regulations so they had to be put back into the water but they were damaged. And that's the concern Ahtna has, is that, you know, king salmon are not the right size, they get destroyed, but -- and they just -- and I know, the Federal people, they get to keep their king salmon no matter what size it is, but it's -- you know, if it's too small do they return it
to the river. I would think if a king salmon was too small like a jack king then they'd return it and if there's a lot of damage to that king salmon or sockeye and then it's released back into the river, you know, because we've been catching a lot of small, small -- especially in the early run season, I've seen some like maybe 10, 12 inch sockeyes this summer, they weren't very big at all and so -- and the kings are smaller too, we don't get any large kings the way we used to. I could remember when we used to get 60 pound, 50 pound kings, we don't see that anymore, they're smaller and small king salmon and small sockeyes and then to me, it makes me wonder if they're returning them because they think they're too small and that they're being damaged and then they're released into the water again, you know, they're damaged, from what I understand, from these monofilament dipnets.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Gloria. Appreciate you taking the time to call in and sharing your experience and conversations with other people that have experience on the river.

Any questions for Gloria.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, thank you again Gloria for calling in and have a good day today. That moves us on in the agenda, if there is no other on the public testimony that would like to be recognized at this time, we'll be moving on to the Regional Council recommendations, RAC Chair or designee.

MS. PERRY: Good morning, Mr. Chair. This is DeAnna Perry, Council Coordinator for the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council and I am sitting in for our Chair, Greg Encelewski, who could not be with us today.

The Southcentral Regional Advisory Council does not want to recommend the regulation that would be convoluted and create an additional requirement on Federally-subsistence users only so they opposed this proposal, 3 to 6. The Council stated that the damage and mortality of fish was due more to the
mesh size and the amount of time the fish is out of the water than the material of the net. They opined that this is the easiest and most efficient way to catch a fish is dipnetting though there should be a move to conservation of the species, this proposal would not result in the desired outcome. If fish are not available then other user groups should be shut down. The Council also voiced concern that this regulation would be challenging for law enforcement to enforce.

That was the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council recommendation.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions for the Regional Advisory position.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, are there any other Regional Council comments at this time.

MS. ENTSINGER: Yes, this is Sue Entsminger, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Sue, you have the floor.

MS. ENTSINGER: Okay. Yes, good morning, and thank you to the Federal Subsistence Board. This is Sue Entsminger, Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council Chair.

The Council voted on this at our last meeting to oppose. If adopted this regulation would cause hardship for subsistence users and make the use of dipnets more restrictive than for the other users. It's onerous to change all your gear and it might be difficult to get other materials. The Council shared that mesh changes on the Yukon River cause a lot of hardship for people trying to change all their nets out and they don't want it to be repeated on the Copper River. The Council believes that a better long-term solution is to educate people on how to remove king salmon quickly and safely from dipnets.

The Council also notes that there is a
lot of discussion about monofilament versus other 
braided net materials, but most of the research was 
done in setnets and drift net fisheries where net 
materials make a difference. However, given the 
relatively short amount of time that fish are in 
dip nets and the conservation that dip nets provide, 
dip net materials don't make that much of a difference 
to fish injury.

And, Mr. Chair, I had some other things 
going on when you had called on me for non-agenda 
items. I'd be willing to bring in a couple non-agenda 
items when maybe you're finished with this proposal.

But I did want to say that I, too, 
served on the Board of Game in the '90s -- '93 to '96, 
and the Federal and the State system has changed a bit. 
The Federal system if every other year for game and 
every other year for fish, and the Board of Game and 
Board of Fish were on two year cycles and they're now 
on three year cycles and some of these types of 
proposals, people are putting them in to try to put a 
concurrent proposal in to either the Fish Board or the 
Game Board, and I believe after watching the system 
over time, that it's time for both the Federal and the 
State systems to think about how they can work together 
on some proposals that people are -- they're coming out 
before the Federal Subsistence Board first when it 
should be last and people used to try to make that 
happen in the past but it just doesn't happen so I can 
see that this is an example, where something like that 
-- where there's a way for these two systems to work 
together on joint proposals to each Board.

So I wanted to bring that up and if 
there was -- if you wanted -- I can bring up my non- 
agenda items after you're finished with this proposal, 
whatever works for your guys.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Either way is 
good for us Sue, so glad you brought it up now, but if 
you want to wait to do it at a specific time, too, 
that'd be okay as well.

MS. ENشمINGER: Well, it's just two 
short ones, maybe I can do it.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, go ahead, 
you have the floor.
MS. ENTSINGER: I'm on the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission. And I know on both of these -- the RACs and the SRCs are governed through FACA and it is a little confusing to understand that the SRCs are on until someone replaces them so if their appointments up they're still on there. So it is confusing why the two systems are different so that brings up a question in my mind.

And then I wanted to state that the Vice Chair, Andrew Firmin, has been talking to me and he's concerned about having our in-person meetings and several of us agree with him, that maybe the Government will get used to that and then we won't have in-person meetings anymore and it concerns him and he and I had talked and we don't understand why, if -- maybe some Council members decided they wanted to meet in-person, why that couldn't happen and other persons call in. It's just an issue I thought the Board should know, that this is -- it's being discussed among our members.

And that's all.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue, appreciate the willingness of the Board to want to continue to work diligently as they do and, again, never -- never is getting together face-to-face replaceable. So thank you.

MS. ENTSINGER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other Regional Advisory Council recommendations or Chairs wish to be heard at this time.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none we'll move on to the tribal, Alaska Native Corp comments, Orville Lind.

MR. LIND: Mr. Chair, can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Loud and clear, brother.

MR. LIND: Hey, good morning. This is Orville Lind, Native Liaison for the Office of Subsistence Management. Good morning everyone. Board
Of the folks online, tribes that called in, we had one person on June 11th, consultation, Chief Gary Harrison, from Chickaloon, and on FP21-12, he just mentioned that he wasn't really sure if that was a good proposal and that was all he mentioned.

And that's all I have for you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions for Orville.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No, hearing none, we'll move on to Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments, our esteemed colleague, Ben Mulligan.

MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

For the record, Ben Mulligan, Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

The Department opposes this proposal. It is unlikely that the prohibition on monofilament or multifilament web material would increase the survival of released kings. Tangling is more a function of net depth and mesh size rather than net material. This proposal would also create an inconsistency between State and Federal regulations which may lead to user confusion.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions from the Board for the State.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Ben. We'll move on to InterAgency Staff Committee comments. Katya.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the Board. For the record, my name is Katya Wessels, Acting Policy Coordinator with OSM. And for
the purpose of this meeting, the InterAgency Staff Committee has a standard comment, it reads as follows:

The InterAgency Staff Committee found the Staff analysis to be a thorough and accurate evaluation of the proposal and that it provides sufficient basis for the Regional Advisory Council recommendation and Federal Subsistence Board action on the proposal.

The InterAgency Staff Committee provided the standard comment on Fisheries Proposal FP21-12.

And as we move forward through the non-consensus proposals, if only the standard comment applies to the proposal this is what I will state on the record.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that Katya. Any questions for Katya.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll move to Board discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, I open the floor for Board action.

MR. STRIKER: Mr. Chair, Park Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Don, you have the floor.

MR. STRIKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move that we adopt FP21-12. If I get a second I'll explain why I plan to vote against my motion.

MR. BROWER: Second.

MR. STRIKER: Thank you for that second. I intend to vote in opposition to my motion in deference to the Eastern Interior RAC, the Southcentral RAC and the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource
Commission, and, importantly this is also consistent with the recommendation of the ISC and the State. My opposition is for the reasons outlined in the Staff analysis primarily that this would be an unnecessary burden on Federally-qualified subsistence users, that it would be unlikely to significantly benefit the resource given that such restrictions have been rejected by the Alaska Board of Fisheries and that Federal harvest by dipnet in this area is low.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any other Board discussion, questions, comments.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the question.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Question.

MR. BROWER: Question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

Roll call, Sue, please.

MS. DETWILER: The motion on the floor is to adopt Fisheries Proposal 21-12. Start with the maker of the motion, Don Striker.

MR. STRIKER: Opposed for the reasons given. Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Okay.

Fish and Wildlife Service, Greg Siekaniec.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Sue. For the reasons highlighted by the National Park Service and in support of the Southcentral RAC, Eastern Interior RAC and the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission, I support the National Park Service motion to oppose this proposal. Ultimately this proposal will not contribute to conservation of salmon stocks and would be more restrictive and an
additional burden to Federally-qualified subsistence users.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

Glenn Chen for BIA.

MR. CHEN: Yes, Sue, the BIA votes to oppose this proposal as recommended by the Southcentral and Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Councils as well as the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Chad Padgett, BLM.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you, Sue. I oppose as stated by the previous comments. Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

MR. SCHMID: Hi, Sue. The Forest Service opposes in deference to the RACs and with the justification provided by the National Park Service.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: I oppose in deference to the Regional Advisory Councils, Southcentral and Eastern Interior. And also that this would create undue stress on the rural public members.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

Public Member Charlie Brower.

MR. BROWER: Yeah, I oppose it from the recommendations of Southcentral Advisory Council, the
Eastern Interior and Wrangell-St. Elias.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I oppose as stated.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you. So motion to adopt fails so this Fisheries Proposal 21-12 does not pass.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue, appreciate that. We'll move on to the next, FP21-13.

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair, can we take a nature call.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, we will take a five minute break for Charlie, I always forget I'm the youngest one on the Board, I think next to Rhonda, so five minute break.

MS. PITKA: I am younger than you.

(Laughter)

MR. STRIKER: I don't know what that had to do with anything.

MR. SCHMID: Much appreciated, Mr. Chair.

MR. SIEKANIEC: I resemble that comment, Mr. Chair, thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hey, hey, hey, I'm sorry, guys, we're all young bucks at heart.

(Laughter)

(Off record)

(On record)

MS. DETWILER: It looks like we have
all Board members on.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue, appreciate that, quorum. As we go through here and anybody needs to reach us, just reach out through the Operator and we'll recognize you. Sue, I'll turn it back over to you to call the order of business and call on the Staff to present.

MS. DETWILER: So we are continuing on now with Fisheries Proposal 21-13.

MS. VOORHEES: Hello, again, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. This is Hannah Voorhees, anthropologist at Office of Subsistence Management.

Fisheries Proposal 21-13 begins on Page 246 of your Board book. This proposal is also submitted by Kirk Wilson of Glennallen and requests that the Board prohibit fishing with dipnets from boats or crafts floating in the river in the Upper Copper River district.

The proponent states that salmon tend to rest in deep areas on their way up river and can be targeted by those fishing from boats, which may be contributing to depletion of salmon stocks.

Much of the information for this proposal pertaining to public waters, cultural knowledge and traditional practices and biological background is identical to that presented for the previous Upper Copper River proposals.

If this proposal carries, this may have bering on consideration of the next proposal which requests that the Board prohibit use of fishfinders while fishing from boats in the Upper Copper River. Currently there are no restrictions on dipnetting from boats in either the Federal subsistence or the State subsistence and personal use fisheries in this area. Ahtna dipnetting for salmon traditionally took place from shore or platform built from shore. Access to fishing sites was limited by territorial jurisdiction, part of a traditional management system. Today fishwheels are the predominant gear in use by Federally-qualified subsistence users in this area.

Dipnetting, including from boats takes place primarily under State permit.
In 2017 the Board of Fisheries rejected a proposal submitted by the Ahtna Customary and Traditional Use Committee that would have prohibited dipnetting from boats in the Glennallen subdistricts.

The OSM conclusion on this current proposal is to oppose with the following justification.

This proposal would make Federal subsistence regulations pertaining to dipnetting more restrictive than State subsistence and personal use regulations. The majority of salmon taken by Federally-qualified subsistence users in the Upper Copper River district are taken by fishwheel rather than from boats. Because both are not widely used to dipnet for salmon under Federal subsistence permits in the Upper Copper River district, adopting this proposal would have little effect on the practice of concern and little conservation effect. Two proposals similar to the one being considered here will be taken up at the next Board of Fisheries meeting where Prince William Sound proposals are considered. These proposals would prohibit dipnetting from boats in the Glennallen subdistrict or the entire Upper Copper River district, respectively.

Thank you.

This concludes my presentation.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, appreciate that. Any questions from the board.

MR. CHEN: Mr. Chair, BIA, please.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Glenn, you have the floor.

MR. CHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Our question is directed to any of the Federal or State managers who have knowledge about this fishery in the Copper and our question is, is there any information anecdotal or otherwise that could inform us about how many fish are caught via boat dipnetting, in either the State or Federal fisheries, and the second part of the question also is we'd like to know if there's an idea of how many fishers are via boat fishermen, if this amount is increasing, or decreasing or staying the same.
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. I think that was a question.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Glenn. Did you ask a question of the Staff, Glenn?

MR. CHEN: Yes, Tony, that was a question to Staff, Federal or Staff.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Does somebody want to answer that question Glenn asked.

MS. VOORHEES: Mr. Chair, this is Hannah.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor.

MS. VOORHEES: Thank you. I would refer that question to either the State, Mark Somerville, or National Park Service, the in-season manager, if they'd like to comment on that.

(Pause)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Is the in-season manager available on the call today or is that a question that we need to wait for somebody to get on the line for.

MR. STRIKER: Mr. Chair, this is Don. I don't think our in-season manager is typically on the call. We might have Barbara Cellarius on the call or I don't know if Josh has access to that data, if their lines are activated.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Don. And if any of those people are on, we await a response.

(Pause)

OPERATOR: This is the Operator and I did open Barbara's line.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
Welcome, Barbara, you have the floor.

MS. CELLARIUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am actually trying to contact our -- Dave Sarafin, is the one who handles those reports. In terms of whether we have actual quantitative data, I don't believe that the harvest report that the fishermen submit asks that question. So I don't believe that we have quantitative data on that particular question for the Federal fish permits.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MS. VOORHEES: Mr. Chair, this is Hannah.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor, Hannah.

MS. VOORHEES: That comports with my understanding as well and I would also add that under Federal permit, we don't have ready access to information about how gear use breaks down because three kinds of gears can be -- including a dipnet, can be used on the Federal permit, and it's actually more complicated to generate gear reports for how fishing was conducted than one might think, at least through the Federal system.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. I hope that helps you Glenn. Do you have any other questions for them.

MR. CHEN: Tony, thanks to Barbara and Hannah for your answers, appreciate it.

MS. DETWILER: Mr. Chair, this is Sue. I see that David Sarafin is trying to get on. He said he tried to hit star one but has no means of speaking, maybe the Operator can just doublecheck on that.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Yeah, we'll check on that.

OPERATOR: I did open Dave's line, this is the Operator.

MR. SARAFIN: Thank you. Hello, Mr. Chair, can you hear me okay.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Loud and clear, you have the floor Dave.

MR. SARAFIN: Okay. Yeah, we don't have any data specific to dipnetting from boats. We do have some information on the harvest by dipnet and, you know, through 2019 anyways -- or the five year average through 2019 was about 13 percent of the harvest of salmon being by dipnet. We have seen a slight rise in the past three years that is likely due -- it's mostly coming from the Chitina subdistrict where we have seen additional participation by Federal users now that we are no longer matching the State schedule. So that has -- in '19 it went up to about 21 percent, and I believe 2020 might be tracking at around 30 percent. And so that's -- you know, there are -- in Chitina, especially, there's a fair number that might be dipnetting from boats that this would apply to.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Thank you for answering the question there, Dave. And, Glenn, did you have any questions in reverse or do you have direction?

MR. CHEN: Mr. Chair. No followup questions, thank you very much Dave for the information. Appreciate it.

MR. SARAFIN: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, thank you guys for that. I believe we were still in the discussion points from the Staff analysis and so we'll go ahead and move on to the next part which is a summary of public comment, Council Coordinator.

MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is DeAnna Perry, Council Coordinator for the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council. And this Council received five written public comments in support of this proposal. They can be found in your meeting book starting on Page 266.

A summary of those comments are:

The Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission strongly supports this proposal and states there is significant opposition to the dipnetting from boats practice among Copper Basin locals. Dipnetting
from boats is not a customary or traditional use of the 
resource and these harvesters would be able to target 
salmon resting in deep parts of the river giving them a 
competitive advantage over both fishwheel users and 
dipnetters who fish from the shore.

Michael Mahoney supports this proposal.
Again stating that these changes would be helpful in 
protecting our king salmon. He addressed Fish 
Proposals 21-12, 13 and 14 at once. He stated that all 
of these practices are not customary and traditional 
and have resulted in much higher efficiency levels of 
harvest.

Thea Thomas strongly supports this 
proposal and as stated before when she commented on 
Fish Proposals 21-11, 12, 13 and 14, it was important 
-- it was important to limit overharvest in the Chitina 
dipnet fishery and to acquire timely data on harvest.

Ahtna TeneNene' supports the proposal 
because fishing from a boat or other craft floating in 
the Copper River has an advantage over dipnetting from 
shoreline and fishing from a boat down river is 
essentially trolling for fish. Fishing in areas where 
salmon rest also enables fishermen to harvest an 
abundance of salmon at one time. Enforcement would be 
a challenge, but may result in more salmon harvested 
and not reported.

Bonnie Yazzie supports the proposal 
because dipnetting from boat is not customary or 
traditional way of getting salmon and it creates an 
unfair advantage of the resource as it isn't 
dipnetting, it's trolling. She heard that dipnetters 
with boats were limiting out this year, while many 
fishwheelers were struggling.

Kirk Wilson, proponent, supports his 
proposal stating that fishing from a boat or other 
craft floating in the Copper River has an advantage 
over dipnetting from shore. Fishing from a boat moving 
down river is essentially trolling. Fishing in salmon 
hold up areas enables an abundance of salmon to be 
harvested at one time. He also mentioned concerns 
about enforcement. And that the traditional dipnetting 
from a platform will work for harvesting salmon.

Again, for the comments in their
entirety, those can be read starting on Page 266 of the meeting book.

We have also received comments from the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park Subsistence Resource Commission and the Copper Basin Advisory Committee.

The Wrangell-St.Elias National Park Subsistence Resource Commission opposed this proposal with a vote of 1 in support and 7 opposed. Commission members were generally not concerned about the practice of dipnetting from boats by Federally-qualified subsistence users, although concern was expressed about increasing occurrence of dipnetting from boats by participants in State managed fisheries in the Upper Copper River. The numbers of Federally-qualified subsistence users fishing from boats is limited, some SRC members noted, however, that people dipnetting from boats should be restricted before fishwheel users in times of low salmon numbers. The Commission also noted a need for information about harvest by gear type. That would have been an important part of information to include in the proposal analysis.

Last week, prior to this Board meeting I received a comment from Copper Basin Advisory Committee who chose not to vote on this proposal but they did share some of their discussion on the topic, which included acknowledging the shortage of fish but there seems to be a shift from fishwheels to dipnetting and so it's getting more popular. You can catch fewer fish dipnetting versus using a fishwheel but there was less than a one percent take of fish in the Gulkana/Klutina area, and they also mentioned, we didn't have boats and equipment like we do today and presumably that addresses historical methods used for take.

That's a summary of the public written comments received on this proposal.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions for the public comments.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none
we'll move on, we'll open the floor to public testimony. Operator, if there's anyone who would like to speak to this proposal, please make their line available.

OPERATOR: Again, just press star one if you'd like your line open. Again, star one. And Karen Linnell, your line is open.

MS. LINNELL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the Board. I would like to talk about some of the resources and the things that we've seen happening and have been reported to me by folks up and down the river. From Chitina north of the bridge there by the airport and up in Copper Center, all the way to Gulkana and Gakona, there are folks that are coming near fishwheels. There's a lot more boat traffic. The folks are able to target salmon when they're held up during high water. I personally have witnessed this, when we went down to visit the Native Village of Eyak camp at Wood Canyon and when we were coming back it was high water, we weren't catching -- folks weren't catching very many salmon in their fishwheels but I seen -- I saw two boats going back and forth in this -- where some salmon were held up and just catching them one after the other. There was about four people in the boat and filling their, you know, getting their limit. And that was south of the Chitina River bridge, but it's also happening up north. You know we all know that the fish hold up during high water and as soon as the water starts to drop the salmon will run and move, we're not seeing that anymore.

