

**On-Time Advisory Committee Comment List
Southeast and Yakutat Finfish
February 23–March 3, 2015**

Pelican Fish and Game Advisory Committee (Minutes 11/24/14)	AC 01
Upper Lynn Canal Fish and Game Advisory Committee (Minutes 12/8/14).	AC 02
Yakutat Fish and Game Advisory Committee (Minutes 12/19/15).....	AC 03
Icy Straits Fish and Game Advisory Committee (Minutes 1/13/14)	AC 04
Juneau-Douglas Fish and Game Advisory Committee (Minutes 1/5/15)	AC 05
Juneau-Douglas Fish and Game Advisory Committee (Letter 1/26/15)	AC 06
Wrangell Fish and Game Advisory Committee (Minutes 12/18/14)	AC 07
Petersburg Fish and Game Advisory Committee (Minutes 1/7/15)	AC 08
Sitka Fish and Game Advisory Committee (Minutes 12/18/14)	AC 09
Sitka Fish and Game Advisory Committee (Minutes 1/14/15)	AC 10
Sitka Fish and Game Advisory Committee (Minutes 1/6/15)	AC 11
Sitka Fish and Game Advisory Committee (Minutes 2/2/15)	AC 12
Craig Fish and Game Advisory Committee (Minutes 2/3/15).....	AC 13

Petersburg Advisory Committee Minutes

1/7/2015

Location: Assembly Chambers

Call to Order: by chairman Bob Martin at 6:30 pm.

Roll Call: 11 of 14 members present

AC members present:

AC Absent:

Bob Martin

Joel Randrup

Arnold Enge

Kirt Marsh

Ben Case

Wes Malcom

Jerry Dahl

Andy Knight

Stan Malcom

Frank Neidiffer

Ted Sandhofer

Max Worhatch

David Benitz

Ryan Littleton

ADF&G Present:

Joe Stratman, regional shellfish biologist

Troy Thynes, area management biologist for commercial finfish

Kevin Clark, assistant area management ... commercial fish

Patrick Fowler, area management biologist for sportfish

Visitors:

Megan O'Neil, Petersburg Vessel Owner's Association

John Jensen, Board of Fish

Mark Roberts, Alaska Troller's Association, local troller

Ed Wood, local troller and longliner

Main Agenda Item was to consider Southeast Finfish Proposals

New Business:

Elections: Bob Martin, Arnold Enge, and Stan Malcom were nominated to be re-elected for two year terms (expiring 12/2016) in their existing seats with the exception of Bob Martin's seat being relaxed from "crab" to an "undesignated" spot as there are usually several AC members holding crab permits in addition to their primary seat designation. There were no objections to the "undesignation" and no competing nominees. All three members were re-elected.

We discussed re-visiting some shrimp proposals we had punted to the Shrimp Task Force at our last meeting and decided to leave them alone. We agreed to re-visit #239 regarding a



statewide proposal affecting Dungeness pot storage at the next meeting (Jan. 8). Joe Stratman was concerned that there may have been a misunderstanding about how proposal #239 would affect Dungeness pot storage.

Visitor Mark Roberts requested that we take up the commercial trolling proposal first since he would be unavailable at the next meeting so we agreed begin with proposal #220.

Proposals #220 - 233, then 114-134 were considered and recorded in proposal comments which are attached.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 pm to be resumed the following evening Jan. 8 at 6:30pm.

Jan 8. continuation of Meeting...

Location: Assembly Chambers

Call to Order: by chairman Bob Martin at 6:30 pm.

Roll Call: 10 of 14 members present

AC members present:

AC Absent:

Bob Martin

Joel Randrup

Arnold Enge

Kirt Marsh

Ben Case

Jerry Dahl

Andy Knight

Stan Malcom

Frank Neidiffer

Ted Sandhofer

Max Worhatch

David Benitz

Ryan Littleton

Wes Malcom

ADF&G Present:

Joe Stratman, regional shellfish biologist

Troy Thynes, area management biologist for commercial finfish

Kevin Clark, assistant area management ... commercial fish

Patrick Fowler, area management biologist for sportfish

Visitors:

Megan O'Neil, Petersburg Vessel Owner's Association

New Business:

Proposal #239 reconsidered and voted down.

Proposals #135-210 were considered. Member Kirt Marsh left the meeting after #139.



Meeting adjourned at 10:45 pm.

Minutes taken by Jerry Dahl and Bob Martin.