Again, it's -- the effort has changed. We have elders, Faye Ewan, who reported to us that, you know, they went to check their wheel at 1:00 o'clock in the morning and caught a boat leaving their fishwheel, you know, there. So she lives one mile from her fishwheel. And it used to be customarily that we would actually camp at our camps and I do do that at my camp because it's 50 miles away, I stay there, but nowadays folks are able to work on their fish and then -- right there and go home because it's easier to get -- stay at home and have the running water, et cetera, now, with these modern conveniences.

But they are targeting those schools of fish that are held up during high water.
And it's not just a handful of boats, now there are hundreds. Folks coming from Fairbanks. Our office is located right across from the local grocery store here in Glennallen and I was walking back from the store to our office one day and there was an elderly couple and I asked them if I could help them with anything and he told me, no, he said, we're good, we just came down to go fishing. One of my friends told me where to go so we got our boat and we're going to head out there. This isn't just a few folks, this is a lot of folks that are doing this and targeting fish while they're held up.

Again, I'm urging you to look at the resource, quit managing for people. This has been happening quite a bit, both on the State side and the Federal side. As we just saw, you're looking at what's restricting for the subsistence user, we are subsistence users and we're asking for this restriction because we're concerned for the resource.

Like I said, in one of my previous testimonies I got 66 sockeye this year, this last year, and it was in a one month period. When I first built my own camp at my dad's homeland, I would get 60 in a day, you know, and then we'd shut off the wheel and we'd work and whatever, and get 120 in a day, but 66 in one month is pretty poor. One day I was tasked with watching all the fishwheels and distributing the fish, 40 fish between four fishwheels, that's it, 40 between four, and I was distributing that to the owners because all the young folks were off and working and whatever so I got it to the elders. That's not good. That is the worst I've ever seen it in all the years that I've lived off of this land. I'm 57 years old and there's not a year in my life that I haven't eaten food from this home, my father's homelands. I watch and see and hear my elders talking about the changes that we're seeing, yes, modernization can be a good thing, we're vacuum-packing, we're freezing now, you know, that's a good thing, but dipnetting from boats right now is not a good thing.

It used to be that those folks would take them and drop them off on the banks of the river, the transporters would drop them off on the banks of the river and then they would leave. The other proposal that we have in is to stop them from using fishfinders. I'm sorry but if you're on our river and
you're using a fishfinder, you're going to hit a rock anyway because you're looking down and not ahead of you and reading the river. Anybody that knows this river knows you can't do that. It's a fast moving river, it's braided and you can't use those modern tools on this river to navigate the river.

So I believe that this is where you folks, as the Federal Subsistence Board, can look at and take action to guarantee, to ensure that we have a sustainable fishery. And that's what I've been asking all along, don't do what is more restrictive than the State, don't look at that, we're looking at the resource. I do not want to turn into the Yukon and the Kuskokwim where anybody's restricted, I'm looking at my -- I'm looking for generations down the road, not today, not tomorrow. You know what we have happening now is when there's "record number" getting by the Miles Lake sonar they increase the personal use permit and more people come. It used to be that there were only 3,000 dipnet permits sold a year and now we're at 9,000. So this is an issue. And we need to look at it. You know, our local -- one of our local managers talks about, well, they're getting their limit and it kind of shows a flat line on his graph but he never shows you that there's been a significant increase in permits. And I want to thank Dave Sarafin for mentioning the increase in permits and I strongly believe that it's because now they're using boats.

Anyway I urge you to what is right for the resource and not worry about whether the State is doing it or not, I urge you to look at what can be done. You know, there might not be data but I can tell you what we see on the daily and I sure hope Faye Ewan has called in and is going to speak because she can tell you her personal experiences on that river. We were at Gulkana Village not long ago and they were talking about their concern for that and Odin Miller, who's an anthropologist for Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission was the one that had direct contact to that and that concern raised with him and he said that he would bring it forward so I hope he also comes on to speak to this. You know, some of our local folks aren't out there on the daily and don't see it and then when you have folks that tell that they don't care if they have more data they're not going to use it, and then our local manager with the State, you know, that concerns me. And we're here, we're on the land every
day. We're on that river every day and we know what's going on and we can see it every day and we want to make these changes so that we can ensure that we're not going to be restricted in the future and that this salmon will be here for centuries to come.

You know the whole reason we have salmon now is because Doc Billum wrote a letter to the Department of Education because the BIA and -- this is in the 1900s when they had a fish weir across the entire Copper River and the people in Chitina and up river were starving, that's why we have salmon, we intervened then and we're trying to intervene now, to prevent this from happening and I truly hope that you guys will do what is best for the resource.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Karen. And truly appreciate your testimony for this proposal and adding that level of information for us to consider. Is there any questions from the Board for Karen.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And I, too, echo your concerns, you know, when we look at these proposals, I thought it was alarming to see, you know, 9,000 permit versus 168 permit difference and pointing at each other across the line, like there was a clearly an issue there and so I hope we could resolve that and find a way to continue to meet the priority needs of the users of the area. So thank you for calling in and testifying.

Operator, is there another person online who would like to be recognized at this time.

OPERATOR: We do. We have Faith [sic] Ewan, your line is -- I'm sorry, Faye Ewan your line is open.

MS. EWAN: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair, or Good morning, Mr. Chair. I want to speak on behalf of my tribe and my people here in the Copper River. We face a lot of deficit in many different ways, especially if we live off the river to -- that is one of our biggest diet for the Copper River Ahtna people.
This year, the National Park Service and the State of Alaska issued, maybe, I don't know how many people that put a camp across the river on the Wrangell-St.Elias National ParkLand and gave them the permission to dipnet off the river when us, as a sovereign nation, a tribe here in Alaska can't even go over there and fish on that land and hunt unless we make negotiations on behalf of our people and they go ahead and do that and guess what, the river is only about a half a mile, three-quarter miles wide, they can come over to my wheel and they unload my wheel and they take it back over and have big barbecue over there, there's cameras, there's people, I reported to Ahtna Land Department, I reported -- we had the Fish and Game in there and you know what, they don't do nothing about it. I depend on that fishwheel. So does a lot of people in Alaska, they depend on our fishwheel to feed their families, especially the ones that work in the cities that cannot come out here to do that. When you go down to Chitina and you got 10,000 people there camped all over in that place, encroached on Ahtna lands and fishing out there, by the time the salmon come up to Copper River, in three months I got 500 salmon and five kings to feed my family of 27 of us. That, to me, isn't justice to my people. When we watch -- I grew up on Copper River, my mom and dad started ANILCA, ANILCA for -- when they did the Copper River for fighting for their rights to keep their wheel open in time of shortage. Where ANILCA has not upheld our rights, they have not had government to government consultation on our behalf on fishing stuff like that, we should have a -- a tribal quota should have been given to our tribes way before these dipnetters and these people came in -- in 1962 as dipnetters. As a sovereign nation we have issues, we have rights to this river, we have a right to fish and we have a right to know what's going on and a right to know when there's regulations going down. We should be at the table as a traditional knowledge and educated people to go there and negotiate. We know Copper River and we know what's coming there, we know how it's going to be there.

And every time there was an increase in fish, like Karen said, they brought in more quota when we told Somerville to put a stop to the river, let the fish come through. Okay the biologist said. No fish came to Gulkana River, even up at Batzulnetas, nothing came. That is five years from now. This is depletion.
Another thing too, and why are these people all having these rights to go down the river and dipnet down the middle of the river, especially around where we're fishing. They know where all the eddies are. To me, this is unfair, especially when, you know, as subsistence users are only one percent, two percent users. And everything we have, we have to share. I ended up with 30 salmon this year and a half a king to feed my family of 27 because I have to share with my sister and brothers and my other family that didn't have a fishwheel.

So to me, I would ask the indigenous people in the Copper River region, what do you think about managing this right here. Don't go by the biologists and scientists and them people, we're the people that know that river.

And thank you for listening to me.

(Pause)

MS. EWAN: Anybody there?

(Pause)

MS. EWAN: They hung up on me -- hello?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, we're still online.

MS. PITKA: Thank you for your testimony.

MR. STRIKER: We heard you. We think we might have lost our Chairman again, sometimes he's losing his signal.

MS. PITKA: Thank you, Faye, for your testimony, and thank you Ms. Linnell for your testimony also. Is there anybody else in the que.

OPERATOR: We do have Hope Rogers -- Roberts, I'm sorry, your line is open.

MS. ROBERTS: Good morning again, Staff and Federal Subsistence Board. Thank you for the floor. Also (In Native) to elder Faye Ewan.
I am the -- again, I am the intertribal liaison for Federal subsistence outreach at Chugach Regional Resources Commission.

I'm sorry, hold on a second.

(Pause)

MS. ROBERTS: Chugach Regional Resources Commission is an intertribal fish and wildlife commission that address environmental and natural resource issues of concern.

Last year we developed the InterTribal Federal Subsistence Cooperative Management Alliance and I am speaking on behalf of them this morning for FP21-13. We ask you to support this proposal. These comments are similar to the other ones that I've given. These recommendations came from the Joint Copper River Salmon Symposium in 2019 where research and conservation of the resource were two major points of agreement that Upper and Lower River user groups agreed were necessary while these proposals would create a situation where Federal subsistence rights were stricter than State regulations. We believe the importance of these salmon runs require precautionary approach to conservation.

That is what I have for that particular proposal, Staff and Board.

Thank you.

MS. PITKA: Thank you, Ms. Roberts, for the testimony. Does anybody have any questions for Ms. Roberts.

(No comments)

MS. PITKA: If not, is there anybody else in the que for oral public testimony on 21-13.

OPERATOR: We do have, we have Odin Miller, your line is open.

MR. MILLER: Hi, thank you. Thank you for the opportunity Federal Subsistence Board members to comment on this proposal, FP21-13. I don't have any remarks prepared, I apologize.
But I can just speak to some of what I've seen and heard working at Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission as an anthropologist. From what I've seen, dipnetting out of boats has been a major conservation concern among Ahtna subsistence fishers as Karen and Faye were both able to express from years of direct experience on the river. As Karen mentioned, there's traditional knowledge that fish during times of high water tend to hole up in deep parts of the river and that when the water level begins to drop, they go through in pulses and so I think that, you know, until the 2020 low salmon return it seemed like there was some question or dispute among managers on the Copper River about whether sockeye runs were even actually doing that badly, I think some of that's changed. But what I've seen is that there's been a lot of qualitative observations from people who have years of experience fishing on the river and are raising a lot of concern about various indicators about the health of the species and I think that the pulses of fish that Karen mentioned, the fact that those aren't going through with nearly the same intensity they used to be; that's something that I've heard several people mention that is potentially an indicator of a change in run quality that is quite concerning.

I think, more generally, just a difference between fishwheels and dipnetting from the bank, one way in which those methods differ from dipnetting from a boat is that dipnetting from a boat, just to state the obvious is a lot more mobile, people can go anywhere in the river that's navigable. Now, granted there's certain things that limit where you can practically dipnet but it gives people who use this practice a lot more mobility and if they can figure out where the fish are, it gives people the ability to target schools of fish with a lot more of a surgical precision.

And then finally the other thing with regard to Federally-qualified subsistence users, as the Staff mentioned in their analysis, this would only affect a small number of Federally-qualified subsistence users because most use fishwheels. And I think one reason why most Federally-qualified subsistence users use fishwheels is because owning a boat costs a lot of money, it's very expensive, so I think it does -- if this increasingly becomes a predominant method of harvesting salmon it sort of, I
think, you know, makes -- it could have the potential
to make subsistence fishing on the Copper River into an
increasingly expensive activity that requires a lot
more funds to successfully participate in.

And, you know, to be perfectly honest I
don't have a whole lot of hope that the Federal
Subsistence Board is going to pass this proposal today,
especially because the Southcentral RAC has already
voted against it, but I think as with, you know, some
of the previous proposals, I would just encourage the
OSM and, you know, other agencies, the State as well,
to support doing a lot more concerted and directed
research into fishing equipment and other factors that
might be affecting the health of stocks on the Copper
River because it seems to me like a lot of these
things, from what I've been able to find, there really
isn't a lot of really good studies and high quality
data about the kind of effects these are having. And
so given the conservation concerns that a lot of people
have it seems like this is really something that
warrants a lot further research and that we should be
using the precautionary principle and putting pause on
practices that may be having negative impact on salmon
populations.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for
that. Any questions from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
hearing none, Operator -- thank you for calling in
today, appreciate that. Is there anyone else that
would like to be recognized at this time.

OPERATOR: And you can just press star
one. Our next one is Gloria Stickwan, your line is
open.

MS. STICKWAN: I wanted to speak to
FP21-13 fishing from a boat. Earlier I heard that
there's no studies done on fishing from a boat or
keeping data on that. It wouldn't be that hard to add
that to the permit, how you have access to the fish, if
you use a boat or not. I think a baseline study should
be started because as the years go by there's going to
be an increase in this kind of fishery to fish from a boat and possibly dipnetting, and it's going to be adopted in the Lower Copper River too if there's ever a fishery down there, you know, it's going to be -- it will be adopted, I'm sure. If there ever is a fishery in the Lower Copper River, and what impact that's going to have on the total fisheries in the Copper River, there is going to be an impact. So I think the National Park Service should have that on the permit. I would ask them to put that on there and keep track of that.

Hovercrafts were used on the National River, what other boats are being used on the Copper River. What types of boat. We don't have any data on that and what impact does it have on the Copper River. That sort of thing needs to be kept track of. Because there is an impact on the fisheries because, you know, they're able to go where their ideal spots are for where -- where the sockeye are held up and who knows, due to lack of enforcement, could be harvesting a lot of fish. We don't have any enforcement on the fisheries other than the State, the National Park Service can't go out there anymore, I mean, you know, who's doing enforcement on the river other than the State. I don't think anybody.

One of the things I heard about is the people said they were on their fishwheels and they had wakes from boats being close to their fishwheel, made their fishwheels rock while they were on it because the boats are too close to their fishwheel.

And this fish proposal -- I mean this kind of fishing, I think was adopted from the State, like most of the regulations were. It's not customary and traditional for the Ahtna people to use boats to fish, we've used dipnetting from a platform on the river. The biggest concern I have about this is a conservation concern, about low returns of sockeye and kings and enforcement, who's watching people getting their bag limit, who's watching them to make sure they do that -- make sure they get their bag limit.

And also I've heard that people are fishing close to the tributaries and they're doing well there, fishing close to the tributaries like Klutina, getting close to that area, being able to catch a lot of fish that are going up there to spawn at Klutina.
Lake. I mean it's affecting the spawning fish by fishing too close to the tributaries with boats.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Gloria. Appreciate your taking the time to call in today to testify to this. Any questions from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Gloria. Operator, will you please recognize the next one online.

OPERATOR: Yes, and that comes from Jim Simon, your line is open.

MR. SIMON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the Board and Regional Advisory Council members. My name's Jim Simon. I am a consultant with the Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission, but today I just want to share my personal comments on this proposal as a former Federally-qualified user who grew up living on Copper River salmon and have also spent 30 years working throughout Alaska as an anthropologist and spent 14 of those years as the Regional Program Manager for the Arctic/Yukon and Kuskokwim region.

And through those experiences I've learned from elders from different rivers that are quite different from the Copper River, you know, geologically, et cetera, but, you know, the fish -- it's highly effective fishing from boat and with fishfinders in the middle channel during high water periods or any period, it's concerning to me from a conservation standpoint because of the lack of tributary monitoring and to really protect the diversity of those various stocks of salmon, both chinook salmon and sockeye salmon and just the gauntlet of the canyon, and this new emergent fishery, dipnetting from boats, is likely having a disproportionate effect on the passage of fish up river. And in many other areas traditional knowledge has long understood that fish swimming in the middle of the river are likely often times bound further up stream and that, you know, when before fish turn into the tributaries to reach their spawning ground they get
bank oriented and I think that this is part of why fishwheels and dipnetting from shore, as is the customary and traditional practice on the Copper River is an important legacy of tribal stewardship because the conditions of the river, for one, as well as being able to monitor how the various fisheries, the long traditional fisheries along the river impacted the spawning and health of those populations.

And so I'm very concerned at the lack of fish getting past the bridge in Chitina for — and the testimony that you have heard about how it takes a month of active fishing to get what used to show up in your fishwheel in one day, and that this is likely a hypothesis that should be investigated as to how this new fishery, from dipnetting from boats, is impacting those up river stocks. Even the hatchery program isn't being able to reach their recovery goal for new eggs, et cetera, there are not enough fish getting past the bridge.

And I urge you to vote to support this proposal in opposition of the Regional Advisory Council position because of the conservation concern of chinook salmon in particular, but also sockeye salmon, which is increasingly becoming a problem and an area of concern.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. I appreciate you taking the time to comment today. Any questions from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, you have a nice day today. Appreciate again you taking the time. Operator is there somebody else who would like to testify to this proposal.

OPERATOR: We do have Karen Linnell, your line is open.

MS. LINNELL: Thank you. I want to thank you for the second opportunity to talk. One of the things that I failed to mention earlier was the erosion. You know, we hear a lot about the climate change and the effects on the coastal waters but we're also seeing it here in our rivers and losing, you know,
20 or 30 feet of bank for change and having to move our fish camps and things like that. That's an additional concern. The fishwheels and the proximity of those boats going by when they cause a wake, it can cause your fishwheel to get off kilter and stop.

And then the other thing I want to talk about and Gloria and folks were talking about, simple change to the permit. I'm not sure, but maybe Barb Cellarius can speak to it but I know when we were talking about having -- being able to compare apples to apples when I was on the Board of Game, we asked if they could change the Federal permit to include the antler spread and how many brow tines was on it and that they had to go through an OMB process and that it was a cumbersome thing and it wasn't as simple as reprinting new permits, and so there's that process that needs to happen as well. And so I don't know if Barb can speak to it but at the time it seemed like it was a difficult thing and not a simple change as that. And so I think that those are considerations that you folks will have to address in your deliberation as well.

I just thought I'd raise that as a concern.

Again, I just would like you to, again, urge you to do what's best for the resource and not worry about so much the people and it seems that we've shifted to managing for people, and this is what's going on at the State level. When I was on the Board of Game it was one of my bigger concerns and I raised it quite often is that we're managing people versus managing the resource.

And I just want to thank you for your time and your consideration in this matter.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Karen. And, again, always appreciate your input on the proposals. Any questions from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And, again, thank you. Operator, is there anyone else who would
like to be recognized.

OPERATOR: At this time I'm showing no further comments.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, thank you very much and appreciate everyone who took the time to call in this morning to publicly testify. At this time we'll move on to Regional Advisory Council recommendation, RAC Chair.

MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is DeAnna Perry, Council Coordinator for the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council and for Greg Encelewski, the Chair.

The Southcentral Regional Advisory Council opposed this proposal 1 to 8. The Council majority agreed with the rationale provided by OSM in its analysis and felt that this proposal would be an unnecessary restriction on Federally-qualified subsistence users. This would limit how those users could harvest their fish and drifting could make harvesting more efficient and less time consuming. Further this proposal would affect only a small number of Federal subsistence users as this is not a method used by a lot of people. The restrictions would be contrary to the intent of ANILCA. It is concerning that many people you see boat dipnetting are State subsistence users with a commercial operator. This burden would be too big of a change on the small group of Federal subsistence users. And this Council also discussed, possibly, sending a letter to address this issue to the Board of Fish. They will further discuss that at their upcoming winter meeting in February.

That's the recommendation of the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Appreciate that. Is there any other Regional Advisory Council Chairs.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And, again, I'll just ask one more time is there a Regional Council
recommendation, I know we've been hearing from two of you.

MS. ENTSINGER: Yes, Mr. Chair, this is Sue Entsminger for the Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor, Sue.

MS. ENTSINGER: Okay, thank you. And good morning, folks. This proposal was six support, two opposed by the Eastern Interior. The Council noted that this proposed regulatory change is getting a lot of support from Federally-qualified subsistence users because fishing from boats has long-term effects on the way of fishing in the Copper. The Council said that the fishing from boats is becoming increasingly competitive and provides an advantage over traditional methods and means, such as dipnetting from shore and using fishwheels. This is a typical situation in a fishery where people have discovered a new method of fishing, once it becomes popular because of its success and advantage it will overturn long-term established fishery practices. Next we'll be dealing with too many boats on the river. It will become dangerous to people, the conflicts will start with too many boats trying to fish at the same time. The Council believes that the Federal Subsistence Board should take the lead on this issue by recognizing the negative effects of dipnetting from boats on Federally-qualified subsistence users and use its leverage to convince the State to also pass this regulation.

Additionally, the Council said that this type of fishing does not give fish a place to hide and rest without being interrupted and captured, which is an issue due to the long migrations.

And I wanted to say this, again, is a situation where if the State Board of Fish met first then they -- and they supported something like this for State users then the Federal side met later, it's possible that things might change on how the support of this goes, because at the SRC meeting I attended -- I'm a representative from the Eastern Interior RAC to the SRC, the vote was one to seven and several subsistence users actually had talked to me and they feel that a lot of the abuse is not subsistence users, they felt it
was from the State users. So I mean I think that's why
the vote was one to seven at the SRC and then the 6/2
at the Eastern Interior RAC. And I know that the
people on the Eastern Interior RAC, the majority of
them are from the Yukon and they do have concerns of
other fisheries because of what has occurred on the
Yukon.

So that's all I have.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue. Any questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other
Regional Advisory Council recommendations or RAC Chairs
who wish to speak at this time.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, thank you. Hearing none there we will move onto
tribal Alaska Native Corp comments, Orville Lind.

MR. LIND: Yeah, can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have
the floor.

MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Board
members. Orville Lind, Native Liaison for the Office
of Subsistence Management. During the consultation
held in June we had one member, Chief Gary state that
he was not in support of this proposal, FP21-13.

That's all I have, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Orville. Appreciate that. Any questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, hearing
none there, we'll move on to Alaska Department of Fish
and Game comments, Ben Mulligan.
MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

For the record, Ben Mulligan, Alaska Department of Fish and Game. The Department opposes this proposal prohibiting dipnetting from boat. It would be unnecessarily restrictive on subsistence users with no management or biological benefit. It would create inconsistencies between State and Federal regulations.

Given the question that I think was posed earlier by BIA, I reached out to our area biologist, Mark Somerville, and if we can let him in on the call he is prepared to provide some data.

OPERATOR: And this is the Operator, I am looking for his line. One moment please.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Who are we talking about, Operator.

OPERATOR: Mark Somerville, I'll open the line.

MR. SOMERVILLE: Yes, hello, this is Mark Somerville with the Department of Fish and Game, area management biologist for the Upper Copper, Upper Susitna Management Area. I know you had several questions earlier and I apologize I couldn't -- I was trying to get online to answer those questions at the time and wasn't able to. So, Board Members, please, by all means please repeat your questions or come up with any other questions. We have lots of data on harvest from boats versus shore, in boat fisheries, and harvest success over the last 20 years, so feel free to ask any questions you'd like, sir.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hello, could you guys still hear me on this line?

REPORTER: Yes.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Yes.

MR. SOMERVILLE: I can hear you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, I was just making sure. I appreciate you taking the time to call in too as well. Any questions for the State.

MR. CHEN: Mr. Chair, BIA.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: BIA, you have the floor.

MR. CHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, Mr. Somerville, so we had asked the question earlier about information pertaining to dipnet harvest from boats, if there's any quantitative or anecdotal information from the managers, and also if you have a sense as to whether or not boat harvest, dipnet harvests have been increasing, staying the same or decreasing.

Thank you very much.

MR. SOMERVILLE: Yes, sir. Through the Chair. BIA. So the Department of Fish and Game has been monitoring harvest from boats versus shore since 2001 in the Chitina subdistrict below the bridge in the personal use fishery and we just started requiring -- in 2019 was the first year we required that same information from subsistence above the bridge, whether they fish from boats or from shore when they're fishing with a dipnet.

So it looks like, basically over the last five years average harvest in the personal use fishery below the bridge, about 25 percent of the harvest is taken by dipnets from boats versus dipnets from shore. Success rates, you're looking at about slightly better success rates for boat versus shore in that fishery.

And then in the subsistence fishery in 2019 about 30 percent of the sockeye salmon that were harvested by dipnets, were harvested from boats, and about 36 percent of the king salmon were harvested from boats. Looking at the numbers here, success rates, dipnetting from a boat the average harvest for king salmon is two per permit and 27 sockeye; dipnetting from shore average harvest of kings was one per permit and 45 sockeye per permit.

And then when you compare that to fishwheels, the average harvest for fishwheel is five king salmon and 70 sockeye per permit on a fishwheel.

So dipnetting from boats compared to dipnetting from shore, below the bridge is a slight advantage, and dipnetting in the subsistence fishery...
it's -- for some people, like I say, find it more
successful, but overall harvest per permit is a little
bit lower than any other methods used in those
fisheries.

In all cases, the harvest in both
districts is -- we feel it's plenty sustainable
regardless of the method. We have been seeing an
increase in dipnet permits in the subsistence fishery
along with a decrease in the number of people getting
on fishwheels. The overall effect of this is not an
increase in harvest but an overall decrease in harvest,
since dipnetting from boats is less effective than
fishing from a fishwheel.

And then as far as dipnetting and
success rates, at high water all fisheries do poorly,
whether you're dipnetting from a boat, from shore, or a
fishwheel. High water affects all the gear types
pretty much the same. People do still find stocks to
fish from boats because they can move around and so on,
the eddies shift, depending on the water level, but
overall success goes down during the high water.

I agree with the testimony there as far
as the pulsing of fish after high waters. In 2020 we
did not see those pulses. And that's not because of
anything to do with the fisheries, it has to do with
the fact that we had so few fish in the river that
those pulses were pretty much hard to see.

The other observations from 2020 here
is that -- to let you know, it was the lowest sockeye
salmon run for the Copper River since the early 1960s.
So obviously we're going to see a lot lower harvest.
Harvest in the Glennallen subdistrict was about 35 --
it looks like it's going to be about 35 percent below
average. Harvest in the personal use fishery below the
bridge is running about 55 percent below average. And
the commercial fishery is somewhere about 90 percent
below average for 2020. So an extremely bad year and
everybody saw the same results in their harvest and
stuff, it just wasn't a good year.

So that's the differences between the
different fisheries there.

If you have any other specific
questions I'll be happy to answer those.
MR. CHEN: Mr. Somerville, thank you very much for that detailed information it was very helpful.

MR. SOMERVILLE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you as well. Any other questions from the Board.

MR. STRIKER: Mr. Chair, Park Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor.

MR. STRIKER: Thank you. Ben, I appreciate your input and the -- I certainly appreciate opposition to proposals that create more inconsistency between the State and the Feds. I'm curious on this notion of a Federal action setting a precedent and in doing so perhaps moving the State fisheries folks to consider a proposal. Is there precedent for Federal action taking, you know, sort of that additional incentive for impacting the State deliberations?

MR. MULLIGAN: Through the Chair. Member Striker. You know I'd have to -- that'd be something I'd have to research. In the time I've been here I'm trying to, you know, dig through my memory just from my time from 2010 to 2015, and the two years now but then also my time going to Board of Fish meetings when I was a legislative aide and I'm trying to remember if I ever saw a case where justification for passing a Board proposal hinged on aligning Federal and State regs on our side, it seems like, just knowing -- it seems like the situations where the Board of Fish or Board of Game has made the action and then we see a subsequent proposal come into your Board's process, but that's something -- I mean I can definitely talk to folks who've got, you know, decades of experience with the Board. I'll talk to our Executive Directors, of both the Board of Fish and the Board of Game and see if I can't provide some examples for you guys.

As our directed -- as we developed our protocols on, I can provide that to Mr. Pappas to provide to all the Board members and their Staff.

MR. STRIKER: Thank you. Thank you so much.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any other questions.

MS. PITKA: Not necessarily a question. But there is precedence for State Board action following Federal action and reverse. We kind of do it all the time.

And also how many State permits were issued to boat users?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I think that was a question back to the State, how many permits, if you guys do know, that were issued to boat dipnetters?

MR. MULLIGAN: Mr. Chair. I'd have to ask Mark Somerville to answer that question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank you.

MR. SOMERVILLE: Yes, this is Mark Somerville, so what was the question again, please.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Rhonda, you have the floor.

MS. PITKA: How many State permits were issued to boat users?

MR. SOMERVILLE: To boat -- I don't have that information directly in front of me right now, but as far as, though, in the Chitina dipnet permit we issue the permits and people can either fish from boat or shore, their choice, and they list their harvest. So on average, over the last five years in the Chitina subdistrict below the bridge, 1,039 permitholders show that they fished from a boat, and 4,855 showed that they fished from shore. And the -- let me look here for a second, the number of permits dipnetted from boats in the Chitina -- in the Glennallen subdistrict in 2019 we had 548 permits that dipnetted from a boat and in 2019 we issued roughly about 2,000 -- or, actually I take that back, about 1,700 permits were issued that year from the State. 173 showed that they dipnetted from shore, 150 did not -- did not show what they -- did not designate boat or shore.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for answering that. I hope that helped you Rhonda.

Any other Board discussion or questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll move on to InterAgency Staff Committee comments, Katya, you have the floor.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the Board. For the record, this is Katya Wessels.

The InterAgency Staff Committee provided the standard comment on the Fisheries Proposal FP21-13.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, thank you, Katya, for that. We'll move on to the Board discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I think we've had a lot of good discussion here on this one. We'll move on, I will open the floor at this time for Board action.

MR. STRIKER: Mr. Chair, Park Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Don, you have the floor.

MR. STRIKER: I move that we adopt FP21-13, and if I get a second I'll explain why, with heavy heart, I plan to vote against my motion.

MR. BROWER: Second.

MR. STRIKER: Thank you. You know I'm really very moved by the public testimony and particularly that of those who have such a depth of traditional knowledge in this area. Ultimately, though, it just seems to me that adopting this proposal
would take subsistence harvest opportunity away from those Federal users that rely on dipnetting from boats. Most of the salmon harvest by Federal subsistence users in the Glennallen subdistrict is by fishwheel, but there are subsistence users that don't have access to fishwheels and public land available to install a fishwheel is pretty limited, so dipnetting from boats, you know, is necessary for some subsistence users and it's particularly efficient for harvest in the Chitina subdistrict.

I guess my concern is that imposing this restriction on subsistence users who don't have fishwheels won't necessarily have a significant impact on the problem that we heard testimony about. Compared to State fisheries, Federal subsistence users harvests are relatively low number of Copper River salmon, and a stated by the State there's not a conservation need right now to restrict dipnetting from boats.

So I guess my intent is to oppose the proposal consistent with the recommendation of the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council and the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any other discussion or comments from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the question.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been called. Roll call, Sue, please.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. The motion is to adopt Fisheries Proposal 21-13.

Let's see, Park Service, Don Striker.

MR. STRIKER: I oppose for the reasons stipulated but I will commit to people that I will work with Superintendent Bobowski to coordinate more science and not -- not let this issue go.
Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Greg Siekaniec, Fish and Wildlife Service.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Sue. For reasons articulated by the National Park Service and in support of the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council, I agree with the National Park Service to oppose this proposal. I think ultimately this proposal will not eliminate the practice of concern we are speaking of or contribute to conservation of salmon stocks without concurrent State support and action and I do advocate for the idea of the precautionary principle at least being given some level of review and discussion as to whether or not we are hitting some level of need for addressing this issue concurrently with the State and Federal.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Glenn Chen, BIA.

MR. CHEN: Yes, the BIA votes to oppose the proposal as per the reasons articulated by Mr. Striker and also in support of the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council as well.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Just to make sure, that's -- you oppose the proposal, correct?

MR. CHEN: That's affirmative, Sue.

MS. DETWILER: Yeah, okay, thank you.

My phone was cutting out a little bit there.

Chad Padgett, BLM.

MR. PADGETT: I oppose for the reasons already stated by my counterparts. Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.
Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

MR. SCHMID: Yeah, I'm also going to oppose in deference to the RAC but share the concerns expressed by the National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service and others then that there is a need here for some concurrent work with the State and I pledge as well to do anything that I may be able to to promote that and look for a workable solution here. I rely heavily on the traditional ecological knowledge in the many of the folks that testified today expressed, and would like to incorporate that moving forward as this looks like this is an expanding issue and certainly affects those users locally. But we'll oppose at this point.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Dave.

Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: Hello, can you hear me?

MS. DETWILER: Yes, Rhonda.

MS. PITKA: I vote to support FCR21-13 [sic] in deference to the Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council per the recommendation on Page 263, the Council believes that the Federal Subsistence Board should take the lead on this issue by recognizing the negative effects of dipnetting from boats on Federally-qualified subsistence users.

I believe there is a public safety concern with people who dipnet from boats. I believe it was Ms. Ewan who spoke to that particular danger. And there is also a conservation issue on this particular river. The fact that people that were getting 60 fish in one day are now getting 60 fish in one month is very concerning and we should look more deeply into this issue.

Thank you, very much.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Rhonda.

Public Member Charlie Brower.

MR. BROWER: Public Member Charles Brower also supports the recommendation provided by my
colleague Rhonda Pitka.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

And, finally, Chair, Tony Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, I agree with everybody and oppose [sic] in deference to the RAC. Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: So you are opposed to the motion -- are you in agreement with Rhonda and Charlie or with the other members of the Board?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: My vote should be reflected as the same as everybody else's, I agree with Rhonda and Charlie.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you. Okay, so we have three votes in favor of the motion to adopt FP21-13 and five opposed to adopt the motion, so the motion to adopt fails so FP21-13 is not adopted.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, thank you, and I think that concludes the order of business for this morning. I want to thank everybody for their hard work. We will be making a couple of announcements right after the lunch break here so standby. I want to say, again, thank you to all the Staff and everybody for patiently waiting as we get through the process on the teleconference in this tough epidemic time we're in. So hope to see you guys all back here at 1:30. 1:30. Please call in early and be ready to go to business.

MR. SCHMID: Thank you.

(Off record)

(On record)

OPERATOR: Thank you for rejoining. I would now like to turn the conference over to Sue Detwiler.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Chair Tony Christianson, are you on?
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, I'm on the phone, thank you, Sue.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. Would you like me to continue with the roll call for the Board members and then also go through and see which Regional Council Chairs have joined us?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, thank you, Sue.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. Dave Schmid is out for an hour and a half or so. Wayne Owen, I understand you're on.

MR. OWEN: Yes, Sue, I am.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. Wayne is on for Forest Service.

Chad Padgett from BLM.

MR. PADGETT: I'm here, thanks, Sue.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Glenn Chen, BIA.

MR. CHEN: Hi, Sue, I will be on for a bit longer and then Gene plans to join us in a few minutes.

MS. DETWILER: Oh, okay, thank you.

Greg Siekaniec, Fish and Wildlife Service.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Yes, good afternoon, Sue, I am here.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Greg.

Don Striker, Park Service.

MR. STRIKER: Good afternoon, thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Don.
Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

(No comments)

MS. DETWILER: Public Member Charlie Brower.

(No comments)

MS. DETWILER: They may be still trying to get into the speaker's room. I will go ahead and go through the RAC Chairs and maybe give Rhonda and Charlie a couple minutes to get back online if they're not already online.

Southeast Chair, Southeast Regional Council, DeAnna, you or Cathy on the phone.

MS. PERRY: DeAnna is on. I believe Cathy was going to as well, but in case she isn't, I'm on.

MS. DETWILER: Okay -- okay, thank you.

Do we have anyone from Southcentral.

MS. PERRY: Again, this is DeAnna, I'll be sitting in for Chair Encelewski.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thanks, DeAnna.

Kodiak/Aleutians, Della, are you on.

MS. TRUMBLE: Great.

Bristol Bay, Nanci Morris Lyon.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yes, I'm here.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, great.

Yukon Kuskokwim Delta, Ray Oney, did you join us.

MR. ONEY: Ray Oney here, thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Oh, great, thank you.

Let's see, Western Interior, Jenny
Pelkola.

MS. PELKOLA: Yes, I'm here.

MS. DETWILER: Okay.

Louis Green, Seward Peninsula.
(No comments)

MS. DETWILER: Anyone from Seward Peninsula join -- Regional Advisory Council join.
(No comments)

MS. DETWILER: Okay.
Northwest Arctic. Did anybody join us from Northwest Arctic.

MR. PAPPAS: Sue, this is George Pappas. Yes, I was contacted that the Chair is currently ill today and the Vice Chair is at work, they're trying to get the Vice Chair off to attend.

Thank you -- or thank you, Sue.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you, George.
Eastern Interior, Sue Entsminger.
(No comments)

MS. DETWILER: And I understand we don't have anybody from the North Slope Regional Advisory Council but, Eva, are you on the line?

MS. PATTON: Yes, Sue, this is Eva. I'll be online to speak to their one crossover proposal.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

And Rhonda Pitka, I believe you are back online, can you confirm that?
(No comments)
MS. DETWILER: Operator, can you check
to see if Rhonda Pitka's line is open or if she's on.

MR. LORD: Sue, she was on the chat
thing, she was online about a minute ago.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. I believe the
Operator is checking to see if Rhonda Pitka is online
and if she can be moved to the speaker's room if she's
not, and in the meantime, Charlie Brower, have you
joined us?

(No comments)

MS. DETWILER: Okay. So Operator we
are having a little bit of trouble getting Rhonda
online, I'm seeing her on a chat line but I'm not able
to hear her on the phone and I just want to make sure
she's recorded as being present here.

OPERATOR: Okay. I just looked in the
main conference, I did not see her dialed in. We did
just get a signal so one moment.

(Pause)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: It seems, Sue,
there's a few people having trouble being heard online
(indiscernible - cuts out) recognized.

MS. DETWILER: Yes. And I'm also
seeing that -- ask the Operator if she could move Cathy
Needham to the speaker's room as well. And also Rhonda
Pitka. So we need both Rhonda Pitka and Cathy Needham
moved to the speaker's room. And Charlie Brower if he
is there as well.

OPERATOR: I do see Cathy. I'm not
seeing Rhonda.

MS. DETWILER: Hum. So is she in the
other room, the public room?

OPERATOR: I'm not seeing her -- I see
Cathy and I see Joshua but I'm not -- I'm not seeing
Rhonda. One moment.

(Pause)
MS. DETWILER: Okay. So it looks like Rhonda has hung up and she is going to try calling in again so.

(Pause)

OPERATOR: Okay, Cathy has been opened.

(Pause)

MS. PITKA: Hello, this is Rhonda, I am online.

MS. DETWILER: Oh, great, Rhonda, you're in the speaker's room, finally. So let me just check to see if Charlie Brower -- Public Member Charlie Brower did you -- are you in any -- either of the rooms?

(No comments)

MS. DETWILER: Okay. Well, Mr. Chair, we do have seven of eight people -- seven of eight Board Members online.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right. Hopefully they can continue to have Rhonda and try to get her patched in, and hopefully she'll get on -- so on the agenda here, I know we had discussed earlier when you said -- I said there'd be a couple of announcements.

I'd like to say that we'd like to congratulate Lisa Maas, the OSM policy coordinator had a baby and is (indiscernible - breaking up) and we'd like to say congratulations to Lisa and God Bless them. And we'll wait and (indiscernible - breaking up) Rhonda birthday.