Proposal votes and comments are attached.

<i>Draft</i>					
Petersburg Advisory Committee					
Finfish Proposal Comments Jan 7&8, 2015					
	Proposal	Support	Oppose	Abstain	Comments
Herring Management	114	0	11		Ties department's hands, removes management tool. Department is adequately managing fishery.
Herring Management	115	0	11		same
Herring Management	116	0	11		same
Sitka Herring	117			na	
Sitka Herring	118	0	11		Could lead to harvest of younger mixed fish and spawn outs
Sitka Herring	119	11	0		Prime area closed for subsistence but not used by subsistence
Sitka Herring	120			na	
Sitka Herring	121	0	11		No need to close more area when ample opportunity exists for subsistence
Sitka Herring	122	5	6		Rolling back justified but not worth the controversy. This might re-open a can of



					worms
Sitka Herring	123			na	
Sitka Herring	124			na	
Sitka Herring	125	0	11		Micromanaging department for no reason
Sitka Herring	126	0	11		Would cause devastating price drop to existing roe on kelp markets. Even 2014 showed drastic price drop.
Spawn on Kelp	127	0	11		Roe on kelp participants generally favor double-ponding to conserve herring. This proposal might discourage conservation in favor of product quality in low biomass years.
Spawn on Kelp	128	3	8		Might cause more fish to be used in fisheries during low biomass years Some members thought it could add value to product and that joining pens together could make adding herring less stressful on the fish being added to pens
Spawn on Kelp	129	9	2		Midnight is a bad time. Predators enter pens and destroy product. Minority said just stagger times and harvest earlier in day.
Dogfish	130			na	
Sablefish	131	0	11		Too vague but not bad idea, liked #134 better
Sablefish	132			na	
Sablefish	133			na	
Sablefish	134	11	0		Good for testing out the pot fishery to address flea and slime eel issues
Sablefish	135	10	0		Housekeeping to get ready for a pot fishery? - Fine
Sablefish	136	2	8		Not clear how many people could be on boat, whether permits required for non-participants Not sure there is a problem that needs to be addressed



					Minority in favor thought 50 was plenty and fishery is rapidly expanding and now is the time to get it under control
Sablefish	137	5	5		Supporters liked gear limit, but want to make sure 350 hooks per permit can be stacked
					Opposers don't think there is a problem with too many black cod being harvested
Gear/Logs	138	10	0		In favor if confidentiality could be protected, perhaps by sealed logbooks
Gear/Logs	139	10	0		Seems reasonable
Lingcod	140	0	10		Not convinced there is a conservation or other stock issue
Lingcod	141			na	
Lingcod	142	9	0		
Sport Rockfish	143	4	5		There is real stock issue and mortality concern but it is mainly near Sitka. The average local sport fisherman does not have this technology when jigging for food and does not release many. Those supporting it thought it addressed a serious concern and this proposal was not an undue hardship
Sport Rockfish	144	0	9		Charter member said this was a bad idea unless #143 was in effect because mortality would increase otherwise
Sport Rockfish	145	9	0		Sure
Subsistence	146	9	0		Housekeeping
Subsistence	147	0	8		RAC should stay out of state regs and #146 addresses the issue
Subsistence	148	0	9		Already allowed by readily attainable special permit
Klawock	149			na	
Klawock	150			na	
Klawock	151			na	
Klawock	152			na	



Subsistence	153	0	9		There is already fishing allowed. Joining nets has unknown implications.
					We generally object to federal RAC pushing proposals in our state regs
Subsistence	154	8	0		Sure
Sport	155	5	4		Supporters said it may be happening already and there is not a problem.
					Opposers said it could get out of hand on large charter vessels
Bow fishing	156	9	0		Why not? Good opportunity to encourage the bow and arrow as a growing hobby in Southeast.
					If snagging is allowed for personal use, then bow fishing seems no less reasonable.
Reduce King size	157	0	9		Treaty implications. No reason to change a long standing rule.
Sport King Mgt.	158	0	9		Current plan is complicated but working. This proposal could upset existing business models. No reason to change.
Non-res limits	159	0	9		Not convinced subsistence fisheries being harmed by non-resident sport fishing
Non-res limits	160	0	9		Not convinced subsistence fisheries being harmed by non-resident sport fishing
Yakutat	161			na	
Yakutat	162			na	
Yakutat	163			na	
Yakutat	164			na	
Ketchikan	165			na	
Taku Sport King	166	9	0		Probably little risk in simplifying regs
Juneau	167			na	
Juneau	168			na	
Juneau	169			na	
Klawock	170			na	
Klawock	171			na	
Ketchikan	172			na	
Com. Salmon mgt	173	0	9		Extreme measure to go back to 1946 data. Seems like a resource grab by one community.