REPORTER: So, Tony, this is Tina.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

REPORTER: Hi, this is Tina. So you're breaking up quite a bit, I'm not sure how you're talking in your phone but I just wanted to let you know that, for recording-wise.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Is that a
little bit better, I'm hollering at my phone.

REPORTER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. Yeah, it just might be the connection, it sounds a little grainy on my end.

REPORTER: Yeah, it seems like it's changed this afternoon, for everybody.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah. Yeah, I had a little older line that wasn't working as well.

REPORTER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So we'll try to get back to Board business here and we'll go ahead and have the next analysis.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, this is Greg.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Greg.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Yeah, Tony, I'm not hearing you really at all. I didn't hear any of your announcement and you're just starting now and you're really breaking up.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, you guys are really breaking up too, I don't know what the -- the connection is not very good on this end either but I can hear you guys.

REPORTER: Okay, so where are we then?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: My first announcement was just about Lisa Maas having a baby and I wanted to congratulate her and wish her the best at home. And then Rhonda's birthday is coming up this week.

REPORTER: Happy Birthday Rhonda.

MR. SIEKANIEC: All right, well, thank you, Tony, I did hear it come through that time. And, yeah, congratulations to Lisa and Happy Birthday Rhonda.
MS. PITKA: Thank you, all.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Help me Rhonda. I'd almost sing you a song.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, well, it sounds like we're all back on now and connected and I'll do my best to talk loud, it's a bad connection, so everybody can hear. And with that I'll turn it over to Sue, we can get started on the next proposal and call on the Staff to provide the analysis. Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. The next proposal is Fisheries Proposal 21-14 and I believe that, again, is Hannah Voorhees doing -- starting that presentation.

MS. VOORHEES: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. This is Hannah Voorhees again. I'm an anthropologist at OSM. And this is the last you'll be hearing from me today. I have a fairly brief presentation for you for this final proposal.

Fisheries Proposal 21-14 begins on Page 276 of your Board book. This proposal was also submitted by Kirk Wilson of Glennallen and requests that the Board prohibit use of onboard devices that indicate bathymetry and/or fish location also known as fishfinders while fishing from boats or other watercrafts in the Upper Copper River.

The proponent states that the use of electronic devices enables fishers to locate and target specific holding areas for sensitive salmon stock. Most of the information for this proposal pertaining to public waters, cultural knowledge and traditional practices and biological background is identical to that presented for the previous Upper Copper River proposals.

The waters of the Upper Copper River are fast and murky. Fish cannot be seen as they travel up the river and traditional Ahtna practices of fishing with basket dipnets from platforms was adapted to these conditions. Today, fishwheels are the predominate gear.
in use by Federally-qualified subsistence users in this area. As a reminder and for example, in 2013 Gulkana residents took 91 percent of their salmon harvest in edible weight by fishwheels and Tazlina residents took 88 percent of their salmon harvest by fishwheel.

Dipnetting, including from boats and, therefore, the use of fishfinders in combination with fishing takes place primarily under State permit.

The OSM conclusion is to oppose this proposal with the following justification.

If this proposal is adopted, Federal subsistence regulations pertaining to use of gear would be more restrictive than State subsistence or personal use regulation. In addition, prohibiting fishfinders may create a safety issue for those navigating the river. Adopting this proposal would probably need to the proponent's desired conservation outcome. Federally-qualified subsistence users are the ones who would have to adhere to this regulation if they do not dipnet from boats and (indiscernible) with fishfinders in significance enough numbers to make this an effective conservation measure. Furthermore, Federally-qualified subsistence users could continue to use fishfinders on boats under State regulations in both the Glennallen subsistence and the Chitina personal use fisheries.

A proposal similar to the one being considered here will be taken up at the next Board of Fisheries meeting where Prince William Sound proposals are discussed. That proposal would prohibit fishfinders in the Upper Copper River district from June 1st to September 30th under State regulations.

Thank you.

That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions for Staff.

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair, I'm online finally.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Charlie, for joining us, appreciate you getting on.
No questions for Staff, we'll move on to summary of public comments, Council Chair coordinator.

MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the Board. This is DeAnna Perry, Southcentral Regional Advisory Council Coordinator. Five written public comments in support were received on this proposal and those can be found in your meeting book starting on Page 292.

A summary of those comments.

The Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission supports this proposal and states that fishfinders enable boat-based fishers to target schools of fish and this targeting contributes to the likely overfishing of salmon. This proposal would be unlikely to have negative impacts on many Federally-qualified subsistence users and restricting fishfinders would merely encourage inexperienced fishers to develop the knowledge and experience requisite for fishing on a swift, dangerous river such as the Copper.

Michael Mahoney supports this proposal. Again, stating that these changes would be helpful in protecting our king salmon. Addressing Fish Proposals 21-12, 13, and 14 at once, he states that all of these practices are not customary and traditional and have resulted in much higher efficiency levels of harvest.

Thea Thomas strongly supports this proposal and as stated before commenting on Fish Proposals 21-11, 12, 13 and 14, that it was important to limit overharvest in the Chitina dipnet fishery and to acquire timely data on the harvest.

Ahtna TeneNene' supports the proposal stating that allowing use of fishfinders may encourage fishermen to find ideal spots on the Copper River to overharvest salmon. Everyone should be concerned about allowing fishfinders due to the condition of the fishery this past summer. There was low sockeye and king salmon runs.

Bonnie Yazzie supported the proposal stating that boaters with fishfinders have used the excuse that they need them to navigate the river channel, these fishers need to learn the river channel.
Using fishfinders to find salmon is taking unfair advantage.

Kirk Wilson, the proponent, commented that allowing fishfinders may encourage fishermen to find ideal spots to overharvest salmon.

Again, for the comments in their entirety, those can be read starting on Page 292 of your meeting book.

The Wrangell-St. Elias National Park Subsistence Resource Commission also provided a comment in support of this proposal and stated their vote was 5 in support and 3 opposed. Justification for supporting the proposal included an increase in fishing from boats, which some characterized as a new fishery and, with it, an increase in the number of people using fishfinders. Using fishfinders allows people to target areas such as eddies where fish are resting and catch more fish, although one of the members who opposed the proposal questioned the effectiveness of fishfinders in locating many fish in the silty waters of the Copper River.

Last week, just prior to this Board meeting I received a comment from the Copper Basin Advisory Committee opposing this proposal. In summary, saying that fishfinders do not seem to work well in silty water, depth finders can help with safety of operating a boat. They stated that the quality of the units makes a big difference. They mentioned concerns about how to enforce this and that people would have to remove them from boats and the Advisory Committee did not want to take away a safety device.

That's the summary of the public written comments received on this proposal.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, DeAnna, appreciate that. At this time, Operator, we'll open the floor to the public to be recognized to this specific agenda item.

Thank you.

(No comments)
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Operator, were you able to hear me on that one?

OPERATOR: Yes. If you would like to make a public comment, please press star one. We do have a public comment from Karen Linnell, your line is open.

MS. LINNELL: Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. Again, we're seeing a decrease in salmon getting to the north end of the tributaries and the headwaters where my fish camp is. And looking at this, and I want to remind you folks, in looking at the comments from both the Eastern Interior RAC and the Southcentral RAC, both have jurisdiction here a Eastern Interior represents Mentasta, Dot Lake and Dry Creek, who all have a C&T in Copper River.

I just want to say that this is new technology that gives benefit to a small percentage of users that can and will exploit that. On our river, if you're looking down and not looking ahead and reading the sand bars and the river, you're going to end up on a sand bar high centered. You have to pay attention to what's going on around you. Our river is not extremely deep and not slow flowing like the Yukon or, you know, it's a pretty -- fairly fast moving river. And I hear this all the time from my husband who works on the Oil Spill Response Crew, and they go up to Tanana occasionally for training. They participate in those kinds of things, and the other pump stations up North come down here for fast water training on the Copper River, so that's where my knowledge is coming from on this. I've seen the Yukon, it is a very slow moving river. Very wide, very deep. Their fishwheels are quite a bit larger than ours. Our average is 8 to 12 feet -- 8 to 10 feet, usually, the average is like either a 4x10, 4x8, or 4x12 foot basket. Very different. Not like the 20 foot fishwheels I've seen on the Yukon or bigger. And I just wanted to talk about that and make sure that you folks understand what we're talking about. You have to be looking ahead when you're driving on the river. And because of the depth, I don't think that the fishfinders look down deep enough or far enough ahead for them to use it as a safety device.

Again, they've been targeting the schools of fish at high water when nobody else is
successful. Mr. Somerville didn't give any percentage when he gave his report and I find it odd that you were asking him for anecdotal information when we were giving anecdotal information from what we've seen. Because he has a degree behind his name or because he's an official from the Department, their anecdotal information is weighed differently than people and users on the river? That, to me, is concerning as well.

And I just want to say, again, that we need to watch for the resource here and ensure that all subsistence users up -- all the way up to the north end of the river are getting their subsistence needs met.

I know I'm a little emotional about this but that directly affects me, my family, the Katie John camp and their family, it really does, and there would be no Federal management if it was not for that Katie John case and all of this and it just blows me away that you guys don't take that into consideration. We're looking at the north end of the river and providing subsistence for the subsistence needs of those people, myself included. Anybody above the Gulkana River, where there is no enhanced stock from the -- from the Gulkana Hatchery. So please take this under serious consideration and ban the use of fishfinders on the Copper River, even if it is prior to the State doing the same, because we put in the proposals to do the same.

And I would like to say that this has been done before, the Mulchatna Caribou Herd is an example of where the State action took prior to the -- I mean where the Feds have taken action prior to the State taking action.

Again, thank you for your time and your consideration.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.....

OPERATOR: The next comment.....

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: A comment, you have the floor.

OPERATOR: Our next comment comes from Hope Roberts, your line is open.
MS. ROBERTS: Good afternoon, Federal Subsistence Board and Staff. This is Hope Roberts. I'm in Valdez and I am representing Chugach Regional Resources Commission Federal Alliance Team. The Alliance Team is made up of one person from each of the seven Chugach tribes which are Chenega, Eyak, Port Graham, Nanwalek, Kudachik(ph), Tatitlek and Valdez. As a whole we are in support of FP21-14 prohibiting the use of fishfinders or bathymetry devices on the Upper Copper River for the same reasons as we were in support of the past proposals that were spoken on this morning. And just to reiterate these recommendations have come from the Joint Copper River Salmon Symposium in 2019 where research and conservation of the resource were two major points of agreement that Upper and Lower river user groups agreed were necessary. While these proposals would create a situation where Federal subsistence regulations are stricter than State regs, we believe the importance of these salmon runs are required for a cautionary approach to conservation.

I thank you, again, for hearing me out and allowing me to speak on behalf of Chugach Regional Resources Commission and their Federal Subsistence Alliance.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Thank you for taking the time to call in today and share the concerns and comments. Any questions from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, thank you. Operator, are there any other people who would like to be recognized at this time.

OPERATOR: I'm showing no further comments, sir.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, appreciate that. At this time we'll move on to Regional Council recommendation, RAC Chair.

MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This
is DeAnna Perry, Council Coordinator for the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council. This might be the last time you hear my very practiced DJ radio voice today.

The Southcentral Regional Advisory Council opposed this proposal 3 to 6. The Council majority felt this restriction on the Federally-qualified subsistence user could prohibit the users ability to quickly and successfully harvest fish. The Council felt that if a conservation concern is determined for this area, then per ANILCA, any restrictions should be placed on other user groups before the restriction is placed on the Federally-qualified subsistence user. The Council also addressed the importance for all users on the river to learn to navigate the waters by reading the river and not relying on bathymetry devices.

That was the recommendation from the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any other comments or questions for RAC Chair.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Are there any other Regional Councils that would like to be recognized at this time.

MS. ENTSMINGER: Yes, hi, this is Sue Entsminger, Eastern Interior RAC.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Sue, you have the floor.

MS. ENTSMINGER: Thank you. The Eastern Interior RAC supports Proposal 21-14 and it was unanimous. Fish returns over the last several years have been very poor, therefore, the Council supports this conservation minded proposal for the sake of future generations. The Council noted that traditionally subsistence users do not use fishfinders while looking for fish. Is it likely that fishfinders will not do much good finding fish in silty water like the Copper River.
In addressing the public comment about river navigability, the Council suggested to use depth finders rather than fishfinders because you need them when your boat goes at a speed of 35 to 40 miles an hour and you are in unfamiliar waters.

And I did want to add just a little bit here, when, on Page 66 of the Federal Board fisheries book for C&Ts for salmon. In Eastern Interior it also includes Healy Lake, Nabesna, Northway, Tanacross, Tetlin, Tok, the Tok Cutoff all the way to Mentasta Pass where it reaches Unit 13, and also the Nabesna Road in that part of Unit 12.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Thank you, very much. Any questions for Sue.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, thank you. Any other Regional Advisory Council Chairs who would like to be recognized at this time.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing none. Any questions from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll move on to tribal, Alaska Native corp comments. Orville.

MR. LIND: Yeah, Mr. Chair, can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Loud and clear, you got it.

MR. LIND: Thank you. Good afternoon, Mr. Chair. Board members. Orville Lind, Native Liaison for the Office of Subsistence Management.

During the consultation held on June 11th, Mr. -- Chief Gary from Chickaloon replied after the Fisheries Proposal 21-13 was read, he said that...
that's probably a good thing and he supports it.

That's all I have for that proposal.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Orville, appreciate that. Any questions for Orville.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll move on to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Ben Mulligan.

MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Again, for the record, Ben Mulligan, Alaska Department of Fish and Game. The Department opposes the removal of navigational devices such as these electronic fishfinders from the boats for the Copper River. You know, in anticipation when we knew the -- our Board of Fish cycle was coming up and there was a proposal of this nature on that side, we did conduct some interviews with boaters about these devices and we found that for the most part those guys were telling us that they use it more for finding the bottom than finding the fish. The silty nature of the Copper really affects their signal strength and using it to find fish really isn't that effective. And also, as usual, if this is done it will create some inconsistencies between the State and Federal regulations.

Those are our comments.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Ben. Any questions for Ben from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing none, thank you, appreciate that. InterAgency Staff Committee comments, Katya.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Members of the Board. For the record, this is Katya Wessels. The InterAgency Staff Committee provided the
standard comment on Fisheries Proposal FP21-14.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions for ISC.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing none, open the floor for Board discussion, and if no discussion, Board action.

MR. STRIKER: Mr. Chair, National Park Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Don, you have the floor.

MR. STRIKER: I move that we adopt FP21-14 consistent with the Eastern Interior RAC and the Wrangell-St. Elias SRC. In my opinion, unlike the last proposal this would have a very limited negative impact on subsistence opportunity. And it serves as a better test of this notion of sort of paving the way for something that we believe should be a Federal and State change in this area where there's been so much compelling testimony from our users.

I understand well the ISC's safety concern, but I believe as outlined by Ms. Linnell's testimony that the safety concerns sort of cuts both ways, I'm not sure that I can make a clear case in my mind that 50 is better one way or the other and so for that reason I move that we support this motion -- support this proposal.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Don. Any other questions or comments.

OPERATOR: So, Tony, could we get a second on that.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, I thought I heard a second, sorry.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Second.
MR. BROWER: Second.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for the second. Thank you, Tina, for the reminder.

REPORTER: Yep.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any further discussion from the Board, questions, comments.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll go....

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: BIA, go ahead.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you. If I may I'd like to ask a question of the Department in-season manager.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll have to ask, is he available.

MR. MULLIGAN: Mr. Chair, this is Ben. Mark Somerville should be listening in so we just have to let him in.

MR. PELTOLA: Okay. I'll lead into my question and ask a question.

So from -- thank you, Ben, for that information. So my question -- my lead in would be that the Federal Subsistence Board is now looking at another proposal to potentially restrict a potential pool of Federally-qualified users in the upper river. Throughout the analysis of these various proposals there's a commonality about providing opportunity and meeting opportunity needs of the upper river residents and here's another example where we have one Regional Advisory Council which is in opposition and another one who supports. As I mentioned yesterday, the overall harvest of the Copper salmon population, whether it be red, chinook or what may have you is an insignificant amount, so via in-season action, in recent history, has the Department taken any administration action to try to minimize -- or actually try to maximize the amount
of fish to make it to the up river section of the river to make them available for harvest, whether it be a Federally-qualified user or a non-Federally-qualified user, and, if so, what are those specific actions.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Gene. And we'll just give it a minute, Operator, were you able to open that line freely and make it available for him?

OPERATOR: I'm sorry, I caught the first name was Mark, what was the last name?

MR. MULLIGAN: Somerville.

OPERATOR: Somerville, thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Are you available now, Mark?

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And we'll just wait a moment until Mr. Somerville is available. Thank you.

(Pause)

OPERATOR: If Mark could hit star zero that would make it easier. Mark, if you could hit star zero -- oh, I see him, okay.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, we'll give him another minute to get back on here. Thank you.

OPERATOR: Mark is -- Mark Somerville's line is open.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Mark, you have the floor.

MR. SOMERVILLE: You can hear me now.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, can hear you loud and clear, Mark, you have the floor. Thank you for getting on.
MR. SOMERVILLE: All right, thank you very much. Again, Mark Somerville, Upper Copper, Upper Susitna Management Area, area management biologist for the State of -- Department of Fish and Game.

I believe the question that was put forth is do we actively manage to get fish to the upper portions of the Copper River, the question there -- how that works, we manage the runs from the beginning to the end as it comes through the sonar and we have to manage the same throughout the whole period so the whole idea is to get fish to the upper parts of the river as well as the lower parts. Two things have been -- have been done over the last several years, one was to -- for the commercial fishery to have fewer openings in the inside areas to allow early king salmon to move -- to get into the river, presumably those fish going to the upper portions of the river, and the upper parts of the river in the Chitina -- Chitina subdistrict, that fishery used to open on June 1st, sometime between June 1st and 7th, it now cannot open until June 7th, so that opening was held off a week, again, to allow more fish to get into the upper portions of the Upper Copper River.

In the subsistence fishery, that fishery opens on June 1st and pretty much stays open 23/7. Fish passing through that area, there's a fishery down -- a majority of the fish are caught down in the lower portions of that subdistrict from the Chitina/McCarthy bridge to the Tonsina River and then -- and then as we go up river we get fewer and fewer fish further up river just because they go off into the side channels and so on.

That's basically how our management is at this point. We don't deliberately close down the lower portion of the subsistence fishery in order to allow more fish up river. We have no counting, assessment away of looking at that to tell exactly where we're at.

We also do aerial surveys at the end of the season to look at distribution and monitoring distribution into various streams. That's a real coarse estimate to give us an idea if we're seeing fish in normal numbers into the upper portions of the river. And from the last several years the aerial surveys have shown that we're getting the same consistent
distribution across the area. In fact, the upper river has actually had a fair -- fair number of fish making it up and higher numbers, above average numbers, actually, into the upper -- some of the upper streams. But if that changes, over time, it -- it ebbs and flows and I know in 2020, the counts across the area were extremely low in all streams and distribution showed low numbers in the upper river.

But, again, no directed management other than those -- the week clo -- the week delay in the personal use fishery and then the moratorium on more than one opener in the first two weeks of the commercial opener on the inside islands.

MR. PELTOLA: A general followup question if I may, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Gene, you have the floor.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you. I appreciate the overview of the management strategy for the Copper. And you said you, generally speaking, are seeing more make it up to some of the upper tributaries, do you have anything more quantitative that you could present to us about, whether it be a swag or anything more firm, about increased percentile or anything more than just it looks like we're getting generally more fish to the tribs?

MR. SOMERVILLE: Good question. Good question. And I apologize for not having direct numbers here, those numbers are usually collected through the commercial fishery manager and I don't have them offhand here to provide but I would say that probably we're looking -- depending on -- I'd say looking at as far as going back to about 2012 when we started seeing these large runs up into the Copper River, some of the -- some of the highest runs where we've got over a million fish into the river, we still have probably -- I'd have to guess the counts in the upper portions like Mentasta -- Mentasta, up in Tanada they saw some -- some increases but I would say we're probably looking -- boy, I'd hate to throw a number at it -- maybe 20 percent on average, but, yeah, I'm a little uncomfortable throwing out a -- throwing out a number. All I can say off the top of my head is that we did see strong -- strong returns to the upper river
MR. PELTOLA: Okay, Mr. Chair, I don't mean to test everybody's patience but I'd like to ask one more followup question of our State in-season manager, if I may, and with that being said, when you gave your overview, which I, you know, really greatly appreciated, you talked about the personal use fishery being delayed a week. So can you tell me whether our catch with that delayed week has remained constant, it has decreased or have we potentially seeing an increase by just compressing the harvest over a lesser period of time than we would have without that one week delay?

MR. SOMERVILLE: That's a -- yes, sir, that's a great question. Overall harvest numbers did not decrease with that -- with that delay of a week. The point of that delay was to see -- was to allow more fish further up river, but when we look at the harvest levels from the week of 1st -- 1st of June to the 7th of June, and we look at it in the Chitina subdistrict and then we also look at it in the Glennallen subdistrict during that week, over the course of time it's been very, very little -- basically no real change in the number of fish harvested in that -- in that week in the lower portions of the Cop -- in the lower portion -- up through, I'd say below the Tonsina River.

MR. PELTOLA: Okay, thank you, appreciate that. And, Mr. Chair, I could probably go on for longer but I'll stop here.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Gene. Appreciate that. Anybody else, any comments or questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, thank you. We still are with a motion on the floor and seconded, under discussion, any other discussion or questions from any other Board, if none I'll have somebody call for the question.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been
called. Roll call, Sue, please.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. The motion is to adopt Fisheries Proposal 21-14. Start out with Don Striker, Park Service.

MR. STRIKER: Thank you. I support for the reasons previously articulated.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Greg Siekaniec, Fish and Wildlife Service.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Sue. I oppose this proposal in support of both the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council. And I do not believe we should be requiring a removal of, you know, navigation and bathymetry devices from Federally-qualified users as one, they're often combined into the same unit and I do believe they provide an important tool for river users.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Greg.

BIA, Gene Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: BIA would request that you come back to us, we still have not solidified our position.

MS. DETWILER: Okay.

Chad Padgett, BLM.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you, Sue. I also oppose for the same reasons articulated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

Dave Schmid -- oh, actually Wayne Owen, Forest Service.

MR. OWEN: Thank you, Sue. The Forest Service opposes -- opposes the motion in deference to the wisdom of the RAC.
MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: I support this in deference to the Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council. It's very difficult to use a fishfinder on a silty river.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Public Member Charlie Brower.

MR. BROWER: I support it as stated by my colleague Rhonda.

MS. DETWILER: Okay.

BIA, are you ready to vote yet.

MR. PELTOLA: Yes. The Bureau of Indian Affairs votes to support the proposal, although we strongly feel that the burden of conservation should not be placed on the Federally-qualified user in the upper river segment of the river but being sensitive to some of the testimony — from public testimony received and in addition to the Eastern Interior RAC. I think we need to take a closer look at the distribution of harvest along the whole system and adjust accordingly.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Gene.

And, finally, Chair Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support, as stated.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. I'm just counting up the votes here. So it looks like we have five votes in support and three opposed, so motion passes.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue, for the count. And thank you to the Board and everybody calling in and participating in that one, it's deliberative and very important discussion and I
hope we did a good job of laying out the record for that. And we'll go ahead and move on to the next agenda item, Sue.

MS. DETWILER: Yes. So that brings us to several fishery closure reviews in the Aleutians, Alaska Peninsula and Kodiak areas. And the presenter is, initially on that will be Robbin LaVine.

MS. LAVINE: Yes, hello, thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. For the record my name is Robbin LaVine and I'm an anthropologist with the Office of Subsistence Management. And I'm prepared to present Fisheries Closure Reviews 21-08, 09, 11 and 13, and my colleague Jared Stone is ready to present Fisheries Closure Reviews 21-16, 18, and 19.

But before we begin, it's important for you to know that the Kodiak/Aleutians Regional Advisory Council recommended deferral on all seven closure reviews in order to solicit additional input from the communities most impacted by Board action on the reviews. You can find the Council recommendation and justification for deferral on Page 392 of your Board book. The justification for deferral is the same for all seven closures.

So if you're interested in considering deferral, you have the option to take all seven up as a package or you can address each closure review individually. To help with your decisionmaking process you should know that all these closures share the following in common.

They were incorporated into Federal regulations from State regulations approximately 20 years ago. This is the first time they've been reviewed. All closures involve waters closed to subsistence fishing, while remaining open to sportfishing. In all of these areas the majority of subsistence fishing happens elsewhere and all have been recommended for deferral by both the Council and the ISC.

So at the direction of the Kodiak/Aleutians Regional Advisory Council, OSM Staff and Council members are already reaching out to community, tribal and State Advisory Council representatives for input. A meeting was held with
tribal representatives from Kodiak Island on January 6th, seven representatives were in attendance, all tribal representatives expressed gratitude for the notice and withheld any comments or recommendations until they had more time to read the closure reviews.

So Jared and I are prepared to do any of, let's say, three things.

1. We're prepared to present the full closure reviews.

2. We can give you a brief description of each; or

3. You can take action on all of these reviews as a package based on the information I've shared thus far.

And I do know that Kodiak/Aleutians Regional Advisory Council Chair Della Trumble is on hand to respond to any questions regarding the Council recommendation.

So we look forward to direction from you, the Board, and thank you.

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Charlie, you got the floor.

MR. BROWER: Yeah, there's a recommendation to defer the fishery closure review on all of them so we should offer to either make a motion or hear them out or is -- could it go both ways, or what, just a question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Based upon what I would -- and then if anyone wants to chime in otherwise, I would offer that -- I would entertain a motion now based on the information presented by the Staff to go ahead and defer until we can get a clear review of these by additional people and get the involvement that we're usually accustomed to when we do a review such as this, and as she stated, you know, the urgency is in the package, and so I would, at this time, entertain a motion to defer.
MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, Greg,

with.....

MR. BROWER: I would so.....

MR. SIEKANIEC: .....Fish and Wildlife

Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Greg.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Yeah, Mr. Chair. I
would like to make a motion to defer action on the
Fishery Closure Reviews 21-08, 21-09, 21-11, 21-13, 21-
16, 21-18, and 21-19 until the next wildlife [sic]
regulatory cycle. The language for these closure
reviews are shown on Page 380 to 463 of the Board book.

Following a second, if it should happen, I will explain
why I intend to support my motion.

MR. BROWER: Second.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Greg, you have
the floor.

MR. SIEKANIEC: I recommend deferring
these closures in deference to the Kodiak/Aleutian
Regional Advisory Council. I think deferring these
proposals to the next fishery regulatory proposal cycle
will allow the Kodiak/Aleutian Regional Advisory
Council to gather the local community input that they
have voiced is so important to the formulation of
Council recommendations for these closures. I think
it's important to delay Board action on these closures
to the next fishery regulatory cycle to coincide with
publication of the Federal Register notice announcing
new fish regulations. Board actions on these closures
prior to the next fishery regulatory cycle would not
expedite their implementation as any new regulations
need to be published in the Federal Register before
they can be implemented. These closures have been in
place, as we heard, for 20 years, and deferring Board
action to the 2023 fish regulatory cycle will likely
have minimal impact to subsistence communities, as we
heard.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Greg. Any questions, comments or further discussion on it.

MS. PITKA: This is Rhonda. I have a question. And I have difficulty hearing who seconded the motion and I couldn't hear who seconded that motion.

REPORTER: Charlie did, Rhonda.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I believe Charlie seconded that motion.

MR. SIEKANIEC: That was by Charlie, correct.

MR. BROWER: That's correct.

MR. STRIKER: Mr. Chair, Park Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Don, you have the floor.

MR. STRIKER: Just a point of order. I'm sorry to be the confused new guy and are we going to do summary of public comments and public testimony and RAC recommendations and tribal comments on these before we take action?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No. Right now I'm entertaining a motion to defer it which would just make that a null and void portion of this so that we could get further review and then once we get that we'll pull that back to the floor for that level of scrutiny by the Board to make a decision and so what we're doing is just deferring this so that there could be a more comprehensive, an in-depth look at the -- for the closure.

MR. STRIKER: 10-4, thank you.

MR. BROWER: In that case, Mr. Chair, I call for question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been called. Roll call, Sue, please.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. So the motion for
-- there's a motion to defer Fisheries Closure Reviews 21-08, 09, 11, 13, 16, 18, and 19.

And I will turn to the maker of the motion for the first vote, Greg Siekaniec.

MR. SIEKANIEC: I support as stated.

Thank you, Sue.

MR. SIEKANIEC: I support as stated.

Thank you, Sue.

Gene Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: Support.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Chad Padgett, BLM.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you, Sue. Could I just clarify one point real quick, I just want to make sure I heard something correctly before I issue my vote.

Greg, did you intend to say the wildlife cycle or the fish cycle, I just want to make sure I'm clear on that point.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Yeah, I probably misspoke on one, the fish cycle, thank you.

MR. PADGETT: Okay, thank you. I support.

Wayne Owen, Forest Service.

MR. OWEN: Forest Service supports.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Don Striker.

MR. STRIKER: Park Service supports for the reasons articulated by Mr. Siekaniec.

Ms. DETWILER: Thank you.
Public Member Pitka.

MS. PITKA: I support the motion to defer, thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Rhonda.

Public Member Charlie Brower.

MR. BROWER: I support the motion to defer.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

Chairman Christianson.

(No comments)

MS. DETWILER: Tony.

(No comments)

MS. DETWILER: Tony may have dropped off. Nevertheless, we do have seven votes to support.....

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I'm on, Sue.

MS. DETWILER: ....the motion.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you, Tony. We had just gotten to you. We had, so far, seven votes to support the motion and we're waiting on your vote.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support, thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. Motion passes unanimously, so the proposals are deferred.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, I support taking a five minute break.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep.
MR. STRIKER: Thank you.

(Off record)

(On record)

MS. DETWILER: And, actually, Rhonda, I -- it could possibly be that Charlie -- that Tony is having problems again with his phone system. I know I talked with him last night and there was a problem with his personal phone and also with his phone service down there, so I'm not sure if he's trying to get back on and can't, but I'd just toss it out to you as the next person in line of being Chair there.

MS. PITKA: Yes, so before break we voted to defer the fishery closure reviews, so I believe we're on FP21-02; is that correct?

MS. DETWILER: Yes, that is correct. And actually if you wanted to start on that, I can actually text Charlie [sic] to see if he's had -- see what his -- see if he's having a problem getting on. But, yes, we would be starting with Fisheries Proposal 21-02, would you like Pippa to start that presentation?

MS. PITKA: Yes, please.

MR. PELTOLA: Madame Chair, BIA.

MR. PELTOLA: That would be great if she could start that presentation.

MR. PELTOLA: Rhonda, BIA.

MS. PITKA: Yes. Yes, sorry, I apologize.

MR. PELTOLA: No problem.

MR. PELTOLA: Go ahead, Mr. Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: Yes. Procedurally, under the Roberts Rules of Orders I'd like to request reconsideration of the vote on Fisheries Proposal 21-13. Strict adherence to the Roberts Rules of Orders dictates it doesn't require a second but if it makes everybody feel comfortable I would proceed if I did get a second on reconsideration of the vote.
MR. BROWER: I'll second.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Charlie. The reason I ask for a reconsideration of the vote on FP21-13 is after discussion with Staff, the Bureau of Indian Affairs wanted to show support to the Eastern Interior's concern. As I expressed on BIA's vote in earlier, our most recent Copper River proposal, that it would be placing additional restriction on Federally-qualified users. Data has shown that that is not the significant aspect of the harvest where it's a fraction of a -- of a couple percentile over the whole drainage. Actions have been taken but we're still resulting in minimal passage and less than ideal fish available for opportunity on the upper river. For those reasons Bureau of Indian Affairs has asked for a reconsideration of the vote on 21-13.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

MS. PITKA: Thank you. So I'm not as familiar with the reconsideration, Ken Lord, can you walk us through the procedure.

MR. LORD: Well, Gene's got it right as long as the meeting has not been formally closed, any Board member can move for reconsideration of a decision.

MS. DETWILER: So the motion has been made and seconded, so I believe there would be -- next there would be Board discussion and then Board action.

MS. PITKA: Thank you. So I'm going to open the floor for Board discussion on the reconsideration motion put forward by Member Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: Madame Chair, BIA. If we don't have any additional comments or items for discussion other than those we presented when we made the motion for reconsideration, although if we do have a call for question and do another recall vote, might I request that we hold off until Chairman Christianson's available and back on so all members are available for a consideration on the vote.

MS. PITKA: Yes, okay.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you.
MR. SIEKANIEC: Madame Chair, this is Greg with the Fish and Wildlife Service.

MS. PITKA: Yes, I'm sorry, go ahead.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Madame Chair. Sue, could you refresh us on how that vote went.

MS. DETWILER: Yes. Let's see, 21-13, the motion was to adopt the proposal. The motion failed by 5-3, with basically the agency folks voting against the motion and the public members voting for it, to adopt it.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you. Thank you, Madame Chair.

MS. DETWILER: So I believe if there were no discussion then the next question would be to call for the question and do a vote.

MR. STRIKER: I call the question.

REPORTER: Who was that, please.

MS. PITKA: I believe that was Mr. Striker.

REPORTER: Thank you.

MR. STRIKER: Yes, I'm sorry, Park Service called for question.

REPORTER: Thank you. Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: So would you like me to do a roll call vote, Madame Chair.

MS. PITKA: Yes, thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. Starting with the maker of the motion, Gene Peltola, BIA.

MR. PELTOLA: BIA votes to support.

MS. DETWILER: Chad Padgett, BLM.

MR. PADGETT: I oppose, thank you.
MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.
Wayne Owen, Forest Service.

MR. OWEN: I would oppose.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.
Greg Siekaniec, Fish and Wildlife Service.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Sue. I oppose for the same reasons articulated yesterday.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.
Don Striker.

MR. STRIKER: I'm opposed, thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.
Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: I support the motion to reconsider, thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Okay.
And Public Member Charlie Brower, on the motion to reconsider.

MR. BROWER: I would support, thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And, Sue, I'm back on.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. Chair Tony Christianson, there was a -- BIA made a motion to reconsider Fisheries Proposal 21-13, it was seconded by Charlie Brower. We're finishing up the vote on that and I'm just now counting up the support versus opposes, so we have 4 opposed and 3 -- 3 support, so we have three members that support -- support reconsideration.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support reconsideration.
MS. DETWILER: Well, it's actually, it looks like a tie, which I believe that means the motion fails. Let me just -- let me -- give me a second here just to make sure I recorded all these, quickly.

Yes, the vote is four to four, so it appears that the motion failed, so the previous vote stands. Is that correct, Ken Lord?

MR. LORD: That is correct.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA. Thank you to all my fellow Federal Subsistence Board members for obliging me on that reconsideration vote. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Gene, appreciate that. And, okay, Sue, so the next order of business, I would appreciate that.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Yes, we were just getting started on Fisheries Proposal 21-14 -- oh, I'm sorry -- sorry, wrong page, 21 -- Fisheries Proposal 21-02.

MS. KENNER: Hello, this is Pippa. Mr. Chair, can you -- how do I sound?

(No comments)

MS. KENNER: Could anyone hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, I can hear you loud and clear.

MS. PITKA: I can hear you, Pippa.

MS. KENNER: Okeydoke. Hello, Mr. Chair, members of the Board and Council Chairs. My name is Pippa Kenner and I'm an anthropologist at the Office of Subsistence Management. The analysis of Proposal FP21-02 begins on Page 52 of your Board materials.

The Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge.....
MR. BROWER: Excuse me, what page?

MS. KENNER: .....submitted this proposal. Page 52.

The Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge submitted this proposal. It requests the Board reduce the required distance between setnets from 150 feet to 75 feet in Kuskokwim River tributaries. The Refuge stated, Federal regulations are more restrictive than State regulations. This requested regulation change would align Federal and State regulations and reduce user confusion and enforcement concerns.

I'm going to give you some regulatory history.

Last year, the Alaska Board of Fisheries took action on a proposal submitted by the Organized Village of Kwethluk and modified the required distance between setnets to 75 feet in tributaries of the Kuskokwim River drainage. The Organized Village of Kwethluk requested allowing the operation of a setnet within 50 feet of another setnet. They said throughout the Kuskokwim River drainage there are few eddies to set gillnets during spring to fall and under ice during winter months where we see setnets less than the current regulation. People along the Kuskokwim River drainages have set gillnets in eddies in spring to fall and under the ice, which are usually less than 150 feet apart. In order to correct this, the Department must adopt a revised regulation that meets the needs of setnetters throughout the year. The Board of Fisheries amended the proposal to allow the operation of the set gillnet within 75 feet of another set gillnet instead. Board of Fisheries members were concerned that nets might get tangled with one another and user conflict might ensue.

The OSM conclusion is to support the proposal.

Thank you, Mr. Chair, that's the end of my presentation.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, appreciate that. Any questions for Staff on that presentation.
MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair, just a question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor, Charlie.

MR. BROWER: Just a question, if this is not adopted the Federally-qualified subsistence users will not be able to fish under the State regulations, you mean they won't be able to fish even though they ask for a permit or something under the State regulations?

MS. KENNER: Thank you for the question, Member Brower. I think -- I was having a little bit of a hard time hearing you. If I heard you correctly about the ability of Federally-qualified subsistence users to fish under State regulations, my response is two-pronged. One is that if the -- even though the Federal regulation may stay at 150 feet apart, a Federally-qualified user could opt to fish under State regulations where the required distance between setnets in tributaries is 75 feet. The exception to that is when Federal public waters are closed to the harvest of fish and in that situation the State regulations wouldn't apply and you -- and one would have to fish under Federal regulations.

As you know, a lot of these salmon bering tributaries in the Kuskokwim have been closed the last five or six years to the harvest of chinook and sometimes other fish because of the conservation issues and to allow for subsistence uses and in those cases, for instance in the Kwethluk River, a person would have to separate their nets by 150 feet.

MR. BROWER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other questions for the Staff.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing none, we'll move on to summary of public comments.

MS. PATTON: Thank you, Mr. Chair and
members of the Board. For the record, Eva Patton, Council Coordinator for the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta Subsistence Regional Advisory Council and there were no written public comments submitted on Proposal FP21-02.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

We'll now move on to anyone online, Operator, who wanted to testify, now is the time to be recognized.

OPERATOR: If you would like.....

MS. PATTON: Mr. Chair.

OPERATOR: .....to make a.....

MS. PATTON: Okay.

OPERATOR: .....public testimony.....

MS. PATTON: Mr. Chair. Members of the Board. We do have John Andrew online. He was not able to get through directly on the teleconference call but he is on through my cell phone at this moment and he wished to speak to public comments.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor, John.

MR. ANDREW: Mr. Chairman. Members of the Board. This is John W. Andrew, Kwethluk, Alaska.

I'm a lifetime fisherman over here, full subsistence. I used to be -- I used to fish commercially too.