Com. Salmon mgt	174	0	9		Chinook survival is low recently in many systems. Department is working on managing the problem.
Com. Salmon mgt	175	0	9		JRPT is working on this issue.
Com. Salmon mgt	176	0	9		JRPT is working on this issue.
Mist Cove	177	9	0		reasonable change vetted by NSRAA board
Mist Cove	178			na	
Hidden Falls	179	9	0		reasonable change vetted by NSRAA board
Hidden Falls	180			na	
Neck Lake	181	9	0		Sure
Deep Inlet	182			na	
Deep Inlet Rotation	183	9	0		Peace and harmony between seiners and gillnetters. Trollers on committee did not object.
Trolling Kendrick	184	9	0		No objection to trolling in Kendrick Bay, most members surprised it is restricted
	185			na	
Anita Bay Rotation	186	9	0		Gillnetters and Seiners worked it out and no one on committee objects
Southeast Cove	187	9	0		A reasonable addition to Southeast Cove language
Southeast Cove CTA	188			na	
Hidden Falls	189	9	0		reasonable clarification
Sockeye Cap	190	9	0		This accounting for sockeye makes sense and has industry consensus
	191			na	
Sockeye reporting	192	0	9		No particular objections but we think this is already required
Manage 12&14	193	0	9		No subsistence shortfall or stock of concern shown
Lisianski	194	0	9		These waters are already closed most of the time and this would tie department's hands



					when abundance is high
Lisianski	195	0	9		Against closing waters with no conservation issues
New Stat Area	196			na	Not a BoF job as explained by Department. Dept. can do this. We do not object.
New Stat Area	197			na	same
Protect Angoon	198	9	0		This is already being done so no objection
Angoon possessory	199	0	9		No conservation issues
Protect Angoon	200	0	9		No conservation issues
	201			na	
Seine Vessel Length	202	2	6		Not sure there is a problem, but bolt-on bow roller issue might get out of control
Seine trawling	203	0	9		unenforceable
Spotter planes	204	0	9		unenforceable
Spotter drones	205	2	7		Not an issue yet and unenforceable
Dist 15 boundaries	206	9	0		Housekeeping
Gillnet in 6-D	207	9	0		In years of high abundance it would give a little extra opportunity to district 6-D gillnetters. Seiners did not object.
District 8 gillnet mesh size restriction	208	3	6		208 is opposed by commercial fishing members on the AC. Gillnetters express that they historically catch a baseline number of Stikine Chinook during the District 8 sockeye fishery and this has been understood and accounted by the Department and the treaty with Canada for decades. Recently more boats have focused on Anita Bay hatchery kings returning through a different corridor in District 8 and there is a misperception that these boats are targeting and catching Stikine Chinook. The proposer, Stan Malcom, and two other AC members supported this proposal because they feel that it is reasonable to make gillnets less effective on all Chinook while District 8 is managed as a Sockeye fishery.



Small mesh gillnets get more meshes deep	209	2	5		Gillnet performance data would be different due to unknown efficiency and could shorten openings
					Supporters note that smaller mesh nets are unnecessarily shallow and ineffective
Monofilament Gillnet	210	5	3		Supporters like option of cheaper nets. Not sure how it would affect fishing.
					Catch rate might increase. Department might have to reduce time until data collected
	211			na	
	212			na	
	213			na	
	214			na	
	215			na	
	216			na	
	217			na	
	218			na	
	219			na	
Expand Yakutat King area	220	0	11		Almost no hatchery component so cannot justify expanding this winter fishery
					Would take away from other long established area's treaty fish
					Other areas would get less opportunity to make this happen in Yakutat
Expand Icy Bay King area	221	0	11		Unknown but possibly significant harvest to non-hatchery Chinook
					Could reduce fishing time in established areas
Spring Troll regs	222	11	0		Housekeeping: Alaska hatchery component no objections
Summer King trolling percentages	223	0	11		Might be harder to catch 40% in August
					Benefits some, might hurt others. Don't fix something that is working.
Troll King cleanup trip limit	224	3	8		Some thought it would be hard for department to implement in timely way.
					Department should/could try to manage better with existing regs
					Those supporting it thought it was a waste to leave fish on table and this would solve the problem.