Someone originally, from my village, made that proposal some time ago, I think came from the corporation board, the tribal office, so when they heard about it, then they objected to it, they don't want setnets set too close to each other. Because in springtime, the mainstem on the Kuskokwim, we're not allowed to fish out there for a couple reasons. Try to avoid catching chinook out there if the early ones are coming up. The first part of the -- first part of the spring and summer the water's always high, murky and poor (indiscernible - cuts out) we can't fish on the mainstem, even on the tributaries so we end up fishing
back in those lakes, mostly back in the lakes so much, mainly go whitefish and pike and small sheefish. And when they go into the lakes, even if it's -- if it's a lake they have ways to set -- they have small channels in the (indiscernible - cuts out) if you set your -- traditionally (indiscernible - cuts out) the lakes and ponds back there used to be -- have the -- people used to have spring camp and have their whitefish nets out and if a guy comes up and corks him within 50 to 75 feet, they'll take their fish away from the guy a little up river -- a little above them (indiscernible - cuts out) have trouble catching any fish. It's one of the reasons why they don't like to go out to the mainstem on the Kuskokwim in the early part of the spring and summer, too high, too murky and too many debris, (indiscernible - cuts out) we're talking about a (indiscernible - cuts out), they tear up the nets if they hit one of them. When the water's high and -- when the water's high and then there's lots of (indiscernible) they ruin their small delicate nets.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

Thank you for taking the time to call in, any questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing none, thank you for calling in and sharing that today. Was there anyone else online who would like to be recognized.

MR. ANDREW: Mr. Chairman. I forgot to mention that I'm one of the -- I'm one of the RAC members at the YK Subsistence RAC and also with the State Advisory Committee.

Thank you.

OPERATOR: If you would like to make a public comment, please press star one. We do have a public comment from John -- Jim Simon, your line is open.

MR. SIMON: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the Board for the opportunity to provide some personal comment on this proposal.
It seems to me that this is probably a good idea to pass this proposal to align the Federal subsistence fishing regulation spacing requirement in tributaries with the State given that there are a number of years now that the Fish and Wildlife Service has stopped enforcing Federal subsistence regulation and has, instead, relied on the State of Alaska's enforcement officers to enforce subsistence fishing regulations and the State of Alaska, as I understand it, is only capable of enforcing State regulations. So I think while decreasing the distance between setnets in the tributaries may contribute to more combat fishing, which is a common concern expressed on the Kuskokwim River during pulse fishing opportunities for many years, it's probably a good idea to align it if the Federal government is going to continue to not enforce its own Federal subsistence regulations.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, I appreciate you taking the time to call in today. Operator, is there anybody else online who would like to.....

OPERATOR: I have no one online right now.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, thank you. All right, we'll move on to Regional Advisory Council recommendations.

MR. ONEY: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the record my name is Ray Oney. I come from the village of Alakanuk. The Yukon Kuskokwim Delta Subsistence Regional Advisory Council opposed FP21-02.

Reducing the distance between setnets in Kuskokwim tributary rivers from 150 feet to 75 feet will not increase actual opportunity, it will only increase crowding and less efficiency of fishing for all. When setnets are only 75 feet apart, nets set up stream are blocked or corked and everyone has a difficult time catching fish. Setnet sites are managed
traditionally by families and they use the same eddies
year after year. Nets set so close together will
reduce the number of fish caught by everyone up stream.
Good setnet sites are limited and people often try to
set nets as close to the mouth of tributary rivers as
they can. Reducing the distance between nets causes
crowding and reduces safety. Reduced distance will
increase density of nets at the mouth of tributary
rivers and increase the likelihood that nets will be
run over by boat traffic from villages and subsistence
activity especially at night. This poses a safety
issue and also increases likelihood of nets and boat
motors getting damaged.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
questions from the Board.

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair. Just to
clarify my -- did he say he opposed it or supported.

REPORTER: Ray.

MR. ONEY: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. For the
record, we did oppose FP21-02.

Thank you.

MR. BROWER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for
that question and answer. Any other Regional Advisory
Council Chairs like to speak to this proposal.

MS. DEATHERAGE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
This is Karen Deatherage, the Council Coordinator for
the Western Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional
Advisory Council. I'm speaking on behalf of Jenny
Pelkola, who is the Acting Chair, with the Council's
recommendation for this proposal FP21-02.

The Western Interior Alaska Regional
Advisory Council unanimously opposes FP21-02. The
Council is very concerned with the high potential of
nets being very close together under this regulation.
This would not only create crowding in traditional
fishing areas but also have the potential to impact
harvest. Salmon could be sucked into eddies on the
river and be easily caught. This is especially challenging right now due to recent low chum salmon runs. The Council agrees with the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta Subsistence Regional Advisory Council that this regulation would not protect the resource, would create crowding and reduce in-season management capacity.

Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the Board.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, appreciate that. Any questions from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing none, any other Regional Advisory Council Chairs who would like to speak to this.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, hearing none, I'll go ahead and move on to Alaska Native Liaison.

MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, loud and clear, Orville, you have the floor.

MR. LIND: Quyana. Orville Lind, Native Liaison for the Office of Subsistence Management. Good afternoon, Mr. Chair and Board members. During the consultation we -- consultation on Fisheries Proposal 21-02, we did not have any questions or comments on that proposal.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank you, Orville, appreciate that. We'll move on to Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Ben Mulligan.

MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

For the record, Ben Mulligan, Alaska Department of Fish and Game. ADF&G supports this proposal as it aligns State and Federal regulations.
Just to give you a thumbnail background, this proposal on the State side was put in at the last AYK Board meeting in 2019, and the original proposal was from a citizen who asked to reduce that distance to only 50 feet, which originally failed the Board, but it was brought back up under reconsideration on a compromised deal to 75 feet where it passed.

So, thank you, Mr. Chair, for letting us provide our comments.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Ben, appreciate that. Any questions for Ben.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, thank you. No questions for the State, we'll go ahead and ask the ISC to provide their comments.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the Board. This is Katya Wessels. The InterAgency Staff Committee provided the standard comment on the Fisheries Proposal FP21-02.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Katya. I'll open the floor for Board discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, I open the floor for Board action.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, Greg with the Fish and Wildlife Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor, Greg.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yeah, I would like to move to adopt Fishery Proposal 21-02. This proposal is shown on Page 52 of the Board book. Following a second, should I receive it, I will explain why I intend to oppose my motion.

MR. PELTOLA: BIA, second.
MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you. I oppose adopting Fishery Proposal 21-02 in deference to the Yukon Delta and the Western Interior Regional Advisory Councils. Both Councils have clearly indicated that they are concerned that reducing the spacing of setnets to 75 feet in tributaries will increase potential conflicts due to crowding of nets. During times of State management of the Kuskokwim drainage, subsistence users will still have the option to setnet in tributaries under less restrictive State regulation. When Federal public waters in the Kuskokwim drainage are closed to non-subsistence users, the more restrictive Federal regulation may help to reduce conflict and crowding of nets in tributaries especially when good setnet sites are limited, as we have heard from the two Regional Advisory Councils.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

MR. BROWER: Question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been called. Roll call, Sue, please.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. The motion is to adopt Fisheries Proposal 21-02.

Starting with the maker of the motion, Greg Siekaniec, Fish and Wildlife Service.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Sue. I oppose as stated.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Moving on to Gene Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: BIA opposes in deference to the Regional Advisory Councils as the three criteria in order to vote otherwise are not present in this situation.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Gene.

Don Striker, Park Service.
MR. STRIKER: Park Service opposes for the reasons given by my colleagues.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Chad Padgett, BLM.

MR. PADGETT: I oppose for the reasons as already articulated. Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Dave Schmid, Forest Service, or Wayne Owen.

MR. OWEN: Forest Service opposes with our colleagues.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: I oppose in deference to the Western Interior Alaska Regional Advisory Council and the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta Regional Advisory Council as listed on Page 59 of the Board book.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

Public Member Charlie Brower.

MR. BROWER: Oppose. Same as stated.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

Chair Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I oppose.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. So the vote is unanimously no so the motion fails and Fishery Proposal 21-02 is not adopted.

So, Mr. Chair, I believe that brings us to Fisheries Closure Review 21-07.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, Sue, we'll call on Staff to provide the analysis.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Did you hear me, Sue, I was just -- said we could call on our Staff to provide the analysis on that, thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Yes, that would be Cory Graham, and I see -- yeah, I see some folks are getting disconnected. I don't know if Cory is on or not.

MR. GRAHAM: No, I was struggling with my mute button, I'm sorry. How am I coming through.

REPORTER: Great.

MS. DETWILER: We could hear you.

MR. GRAHAM: Okay. Hello, Mr. Chair, members of the Board. My name is Cory Graham and I'm a fisheries biologist with the Office of Subsistence Management. I'll be presenting Fisheries Closure Review 21-07 which can be found on Page 366 of your Board book.

Fisheries Closure Review 21-07 reviews the closure to the harvest of Arctic grayling in Nome Creek of the Yukon River drainage by Federally-qualified subsistence users. The Federal Subsistence Board adopted this closure from State regulations at the beginning of the Federal Program in 1992 and it has not been reviewed or modified since. Under State regulations, Nome Creek is closed to subsistence fishing. Sportfishing is allowed, however, all grayling must be released. Sportfishing is limited to unbaited artificial lures or flies with a single hook from April 1st through May 31st. Nome Creek is in the White Mountain Special Recreation Management Area which is administered by the Bureau of Land Management and is approximately 50 air miles north of Fairbanks.

A mark/recapture study performed in 2000 estimated there were 419 grayling greater than 250 millimeters fork length in the upper section of Nome Creek, abundance in the lower section was estimated to be between 878 and 4,522 grayling greater than 180 millimeters fork length.
As noted before, sportfishing is allowed but all grayling must be immediately released. Mortality can occur during catch and release fishing with previous estimates ranging from one to 10 percent for Arctic grayling.

The OSM conclusion is to maintain status quo. If this closure is maintained, Nome Creek will continue to be closed to subsistence fishing for grayling and catch and release sportfishing will still be allowed under State regulations.

The justification for maintaining the closure is that grayling are susceptible to over-exploitation and Nome Creek is road accessible which allows for easy access and harvest of fish, therefore, allowing a subsistence harvest has the potential for local depletion or overharvest of these stocks.

And that concludes my presentation for Fisheries Closure Review 21-07.

And we are prepared to take any questions.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions from the Board for Staff.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, this is Greg.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Greg, you have the floor.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you. Yeah, thanks for the introduction and presentation. So grayling seem to be known to move around quite a bit, a lot of these fish, I apologize I don't recall from the Board book, are they moving around quite a bit, have there been any studies to see, are they moving into areas where they are then subject to subsistence harvest and then, you know, moving back seasonally; do you have any of that information?

MR. GRAHAM: Through the Chair. Thank you for your question. My understanding is that grayling in the area are using Nome Creek largely for spawning -- spawning areas in the spring and as feeding grounds in the summer, and I believe there is exchange...
between Nome Creek and Beaver Creek and grayling are susceptible to -- are allowed to be harvested under subsistence regulations in Beaver Creek.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any other questions from the Board.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Gene, go ahead, you have the floor.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. If I recall, the way we currently stand it's closed to subsistence take but open for sport. Do you have any population specific catch and release mortality information for this population.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. GRAHAM: Through the Chair. Thank you for your question. My understanding is that catch and release mortality estimates that were included in the analysis are species specific but not necessarily location specific to Nome Creek.

MR. PELTOLA: And one more followup, Mr. Chair, if I could. For my memory, could you express the catch and release mortality rates which may be utilized and expressed towards this population that were in the analysis?

MR. GRAHAM: Through the Chair. The estimates that we gave, I believe, we were ranged between one and 10 percent mortality from catch and release.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, much, appreciate it. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, one second, I'm having a personal issue right now, Rhonda, could you please take over. I'll be back on in five minutes, Rhonda, thank you.

MS. PITKA: Absolutely. Does anybody
have any further questions for Mr. Graham.

MR. SCHMID: No, Rhonda, but this is Dave Schmid, just to let you know I'm back on as well, and thanks, Wayne, for covering.

MS. PITKA: Hi, Dave, thank you. So I believe that we are at the summary of public comments, is that true?

MS. DETWILER: Yes. Yes, Rhonda, that's true.

MS. PITKA: Thank you. Could we get the summary please.

MR. KRON: Madame Chair. This is Tom Kron from OSM. There were no written public comments on FCR21-7.

Thank you.

MS. PITKA: Thank you, Mr. Kron. I'd like to open the floor right now to public testimony.

(No comments)

MS. PITKA: Operator, is there anyone in the que.

OPERATOR: Apologies. If you would like to make a public comment, please press star one. One moment please.

(Pause)

OPERATOR: I am showing no public comments at this time.

MS. PITKA: Thank you. I'd like to hear the Regional Council recommendation. I believe this is Eastern Interior.

MS. ENTSMINGER: Yes. This is Sue from the Eastern Interior, Sue Entsminger. And I've been chatting with Andrew Firmin, the Vice Chair, and I'm not sure if he's online and he was going to take this up. Andrew, are you on?
MR. FIRMIN: Hello, Sue, this is Andrew Firmin, I'm on but I was just -- I just got on and I wasn't sure as to what -- which proposal we were discussing right now.

MS. ENTSMINGER: Okay.

MS. PITKA: Andrew, this is Rhonda. We're at Fisheries Closure Review 21-07 and we are now at the Regional Advisory Council recommendation. It's in your Board book on Page 375.

MR. FIRMIN: I'm trying to get there on my computer right now if you'll bear with me a moment.

(Pause)

MR. FIRMIN: Perhaps for sake of time Sue can read what's there and I can elaborate some when I get the meeting materials up in front of me.

MS. ENTSMINGER: Yes.

MS. PITKA: Go ahead, Sue.

MS. ENTSMINGER: All right, thank you.

On Page 375 the Eastern Interior, we voted to modify the closure by closing the Nome Creek drainage to the harvest of grayling by all uses and users. And then in your book you'll see the modified regulation, how it should read. Do you want me to read all of that, or just read our justification?

MS. PITKA: Your justification, it's just your presentation, ma'am.

MS. ENTSMINGER: Okay. Because it's just the language for the book and I think all it did is strike out subsistence fishing on the last page there before our comment.

The Council said catch and release fishing should not be allowed when conservation concerns exist that preclude subsistence uses. The Council thinks current regulations give priority and more liberal opportunities to sportfisheries over Federally-qualified subsistence users. If the intent of this closure is to protect the grayling population from over exploitation, then the closure should be for
all users and uses, including catch and release
sportfishing. It is well documented that the catch and
release fishing causes mortality which could affect a
small population of grayling. The Council's reason for
this modification is a conservation concern for
grayling and any and all cases of grayling mortality
should be eliminated. The Council also noted that Nome
Creek is not easily accessible or widely used and that
there are many other creeks in the area loaded with
grayling such as the Deadwood Creek and Crooked Creek.

And if I may, I just -- I got a
message, I don't know -- this is how we voted at the
meeting but it seems like BLM noted to me that there
was some information from Fish and Game but it wasn't
at our meeting so I don't know how that will work out
so I'm not going to get involved because it wasn't at
our meeting.

MS. PITKA: Thank you. Andrew, do you
have anything to add? Mr. Firmin.

MR. FIRMIN: I think Sue pretty well
covered it. I'm sorry, this is Andrew Firmin, the Vice
Chair of the Eastern Interior RAC. I just -- I think
that that was a lot, just trying to remember our
discussion on it, that, as Sue stated, there are plenty
of other fishing opportunities in the area and if
conservation is a concern then the handling of the fish
and the catch and release and the things like that was
what kind of took over our conversation at our meeting.

MS. PITKA: Thank you. Does anybody
have any questions for the Regional Council.

MR. PADGETT: Madame Chair, this is
Chad Padgett with BLM.

MS. PITKA: Yes, Mr. Padgett.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you. If it's
helpful for the RAC, we do have our subject matter
experts with BLM who are in the public que that we
could have join. I think there might be some updated
information that maybe not have been available during
your meeting. Would that be helpful to present now or
we could wait until the motion as well?

MS. PITKA: I think it's fine to
present it now, this is just discussion with the Regional Advisory Chair, correct, it'll be fine.

MR. PADGETT: Okay, thanks. I'm not sure who's on, John Haddix and Jim Herriges are on the line and so if they could be let in, they can probably speak to the updated information.

MS. DETWILER: So Operator did you get those two names to let them -- open up their lines?

(No comments)

REPORTER: Or they could prompt with a star one and that'll prompt the Operator.

OPERATOR: Jim has disconnected -- oh, Jim is open now.

MS. PITKA: Okay, please proceed then.

MR. HERRIGES: Good afternoon, Madame Chair and Board members. I'm Jim Herriges, I'm with the Eastern Interior Field Office of BLM. And I help service the Subsistence RAC. The new information, I guess, that Sue would have been referring to would -- that the Board -- or that the Eastern Interior RAC didn't have when they were considering this is that -- that BLM and Department of Fish and Game have made plans to do some -- some studies of grayling in Beaver Creek and Nome Creek and -- and so that could be utilized essentially to assess the -- the potential effects of -- of a subsistence harvest, which was in the original analysis thought to be not sustainable so -- and I don't have a lot of information on that but I believe that someone from Fish and Game is probably on line that could go into that a little bit more and -- and about the -- the potential effects of allowing a subsistence harvest as an alternative.

So that would have been the -- the other alternative that was analyzed in the -- in the Staff report.

MS. PITKA: Thank you. So I have a question, so it was noted in the proposal earlier -- the presentation earlier that this was a subsistence -- spawning grounds, the spawning grounds for some of the grayling, would that have an effect on the harvestable
surplus?

Thank you.

MR. HERRIGES: Yeah, I'm not a fisheries biologist. It is -- this is Jim again. I -- that is the reason that -- one of the reasons that there's a catch and release fishery here now and it's the reason for the -- the specific single hook, unbaited regulation that's for a portion of the season that's in place. So -- so there would be some concern that if there was a -- a heavy harvest, there's significant recreational use of Nome Creek Valley, BLM has developed 18 miles of road and two campgrounds in the Valley and most of Nome Creek in that section is accessible. But as was alluded to in the -- in the comments in the Eastern Interior RAC discussion, there's a lot of creeks that have grayling fishing available that are closer to home for subsistence users so it's not anticipated that there would be a -- really a -- much interest amongst subsistence users of traveling into Nome Creek to fish for grayling if there was a limited harvest limit.

MS. PITKA: Thank you very much for that. Does anybody have any further questions for the Regional Council Chair.

(No comments)

MS. PITKA: So I see on my screen that the other Regional Advisory Councils voted to defer to the Eastern Interior. So I think at this moment we're at tribal and Alaska Native Corporation comments with Orville Lind.

MR. LIND: Yeah, can you hear me Madame Chair?

MS. PITKA: Yes, thank you, Orville.

MR. LIND: Yes, good afternoon. Members of the Board. During the consultation session we did not have any questions or comments on 21-07.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

MS. PITKA: Thank you, Mr. Lind. Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments, Ben
MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Madame Chair.

For the record, Ben Mulligan, Alaska Department of Fish and Game. The Department supports OSM's preliminary conclusion and opposes the proposed amendment by the Eastern Interior RAC.

Nome Creek is located within the State's Fairbanks non-subsistence area and elimination of recreational opportunities within a popular Federally-designated recreational area would be unnecessarily restrictive. And most conservative fishing regulations have already been implemented out of abundance of caution, and that was done in 1995. But the level of fishing effort and associated hooking mortality on this population is negligible and sustainable and there is a level of exchange between the grayling population between Nome and Beaver Creek, as has already been said, which has the large population.

I will say given the conversation that we've heard and the conversations that have been had, we know that there is the possibility for a small subsistence fishery on that. In order to better understand that population and neighboring population there is going to be some joint work planned and I have one of our area biologists, Lisa Stube, online and ready to take any questions but then also kind of present what that study would do and any other pertinent background on that grayling population she feels the Board should know.

Thank you.

MS. PITKA: Thank you, Mr. Mulligan.

Does anybody have any questions for Mr. Mulligan or Ms. Stube.

MR. MULLIGAN: It's up to them, I offered it.

MS. PITKA: I would like to hear her presentation on this particular study, though, if she's online and available.

MR. MULLIGAN: I think she is. I think you hit star one.
MS. PITKA: Hi, is Ms. Stube online, can she please present on the study.

MS. STUBE: Hello, can -- can you hear me?

MS. PITKA: Yes, I can hear you now.

MS. STUBE: Okay. For the record I'm Lisa Stube with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of SportFish and I am currently the Yukon area management biologist. It excludes the Tanana River though.

And I and Chris Clark, the new Bureau of Land Management fisheries biologist, we're working on getting a radiotelemetry study going on Arctic grayling in Nome and Beaver Creeks. Right -- right now we don't -- what we're hoping with the study is to be able to deploy radio transmitters this summer and then track them for a good year and a half and be able to actually document spawning areas because there is no hard documentation of the spawning areas. Document spawning areas within Beaver and the Nome Creek tributary as well as oversummering areas, overwintering areas. There was a study done back in 1993 using radiotelemetry for overwintering but there hasn't been any work done since then. And also to note, timing and movements of the fish, you know, between their overwintering areas because they'll overwinter, you know, per the 1993 study much further down river, like towards Wickersham Creek, and those areas, lower, you know, a little bit lower in the river but still within the White Mountains National Recreation Area. Get timing of when they come in to Nome Creek. Also look at exchange, too, between Arctic grayling within Beaver Creek and Nome Creek and we're hoping, too, with this telemetry study and answering these questions to be able to design a future mark/recapture study to actually get a better handle on the population within Nome Creek.

The study that was performed back in 2000 was kind of -- it was a -- kind of a separate study on Beaver Creek from Little Champ -- from Champion Creek on down to below -- well, the Big Ben, and the Nome Creek was separate but there were some issues actually with it not being a closed system and, you know, it -- and to satisfy the -- you know satisfy
the consistent, you know, Peterson, and having it be a,
you know, closed system and not have movement in and
out of the system wasn't satisfied, so we're hoping to
look and better understand the movements of the Arctic
grayling and then hoping in 2023 to be able to use this
information to design an upcoming mark/recapture study
so -- so we better understand what the actual
population is.

MS. PITKA: Thank you, Ms. Stube, I
look forward to the results of that study. Does
anybody have any questions right now for Ms. Stube.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Madame Chair, this is
Greg.

MS. PITKA: Yes, Greg.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Yes, thank you. So it
might be more for Ben. Ben, you had noted that there's
possibly room for some limited subsistence harvest, I
think I heard you say that and if that's correct, could
you give me -- do you have a little more information
around that, what you're thinking?

MR. MULLIGAN: Well, there's been some
conversations with the local managers and BLM's local
folks and I got word that a compromise may be
presented, and that's why I prefaced that, you know,
that I think it was five grayling but you'll have to
get the details from BLM.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Okay. Thank you, Ben.
And then if you were designing a study and under ideal
conditions, what status would you like to see the river
in. Is the way that it's being administered right now
or if a subsistence fishery was added into that river,
does that complicate your study in some way where you
would have less confidence in potential results?

MR. MULLIGAN: I -- through the Chair.
Greg -- I will ask Lisa definitively for that, I would
say I don't think that it would disturb the study too
much but she could give you a definitive answer on it.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thanks Ben.

MS. STUBE: My apologies. Could you
please repeat the question.
MR. SIEKANIEC: Yeah, I was just asking, so you're designing a study and if you had an ideal study scenario, would it be under the conditions that the river is administered or managed right now, or would it change your confidence in the study if we had a limited subsistence harvest at the same time as we have a sportfish catch and release?

MS. STUBE: That's a very good question. I guess the only concern would be if the subsistence user were to catch a radiotagged Arctic grayling but we -- we will implant the transmitters via surgeries and usually there's always going to be a recovery time, and -- and we could put up informational signs too, to let folks know if you do catch an Arctic grayling, you know, that that is part of the study and you'll see an antenna, you know, coming out of it.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Right.

MS. STUBE: You know, to -- to, please, you know, let it go and/or, you know, to give me a call. I don't think this would be a problem at all. I mean we're planning on -- we're still working on the nuts and bolts of it and still getting a proposal together for when the call of proposals is issued, here probably in the next couple of weeks, but I believe we'll have enough radio transmitters deployed that if there was an occasional Arctic grayling that succumbs to subsistence mortality, that it should be fine.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you very much. I think that's what I was waiting to hear, was, that you can design that into your study and feel good about it.

MS. STUBE: Yes. Yes.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Yeah, thank you. Thank you, Madame Chair.

MS. PITKA: Thank you, very much. Does anybody else have any further questions.

(No comments)

MS. PITKA: If not I would like to go to the InterAgency Staff Committee comments.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Madame Chair.
Members of the Board. This is Katya Wessels.

The InterAgency Committee has concerns about a potential precedence being set if the Board moved to maintain the closure to grayling fishing in Nome Creek by Federally-qualified subsistence users as recommended by the Office of Subsistence Management in the FCR21-07 analysis. Doing so, would allow for a catch and release sportfishery while not allowing for consumptive use of grayling by Federally-qualified subsistence users. This would appear to violate the priority consumptive use clause found in ANILCA,.802(2).

As stated in the analysis for FCR21-07, grayling are very susceptible to over-exploitation. And even though the sportfishery currently in place in the area is catch and release only, there is associated mortality. In one study as high as 10 percent as indicated in the analysis. And any mortality should be considered as take.

The InterAgency Staff Committee believes that the modification proposed by the Eastern Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council, which seeks to close the fishery to all users is more appropriate if the intent of the current closure to Federally-qualified subsistence users is to conserve the grayling resource from over-exploitation.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

MS. PITKA: Thank you, very much, Katya. I'd like to open it for Board discussion.

(No comments)

MS. PITKA: Hearing none, I'd like to open the floor for Board action.

MR. PADGETT: Madame Chair, Chad Padgett, BLM.

MS. PITKA: Go ahead, Mr. Padgett.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you, Madame Chair. I move to modify the closure for FCR21-07, to replace the closure to subsistence harvest of Arctic grayling in Nome Creek with an allowable subsistence harvest of
five fish per day, which is the limit currently in place down stream of the mouth of Nome Creek.

The analysis for FCR21-07 can be found on Page 366 of your meeting materials booklet.

If I get a second, I will explain why I intend to support my motion.

MR. PELTOLA: BIA second.

MR. BROWER: Second.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you. The current State catch and release fishery does not represent a conservation concern and such concern is not supported by substantial evidence. This proposal would provide an opportunity for subsistence harvest and a subsistence priority not currently in regulation. The level of interest among subsistence users of traveling into Nome Creek, given the abundance of grayling fisheries much closer to home, is likely to be quite low. The harvest pressure and grayling population size and characteristics can be monitored and if a conservation concern arises, further restrictions could be considered.

Although subsistence harvest does have the potential to result in depletion or overharvest of the fishery in Nome Creek, the level of subsistence harvest is likely to be low and can be monitored.

BLM is planning to begin studies in 2021, including a radiotag movement study followed by a population study, which will allow estimation of effects of limited harvest and/or sportfishing related mortality.

The proposed regulation would make the subsistence regulations in Nome Creek the same as those currently in place from the mouth of Nome Creek down stream to the mouth of O'Brien Creek.

The amended regulatory language should read as follows:

In Beaver Creek down stream from the confluence of Moose Creek a gillnet with mesh size not to exceed three inches stretch measure may be used from
June 15th through September 15th. You may subsistence fish for all non-salmon species but may not target salmon during this time period. Retention of salmon take and incidentally to non-salmon directed fisheries is allowed. The Beaver Creek drainage down stream to the confluence of Moose Creek, only rod and reel may be used. Nome Creek and Beaver Creek down stream to the confluence of O'Brien Creek, the daily harvest and possession limit is five grayling. From the mouth of O'Brien Creek down stream to the confluence of Moose Creek the daily harvest and possession limit is 10 grayling.

With that I'll conclude my motion.

MS. PITKA: Thank you, Mr. Padgett.

MR. BROWER: Question.

MS. PITKA: Question's been called.

MR. PELTOLA: Madame Chair, BIA.

MS. PITKA: Yes, sir.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you. I'd like to ask a question of our Solicitor, Ken Lord. The Board is currently in the process of a closure review, according to policy, regulation and procedure, is that -- and this is not a harvest proposal, would the Board be acting within our authority by amending a closure review?

Thank you, Madame Chair.

MS. PITKA: Mr. Lord.

MR. LORD: Yeah, that question was just raised by Staff as well. I'll tell you what, can I just take a minute to review what's going on here exactly and think about that?

MS. PITKA: Yeah, so we can take a short five minutes.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, I concur, this is -- I'm back on now Rhonda and I thank you for doing a good job.
MS. PITKA: Thank you.

MS. DEATHERAGE: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep.

MS. DEATHERAGE: This is Karen Deatherage. I just want to let Ken know as he's looking that up, that FCR21-04 also had a modification and this closure was under the consensus agenda.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

We'll take five minutes to clarify.

(Off record)

(On record)

MS. DETWILER: This is Sue, I'll just quickly go through the roll call while we're waiting for people to gather up.

Don Striker, are you back.

(No comments)

MS. DETWILER: Greg Siekaniec.

MR. SIEKANIEC: I'm here, Sue, thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Gene Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: Roger, Roger 10-4.

MS. DETWILER: Chad Padgett.

MR. PADGETT: I'm on.

MS. DETWILER: Dave Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: I'm here.

MS. DETWILER: Rhonda, I just heard you.

MS. DETWILER: Charlie Brower, are you on.
MS. DETWILER: Tony Christianson, did you come on.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, I'm on now, too, Sue, thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. So it looks like we're only missing Don Striker and Charlie Brower.

MS. PITKA: Tony, I heard Ken Lord say he was back on.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank you.

MR. STRIKER: (Indiscernible)

MS. DETWILER: Don Striker, was that you?

MR. STRIKER: (Indiscernible)

MS. DETWILER: I'm sorry, could -- whoever just joined and was trying to say something could you repeat that please.

MR. STRIKER: Yeah, I (indiscernible).

MS. DETWILER: I'm sorry, Don, I'm thinking that's you but can you confirm.

MR. STRIKER: (Indiscernible).

MS. WESSELS: So this is Katya, Operator is telling me that it's him.

MS. DETWILER: That Don Striker is on?

MS. WESSELS: Yeah, that's what she's saying.

MS. DETWILER: Could she tell if Charlie Brower's on yet?

MS. WESSELS: Okay, I'll ask her.

MR. BROWER: Yeah, I've been on.
MS. WESSELS: Okay, I guess, yeah, he said himself.

MS. DETWILER: So Don Striker is trying to dial back in but, Mr. Chair, we do have Ken Lord and the other seven Board members on while Don is trying to call in.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, if they're ready to proceed we'll start now.

MR. LORD: Okay, Mr. Chair, this is Ken. Sorry about that, I had to do a bit of thinking, we're in uncharted waters here and conferred with Theo. My recommendation is that the best way to ensure appropriate opportunity for public comment as well as actually for the RACs to weigh in, would be to treat this as either -- at the moment for either, as a binary decision, either opened or closed, and if the Board decides to open then, then invite a special action request in the short-term, and a proposal in the long-term that would allow for the appropriate input and transparency in terms of setting seasons and bag limits.

While it's probably not just to this proposal but also 21-04, which is on the consensus agenda.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, this is Greg.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor, Greg.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you. Ken, thanks for that, I'm just trying to make sure I'm following this in the simplest way, perhaps, is we should either maintain the closure or get rid of it, that's sort of the base of our decisionmaking today, and then.....

MR. LORD: Yes.

MR. SIEKANIEC: ....if we get rid of the closure, we should encourage a proposal to be put in front of us?

MR. LORD: Yeah, that would -- for the short-term a special action request.
MR. SIEKANIEC: Okay, yep, yep.

MR. LORD: And for the longer term a proposal, yeah, exactly.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Okay, thank you.

MR. PADGETT: Mr. Chair, this is Chad Padgett with BLM.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Chad, you have the floor.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you. Based on the new information procedurally here it sounds like the best course of action, and, Ken, I'll try and get this right but pay attention so I do. But procedurally it sounds like it would be best for me to withdraw my motion; would that be the best course going forward and then reintroduce a different motion on the thumbs up or down on the closure?

MR. LORD: With the approval of the second, that would be a good way to do it.

MR. PADGETT: Okay. In that case I'd like to -- Mr. Chair, I'd like to withdraw my motion, if I could get a second.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Second, Fish and Wildlife Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes and yes.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you. Okay, so I think at this point I can make a new motion.

So the new motion I'd like to make, I'm sorry I'm doing this on the fly so my -- I apologize for the wording here. But my new motion, I'd like to keep status quo as far as the closure goes. So the new motion is just to keep the status quo.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Second, Fish and Wildlife Service.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. A
motion's been made and seconded, any further discussion
on the floor.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, BIA, you
have the floor.

MR. PELTOLA: I have a question for
BLM. Chad, are you prepared to take additional action,
with potentially a special action in place at this
meeting or -- or not. I'm trying to see where we're
going to go from this.

MR. PADGETT: You bet. I think we'll
have to discuss and see if we can't get a new proposal
in front of the Board.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. So
that's the understanding that we're just going to
develop a new proposal on this for the next cycle or
next meeting?

MR. PADGETT: It sounds like it will be
the next cycle.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, if I may, BIA.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Gene,
that's what I was just trying to make sure we had
clarification. You have the floor.

MR. PELTOLA: So one thing for
consideration, Chad, is an emergency special action
which could take place later on in this season and
could be implemented before, you know, the ice melts,
if you wanted to consider that route, or a temporary
special action which would just entail having a meeting
-- a public meeting within the affected area, and if
that's the route you want to consider, you might want
to consider a deferral until a later date on this if
you want to implement your -- your negotiated -- or
your alternative option to close, maintain the status
quo, open or closing.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. PADGETT: Thanks, Gene. I think at
this point -- through the Chair. I think at this point
we'll discuss it as a special action and make sure that we do it right and get it in front of the appropriate folks.

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any other further Board discussion, questions or deliberation.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the question.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Roll call, Sue, please.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, the motion is to maintain the status quo on FCR21-07. And starting with the motion maker, Chad Padgett.

MR. PADGETT: Thanks, Sue, I support my motion.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Gene Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: Could you come back to me shortly, I'm having discussion with my Staff.

MS. DETWILER: Yes.

Greg Siekaniec.

MR. SIEKANIEC: I support the motion to maintain status quo with the expectation that we would see a special action request as Chad indicated.

Thank you.

MR. PELTOLA: BIA's ready.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.
Don -- I'm sorry, Gene.

MR. PELTOLA: BIA's ready to cast their vote.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, go -- go ahead, Gene.

MR. PELTOLA: BIA supports the vote and the justification provided by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

MS. DETWILER: I'm -- I'm sorry, Gene, could you repeat that.

MR. PELTOLA: Support for the same justification as provided by.....

MS. DETWILER: Okay.

MR. PELTOLA: .....the Fish and Wildlife Service.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

Don Striker.

MR. REAM: Hi, Sue, this is Joshua Ream. Don Striker's having trouble getting back on the call and said that I should go ahead and vote for the Park Service if.....

MS. DETWILER: Okay.

MR. REAM: .....that's okay with the Board. The Park Service supports the motion for the reasons articulated by the other agencies.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Moving to Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

MR. SCHMID: Yeah, the Forest Service also supports the motion that maintains the status quo and like the Fish and Wildlife Service, with the expectation this would come back as a special action.
Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: I vote to maintain the status quo on FCR21-07. I would also like to ask that we have the specific information around the effects of opening a fishery in a spawning ground.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Public member Charlie Brower.

MR. BROWER: Support as stated.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

Chair Tony Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. The motion passes unanimously to maintain the status quo.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right.

MS. DETWILER: That leads -- yeah.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Sue, you have the floor.....

MR. STRIKER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: .....call the next order of business please.

MR. STRIKER: Mr. Chair, Park Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Don, you have the floor.

MR. STRIKER: So if it pleases the Board, first of all I'm back. And second of all I noticed a problem with FP21-14 and if it's okay I'd like to just take a minute to talk about that one
before we move on.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, you have
the floor, Don.

MR. STRIKER: All right, thanks. So
Staff brought it to my attention that the general
description that I was using to formulate my motion
doesn't appear to match the proposed regulation. I was
thinking that the intent was not to be able to have
fishfinders in operation while fishing from the boats,
but a closer read of the proposed regulation says that
you can't even have the device on board.

I don't think that's within the purview
of the Board to make a statement like that. And I'm
just thinking that maybe, and, maybe Ken can dig me out
of this mess, too, but could we clarify that the
intention of the Board was to -- was not to have that
language that was sort of, you're not even allowed to
have it on board, interpretation of this.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Don.
Any questions for Don.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hello,
Operator, can you hear me?

MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, we can hear you.

MS. DETWILER: Yeah, so -- this is Sue,
and I guess as far as making motions, I guess I would
ask if we actually need to make any motions on that or
if that's something that we could just deal with based
on the record here, just make sure that that is what
eventually goes into the regulation.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I would just
ask that the maker and the second have concurrence with
the new information and that we would direct Staff to
go ahead and inject that into the regulation and make
sure we just clearly have that stated on the record.

Thank you, Sue.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, this is Greg.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Greg.

MR. SIEKANIEC: I was having trouble hearing you, what is your recommendation?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I was just saying as long as we have first and second -- maker of the motion concurring, that, Sue's recommendation of just making sure that it's included in the regulation to reflect that change, that we just move ahead.

MR. SIEKANIEC: And the change being that we're not requiring the removal of equipment, just that.....

MR. STRIKER: That's right.

MR. SIEKANIEC: ......just using the equipment.....

MR. STRIKER: Mr. Chair.

MR. SIEKANIEC: ......is that.....

REPORTER: Okay, just one at a time, please.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So, Don, can you restate that for Greg so he can clearly understand it.

MR. STRIKER: Yeah, so I -- I was relying on the general description and the intent of that is that you don't have a fishfinder in operation while fishing from the boat, and that's how the regulation should read, not -- it should not read that you can't even have the device on board.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, BIA, go ahead.

MR. PELTOLA: Yes, Don, the Bureau of Indian Affairs voted to support that with the interpretation of prohibit the use.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that. That sums it up and just make sure that the regulation....

MR. PADGETT: Mr. Chair, Chad Padgett, BLM.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Chad, you have the floor.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you. Procedurally, wouldn't this require an amendment to the motion? Ken would have to answer that question, I think.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I think, myself, as the Chair, it seems Gene just did a good job stating that: prohibit the use of, clearly, you don't have to take it off the boat.

MR. LORD: Yeah, agreed, Mr. Chair, this is Ken. Everything in that analysis talks about limiting the use and it's only the language of the proposed regulation at the beginning of text about not having one on board and so that was where the lack of clarity came in. And I think as long as the Board is clear on its intent, any mechanism by which we accomplish that would be sufficient for Theo to be able to draft the appropriate regulation.

MR. PADGETT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any further discussion on this.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, thank you, it's through, I think we gave the Staff enough to go ahead and develop that. And, Sue, I'll call on you for the next order of business.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. So the next order of business is adoption of the consensus agenda and I would note that on the consensus agenda is Fisheries Closure Review 21-04, which does the same thing as what we just discovered we cannot do with Fishery Closure Rev -- 21-07, which is to establish a -- establish a harvest limit, so we'll have to figure out what to do with that consensus agenda item, FCR21-04.
MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, go ahead, Gene.

MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chair. Might I recommend that we remove -- remove 21-04 from the consensus, take it up individually, then we could act upon the consensus agenda for the remaining actions.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I think if there's no opposition from any other Board member for that I think that should be something we could do.

MR. SIEKANIEC: No opposition from Fish and Wildlife Service.

MR. BROWER: None from Public Member here.

MR. SCHMID: None from Forest Service.