Dist 12&14 Chum Trolling	225	11	0		Support JRPT reasons and decision
	226			na	
	227			na	
10 day troll closure	228	0	11		No escapement issues or stock of concern. No established subsistence shortfall
Expand area to allow trolling between areas	229	0	11		Fishery is still in experimental stage, impacts of this area unknown. Not proposed by a group. Give it a few more years and propose through industry association
Restrict trolling in 15c	230	4	7		Majority opposed - thought troll impact is small and not a problem that needs solving Minority in favor expressed concern over juvenile Chinook mortality, especially Taku
Naha Bay sanctuary	231	0	11		Department is adequately looking out for escapement issues caused by Neets bay fishery
Troll gear regs	232	11	0		Clarity is good
Allow downriggers all year	233	0	11		Not something that needs changing and concerns over downriggers used as extra hand gurdies with multiple hooks.
Statewide Dungeness pot storage	239	0	10		We re-considered this statewide shellfish proposal after it was brought to our attention that we may have been given the wrong impression by the department that it would just bring the 72-hour pot storage in line with the 7-days allowed after the summer and fall seasons we were familiar with locally. This does not seem to be the case although it may be the intent of the proposer to do that. We were not comfortable amending this without consulting the proposer so voted it down unanimously.



Sitka Advisory Committee
December 18, 2014
Sitka Sound Science Center, 834 Lincoln Street

- I. Call to Order: 6:30 PM by John Murray
- II. Roll Call: Jessica Gill
Members Present: Jerry Barber, Dick Curran, Kim Elliot, Jeff Feldpausch, Tad Fujioka, Jessica Gill, Randy Gluth, Moe Johnson, Karen Johnson, John Murray, Bradley Shaffer, Wayne Unger
Members Absent: Cody Loomis, Brian Massey, Peter Roddy, Floyd Tomkins
Number Needed For Quorum on AC: 8

List of User Groups Present: Hand Troll, Longline, Subsistence, Alternate 1, Trapping, Alternate 2, Hunting, Seine, At-Large 1, Power Troll, At-Large 2, Processor
- III. Approval of Agenda:
No formal agenda was published, but John overview the proposals we would try to cover during the meeting. John would like to discuss a few subsistence/personal use fishery proposals this evening, if there's time.
- IV. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes:
Kim made a motion to approve all the minutes. Jerry seconded. 9 in favor; 2 abstain.
Meeting minutes from November 18th, December 2nd, and December 10th were approved.
Jessica will forward the minutes onto Boards Support.
- V. Fish and Game Staff Present:
Dave Gordon, Troy Tydingco, Mike Vaughn, Kyle Ferguson (Alaska Wildlife Troopers)
- VI. Guests Present:
Steve Reifentstahl, Mike Baines, Randy Langtiegne, Al Wilson, Tori O'Connell, Roger Ingman, Linda Behnken, Frank Bolivich, Jeff Favour, Troy Denkinger
- VII. Old Business:
Charter seat elections will not be held tonight. John and Jessica did not notify Boards Support in time before elections were going to be held.
- VIII. New Business:
Kim discussed a high school scholarship for students going to college/trade school in the maritime industry.
Jerry asked about the charter seat/at-large seat. Steve Reifentstahl asked about adding an aquaculture seat, and John mentioned the possibility of a gillnet seat. Bradley mentioned it would throw off the number of seats, with split even votes if we moved outside the 15 current members. Kim suggested we approached it a little differently. Bradley asked if it was public notice or administrative hold up that barred us from holding the elections tonight. John mentioned that the issue was not letting Boards Support know about the election in a timely manner.
John asked about BOF proposal 113 and possibly bringing this up at the next meeting. Kim mentioned that she looked up the proposer group, look to be a worldwide conservation group.