MR. STRIKER: None from Park Service.

MR. PELTOLA: And none from BIA.

MS. PITKA: I'm good.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. So we'll go ahead and pull that one from there with the information that was provided to us earlier and move forward with the remaining consensus agenda items. And entertain a motion at this time.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hello, Operator, can you hear me?

OPERATOR: Yes, I hear you, are you wanting to open for public comment, sir?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, we're going to listen to the Staff analysis and then move on with the consensus agenda.

MS. DETWILER: So, Mr. Chair, did you -- let's see -- just to clarify, we're moving on with
the consensus agenda, did you want Staff member George
Pappas to read the consensus agenda and then move to
Board deliberation and Board action on the consensus
agenda?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes. Yes, that
was the order of business, I was calling for the Staff
to provide the summary of the consensus agenda.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

George Pappas....

MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair. I'm sorry,
George -- Mr. Chair, this is Katya Wessels. If we move
the FCR21-04 off the consensus agenda, don't we need to
first listen to the presentation on that before we vote
on the consensus agenda is introduced?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I think either
way works. I mean we can get this off and then go
back, or we can do it either way. Is there a
preference by anybody on the Board, we do it one way or
the other?

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chair, this is
Greg. I see we T-up the consensus agenda as George is
ready to go.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I agree. Let's
go with George and we'll back up to the one we just
pulled and we'll run through the whole process for that
non-consensus agenda item.

Thank you.

MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

George Pappas. I will go through the consensus agenda
noting that the two proposals have been pulled off.

So this is Agenda Item 7, Page II of
your book. The following are brief summaries of
fisheries proposals on the consensus agenda as well as
the recommendations for each proposal and what page or
on, fishery proposal, occur in your book.
I'm going to start with FP21-01. The request repeals -- repealing the closure to subsistence fishing prior to, during and after State commercial fishing periods in the Kuskokwim District 1 and 2 for salmon. The recommendation is to support the proposal and it can be found on Page 39 of your meeting materials book.

The second proposal here on the consensus agenda is FP21-03 that requests modification language to clarify set gillnet orientation in the tributaries of the Kuskokwim River for all fish. The recommendation is to support the proposal and it can be found on Page 67 of your book.

The next one, FP21-05 seeks to repeal subsistence regulatory language referring to State commercial fishing districts in Bristol Bay area for salmon. The recommendation is to support this proposal and it can be found on Page 68 of your book.

Next one, FP21-06 seeks to modify subsistence regulations for the Bristol Bay area to include dipnet, beach seine and gillnets for salmon. The recommendation is to oppose the proposal and it can be found on Page 79 of your book.

The next one is FP21-07 seeking to repeal time restrictions for harvesting salmon in the Egegik River. The recommendation is to support the proposal and it can be found on Page 93 of your meeting materials book.

Next one is FP21-08 seeks to repeal prohibition of harvesting fish 300 feet from the stream mouth used by salmon for the Bristol Bay area. The recommendation is to oppose the proposal and it can be found on Page 99 of your meeting materials book.

And next one, FP21-09 which seeks to modify naming conventions of early or late run Kenai River chinook salmon with specific date ranges. The recommendation is to support the proposal and it can be found on Page 109 of your meeting book.

The next one is Fisheries Closure Review 21-01 which requests to rescind the closure to Federally-qualified subsistence users in the Yukon [sic] drainage for chinook salmon. And the
recommendation is to retain status quo and it can be found on Page 330 of your meeting materials book.

The next Fisheries Closure Review is FCR21-06 seeks to rescind the closure to Federally-qualified subsistence users in the Toklat River for all fish. The recommendation is to support eliminating the closure and that can be found on Page 356 of your meeting materials book.

Next one is FCR21-22 seeks to rescind the closure to all except Federally-qualified users in Makhnati Island Federal public waters for herring and their spawn. The recommendation is to maintain the status quo. The proposal can be found on Page 464 of your materials -- meeting materials book.

And, again, the Board retains the final authority for removal of proposals from the consensus agenda. The Board will take final action on these fisheries proposals on the consensus agenda at this time.

Thank you very much for your time, sir.

Standing by.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, George. Appreciate you taking the time to present us with the consensus agenda. Any questions from the Board for George.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing none....

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, BIA, you have the floor.

MR. PELTOLA: BIA moves to accept the consensus agenda a presented to the Board.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Fish and Wildlife, second.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion's been
made and a second, any discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, call for the question.

MR. BROWER: Question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been called by Charlie. Sue, roll call, please.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. Motion to accept the consensus agenda.

Gene Peltola, BIA.

MR. PELTOLA: Accept.

MS. DETWILER: Greg Siekaniec, Fish and Wildlife Service.

MR. SIEKANIEC: I accept the consensus agenda, thank you, Sue.

MS. DETWILER: Don Striker, Park Service.

MR. STRIKER: We accept the consensus agenda, thanks. Sue.

MS. DETWILER: Chad Padgett, BLM.

MR. MCKEE: Sue, this is Chris, Chad had to step out briefly so I'll act in his stead. BLM accepts.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Chris.

Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

MR. SCHMID: Yeah, Forest Service accepts the consensus agenda.

MS. DETWILER: Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: Yes, I accept, thank you.
MS. DETWILER: Public Member Charlie Brower.

MR. BROWER: Yes.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Chair Tony Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Motion passes unanimously, the consensus agenda is accepted.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Now, Sue, I guess we will step back to the ones that we pulled off so we could address the non-consensus item we have remaining on our table today.

MS. DETWILER: So, I believe we have just the one that was just pulled off the consensus agenda, 21 -- Fisheries Closure Review 21-04.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes. And if we could have the Staff come up and give us a brief summary of that so we could run through the process of consideration.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you. And I -- I'm sorry.

MR. BROWER: Was that 21-04?


MR. BROWER: Okay, thank you.

MR. GRAHAM: Hello, Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. This is Cory Graham again, and I'm a fisheries biologist with the Office of Subsistence Management. I'll be presenting Fisheries Closure Review 21-04 which can be found on Page 339 of your Board book. This closure review reviews the closure to the harvest of all fish in the Jim River drainage by Federally-qualified subsistence users.
The Federal Subsistence Board adopted this closure from State regulations at the beginning of the Federal program in 1992 and it has not been reviewed or modified since. Under State regulations, Jim River is closed to subsistence fishing but sportfishing is allowed. Three miles of Jim River exists within the Kanuti Refuge boundary, the remainder of the Jim River drainage is on general domain lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management.

Coho, chum and chinook salmon spawn in the Jim River. Aerial surveys that were conducted from 2009 to 2012 and in 2015 indicated there were, on average, 183 chinook salmon and 462 chum salmon counted each year. There is no escapement goal for any salmon species in this drainage. The predominant non-salmon fish found in the Jim River drainage include Arctic grayling, burbot, round whitefish and slimy sculpin. Population estimates conducted for grayling in the Jim River indicated there were between 5,100 and 5,400 Arctic grayling in a 10 kilometer stretch near the Dalton Highway in 1995; and approximately 12,000 Arctic grayling over a 21.3 kilometer section of the river in 1997.

Communities in the vicinity of the Jim River include Wiseman, Coldfoot, Evansville and Bettles. Wiseman has a documented use area for non-salmon fish that includes the Jim River and areas adjacent to the Dalton Highway. Important non-salmon species include grayling, sucker and burbot.

If this closure is eliminated Federal subsistence regulations for the Yukon area would apply. Federal subsistence fishing schedules, openings, closings and fishing methods would be the same as those issued by State emergency order unless superseded by a Federal special action.

The OSM conclusion is to eliminate the closure and modify regulations to allow subsistence fishing by rod and reel only. Currently this drainage is closed to fishing by Federally-qualified subsistence users but remains open to other uses, which does not allow a subsistence priority. OSM recommends that subsistence harvest be restricted to rod and reel to protect healthy populations in the system. Under OSM's recommendation, subsistence rod and reel harvest limits would mirror State sport regulations.
And that concludes my presentation and we're prepared to take any questions.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Appreciate you being ready to do that on the fly. Any questions from the Board.

(NO COMMENTS)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing none, we'll move on to the next part of the process. We'll listen to the summary of public comment.

OPERATOR: If you would like to make a public comment, please press star one.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Sorry, Operator, at this time I'm asking the Staff if there's any public comments that were received.

Thank you.

OPERATOR: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And then we'll go to the.....

MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair, this is Katya Wessels.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Katya, you have the floor.

MS. WESSELS: Yeah, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mr. Chair and Members of the Board. We did not receive any written public comments on FCR21-04.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Katya. We'll, at this time, Operator, open up the line to any public who may want to testify at this time, this is their opportunity.

OPERATOR: Thank you. Once, again, if you would like to make a public comment, please press star one. One moment please.
(Pause)

OPERATOR: I'm showing no public comments at this time.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Operator. And with that we'll go ahead and move on to Regional Advisory Council recommendation, RAC Chair or designee.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No RACs wish to speak to this, calling on any RAC who wishes to speak to this proposal at this time, now would be your opportunity.

OPERATOR: Please hit star one.

MS. DEATHERAGE: Mr. Chair, this is Karen Deatherage. So are you asking for the Regional Advisory Council's recommendation for FCR21-04?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, I'm just seeing if any of the RAC Chairs want to chime in on it, we did pull it off the consensus and made it non-consensus. Just trying to give everybody an opportunity to speak to the proposal before we deliberate and vote on it.

Thank you.

MS. DEATHERAGE: With the Chair's permission I'd be happy to speak on behalf of Jenny Pelkola, the Acting Chair for the Western Interior Alaska Council, and this recommendation for this fisheries closure review.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor, thank you.

MS. DEATHERAGE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The Western Interior Alaska Regional Advisory Council supported elimination of the closure per the OSM recommendation with the following modification. Allow a bag possession limit of 10 grayling per day by rod and reel in the Jim River, including Douglas and
Prospects Creek. This closure was authorized to minimize the disruption of the State's continuing fish and game management of subsistence, while at the same time fulfilling the requirements of ANILCA. The Jim River is currently excluded from the list of rivers where subsistence use is permitted along the Dalton Highway Corridor. Under this regulation, use has been closed to Federally-qualified subsistence users, but open to sportfishing under State regulation. The Council believes there is verifiable traditional use of salmon in this river and a limited harvest of rod and reel should be allowed to occur.

The Council also believes that if subsistence users are going to travel down the river for grayling, the bag limit should be increased to justify time and expense. Allowing for a small traditional harvest of salmon along with a reasonable harvest of grayling would reestablish a subsistence priority use of this resource.

I do want to note, and Cory or Hannah can correct me if I'm wrong, that opening this closure would allow for a bag limit of five grayling per day, based on the additional portions of the regulations. So what the Council is asking for is to increase that bag or possession limit to 10.

Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Board.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions from the Board.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA. I have a question for legal Counsel.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: There you go.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So my understanding based on the previous direction received on the grayling in the White Mountains, we have the Western Interior, which has been deferred to by YKD, Seward Penn, all the others, we would vote to rescind the closure, which would put in place an existing bag limit of five as Ms. Deatherage identified, and if the bag limit and possession wanted to be modified, then that could be addressed in the same manner, via special action request, emergency, or...
temporary followed up by a regulatory change during the cycle. Is that correct, Mr. Lord?

MR. LORD: That is correct. Thank you, Mr. Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, appreciate the comment. And any other questions -- thank you for that position -- any other Regional Advisory Council Chairs wish to be recognized at this time.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none, we'll call on the tribal, Alaska Native Corp comments, Orville Lind.

MR. LIND: Thank you, Chair. Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I can hear you loud and clear, brother.

MR. LIND: Yeah, during the consultation session there were no questions or concerns on FCR21-04. That's all I have, Mr. Chair.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

Next, we'll move on to Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Ben Mulligan.

MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the record, Ben Mulligan, Alaska Department of Fish and Game. The Department has no comment on this closure review.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Mr. Mulligan. We'll move on to the InterAgency Staff comments, Katya.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. Katya Wessels. The InterAgency
Staff Committee had the standard comment on Fisheries Closure Review FCR21-04.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Katya. Board discussion, Board action, the floor is open.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chairman, Greg.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor, Greg.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. At this time I would like to move that we maintain the closure of FCR21-04, and if I get a second I will add some additional justification.

MR. BROWER: Second.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Charlie. In moving to maintain the closure, I believe that the status quo is appropriate until such time as we receive a special action request from the Western Interior Regional Advisory Council. I think this is similar to the last issue that we dealt with. There is obviously some interest and it looks like justification that can be put together around this and to make sure that we get it right and take the appropriate Board action, I, again, would say that we should maintain this closure until that time.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

MR. SCHMID: Question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been called, thank you, Dave. Sue, roll call.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, the motion on Fisheries Closure Review 21-04 is to maintain the status quo.

Greg Siekanie, your vote.

MR. SIEKANIEC: I support maintaining
the status quo.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Don Striker.

MR. STRIKER: I support, thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Gene Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: BIA supports with the same expectations as the Fish and Wildlife Service.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Chad Padgett, BLM.

MR. PADGETT: I support.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

MR. SCHMID: I also support with the same expectations as stated by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: I support maintaining the status quo. Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Public Member Charlie Brower.

(No comments)

MS. DETWILER: Charlie Brower, did we lose you on this vote.

MR. BROWER: I support, thank you, as stated.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

And, finally, Chair Christianson.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support as stated, thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, motion passes unanimously to maintain the closure.

MS. DEATHERAGE: Thank you, this is Karen Deatherage. With the Chair's permission I'd like to speak to this.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor, Karen.

MS. DEATHERAGE: Thank you, very much. I just wanted to remind the Board that the Council voted unanimously to support the elimination of this closure, not to maintain status quo, and that they supported the elimination of the closure with a bag possession of 10 grayling per day.

So I just heard, and it's late in the day so I could have heard wrong, that the Board just voted to maintain the status quo, which to me would maintain the closure, which would go against the recommendations of the Western Interior Council.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that. Does that clearly reflect what just happened, and I think there was some legal reasons why; can somebody explain?

MR. LORD: Mr. Chair, this is Ken.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Ken, you have the floor.

MR. LORD: That's exactly right. The deference issue is not a concern when we are acting in a manner that trying to properly implement the law, in this case, the Administrative Procedural Act, so there's no need for the Board to go down that list of three possible reasons for not deferring to a Council in this particular case because there's an unwritten, fourth one, which is compliance with the law.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, appreciate that. I hope that helps you understand the
Thank you.

MR. STRIKER: Mr. Chair, Park Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Don, you have the floor.

MR. STRIKER: Thanks for your indulgence and I apologize for seeming to have Park Service domination. I would like to request reconsideration of FP21-14, and if I get a second I'll explain my rationale.

MR. PELTOLA: Second, BIA.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion's been made and seconded for reconsideration, you have the floor, Don.

MR. STRIKER: Thank you, Gene. I just want to make abundantly clear on the record what my intent was and provide a clear opportunity for the Board to be able to vote on this with that intention being crystal clear. I want to make sure that we're not running afoul of any possible interpretation of taking an action that could be viewed as arbitrary and capricious.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that Don. I think we're here to do business while we're at the table so I appreciate that. Any other Board discussion, questions or comments.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: There is a motion on the floor to reconsider the proposal we just voted on, at this time I'll call for the question on that reconsideration seeing as it has a second.

MS. DETWILER: So just -- so I'm making sure, this is a motion to reconsider Fisheries Proposal 21-14?

MR. STRIKER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

MS. DETWILER: Okay.

MR. PELTOLA: BIA calls for a question on Fisheries Proposal 21-14 as clarified by the National Park Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Roll call.

MS. DETWILER: Okay.

Don Striker.

MR. STRIKER: Support.

MS. DETWILER: Greg Siekaniec.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Support.

MS. DETWILER: Gene Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: Support.

MS. DETWILER: Chad Padgett.

MR. PADGETT: Support.

MS. DETWILER: Dave Schmid.

MR. SCHMID: Support.

MS. DETWILER: Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: Support.

MS. DETWILER: Charlie Brower.

MR. BROWER: Support.

MS. DETWILER: Tony Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support.

MS. DETWILER: Motion passes to reconsider Fisheries Proposal 21-14.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: That brings that up back up to the table and at this time we could
either have further discussion or we could get a motion on the floor to clearly articulate our intent for the record.

Thank you.

MR. STRIKER: Mr. Chair, Park Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Don, you have the floor.

MR. STRIKER: I move that we adopt Fisheries Proposal 21-14 in deference to the Eastern Interior RAC and because of the overwhelming public testimony that we heard in the region. It's not clear to me that this equipment provides substantial benefits on the river. Additionally, I don't think that this action will unduly affect subsistence opportunity. I believe it's a starting point for us to explore how some restrictions of this nature can help facilitate future conservation efforts driven by the local users.

I'm a little concerned that the restrictions are on Federal users, and I do hope that we can find ways to work with the RACs and the State to jointly work towards conservation and to fully understand the issues.

I also want to be clear that the regulation is to prohibit the use of bathymetry equipment and fishfinders while fishing from a boat or watercraft, not to prohibit them from being on board entirely. That is beyond the jurisdiction of this Board.

I would also welcome exploring future proposals regarding this equipment and to hear more broadly from people in the region regarding their use, both for finding fish and for safety and where there might be room for compromise more broadly. And I also want to reiterate that I take great, great hesitancy in restricting Federally-qualified subsistence users when State users don't have the same restrictions.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Don, appreciate that. Further Board questions or discussion.
REPORTER: A second?

MR. PELTOLA: BIA seconds.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for that reminder, Tina.

Motion's been made by Don, seconded by Gene, now the floor's open for further discussion, deliberation.

MR. BROWER: So, Don, your motion is to iterate that while you're fishing from a boat or a watercraft you may use one of these devices for fish locations, fishfinders, for the subsistence users?

MR. STRIKER: No, so it would prohibit -- it was prohibit the subsistence users from having that equipment turned on basically while fishing.

MR. BROWER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any further Board questions, discussion.

(No comments)

MR. PELTOLA: Question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been called. Roll call, Sue, please.

MS. DETWILER: The motion is to adopt Fisheries Proposal 21-14.

Don Striker.

MR. STRIKER: National Park Service supports for the reasons previously articulated.


MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Sue. I oppose. I think, again, restricting Federally-qualified users in this regard is going to be extremely complicated because quite often navigation bathymetry and fishfinder devices are all in a combined single unit now and, you know, limiting them from a safety
standpoint of having their navigation utilized, I think, is going to be something that a law enforcement officer will find great difficulty in enforcing.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Gene Peltola, BIA.

MR. PELTOLA: Bureau of Indian Affairs votes to support for the reasons articulated by my colleague at the National Park Service. And I'd also like the record to reflect my comments carried over from the previous vote on this proposal.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Chad Padgett, BLM.

MR. PADGETT: I oppose for the same reasons as previously stated. And I'd like to add, too, that this may be out of our jurisdiction due to Coast Guard regulations.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

MR. SCHMID: Yeah, I'm going to oppose for the reasons stated by both BLM and Fish and Wildlife Service.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: I vote to support as stated by my previous comments and also in support of the National Park Service.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.
Public Member Charlie Brower.

MR. BROWER: Support as stated.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Finally, Chair Tony Christianson.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Support.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Motion passes five to three. So the proposal -- Fisheries Proposal 21-14 is adopted.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And that's why we like to entertain people on the call and make sure they pay attention because you can change the business of the Board by giving us information so I truly appreciate everyone's diligence, paying attention and trying to make sure we get it as correct as we can for the people who are on the land using the resource, so, thank you.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair. BIA recommends since we have the rural/nonrural coming up next on the agenda, that we recess for the evening and convene in the morning.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I concur, as the Chair, if there's no opposition to it starting again in the morning at 9:00 a.m.

MR. SCHMID: That works for me, thank you.

MS. PITKA: I look forward to the morning. Goodnight.

MR. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. STRIKER: Thank you.

(Off record)
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