Southeast and Yakutat Finfish, Jan. 23–March 3, 2015
Alaska Board of Fisheries

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form

BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
BOF	123	Assign equal quota shares in the Sitka Sound commercial sac roe herring fishery.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	3	7, 2 abstain.	<p>Wayne moved to adopt, Dick seconded.</p> <p>Wayne—processor side of things and local economy it's something that we should be in support of. Less equipment out on the grounds to harvest the same amount of fish. Give more towards the local fishermen, and the money would stay in Sitka. Not as many tenders into town. More processing time, this could extend the processing out to 10-11days.</p> <p>Kim—thinks there's a problem with this, and getting all the permit holders to agree, and it could be more damaging to the herring biomass. Local economy counts on seiners to spend their money every year. Doesn't think she'll support it.</p> <p>Moe—would like to hear the permit holders input. Every year this comes up.</p> <p>Troy Denkinger (Public)—strongly believes this equal split will leave the money in town. There are losers though- the out of town tenders and pilots. Money would stay year round and not leave.</p> <p>Dick—Should we leave this up to the permit holders?</p> <p>Tad—this would set BOF and ADF&G to manage this way regardless of if all permit holders agree.</p> <p>Kim—do they have to have 100% agreement to have quota shares?</p> <p>Troy D.—yes. The last time this came up, 80% signed off, 10% neutral, 10% strongly opposed.</p> <p>Roger Ingman (Public)—been in favor with equal splits, agrees with Troy. Mature biomass too large during test sets, and with equal quotas, they can give the fish to certain permits.</p> <p>John—if you don't have proposal 126 pass, this won't work?</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—not necessarily. Those doing SOK would give up seine. No having to give up permits, SOK harvest biomass would be taken away from sac roe biomass.</p> <p>Kim—maybe I'm confused, but if they only want to send out a few boats, they would send out all the boats? And you could wipe out a whole population by fishing?</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—wouldn't open up the whole Sitka sound. We can still close the fishery as necessary.</p> <p>Kim—you misunderstand. One big mass of herring, you'd fit 10 boats vs. 50 boats, and you could take a bunch of them? Could you damage the biomass future with equal shares?</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—if we execute a fishery in a smaller area it's still a lot of boats. Doesn't see anything different.</p> <p>Troy (Public)—5 boats vs. 50 boats are easier to manage. Fisherman's</p>



			<p>perspective is that ADF&G still have control, and everyone would have been allocated a certain percentage or tonnage.</p> <p>Roger (Public)—FYI, when we’ve had equal splits, processors have so many boats, and it’s split up on the # of boats the company has. Don’t have to send out 10 boats for 10 shares, can send out 1 boat to fish the 10 shares.</p> <p>Tad—2 points: 1) conservations concern, you’re assured to not go over the quota with less boats fishing. 2) from economics, the value of the permit goes up, and it’s already an expensive permit, and that might be a concern for people trying to get in the fishery.</p> <p>Dick—market might make a difference in the price of the permit.</p> <p>Jerry—this one’s similar to proposal, but likes that the 70/30 split for the management.</p> <p>John—didn’t it have to be 100% majority? Who would set the new shares?</p> <p>Tad—BOF would set new shares regardless of permit holder agreements.</p> <p>Troy (Public)—it has to be 100% between permit holders and then go to equal shares.</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—it would be like Chatham black cod. We don’t manage the shares, only the openings and closures.</p> <p>Steve Reifentuhl (Public)—past BOF meetings have looked for 100% agreement from permit holders.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>
BOF	124	Allow purse seine permit holders to vote on equal quota shares in the Sitka Sound commercial sac roe herring fishery.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	3	6, 3 abstain	<p>Jerry moved to adopt, Kim seconded.</p> <p>Jerry—likes the idea of 70% vote, and a lot of things are already based on 50% majority. Doesn’t like that 1 or 2 permit holders can stop the other 48 from doing what they want to do, like the way it is now.</p> <p>Wayne—this is a fisherman issues, in terms of how they want to vote.</p> <p>Jerry called question.</p>
BOF	125	Reduce the harvest rate and establish a maximum guideline harvest level for the Sitka Sound commercial sac roe herring fishery.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	4	7	<p>Tad left, voting down to 11. Jeff moved to adopt, Kim seconded.</p> <p>Jeff— this proposal would cap the harvest at 10%, and GHLC cap at 10,000 tons. Sac-roe fisheries are very wasteful, 12% is harvested, 88% waste. Dr. Hamada from Research Institute for Humanity and Nature gave an overview to Sitka Tribe of Alaska’s council about what’s going on with herring in Japan. In his work, he contacted Japanese processors, the herring from Canada and southeast AK is processed in China, then the roe is extracted, and the rest turned into fish meal. Lack of fish meal is hurting fish farmers. Fish meal prices have gone up tripled in the last 15 years because of Peruvian anchovy decline. This year’s price was the lowest ever, \$0.09 a pound exvessel value. Make herring least valuable fish in AK, part of this decline is due to the end user—losing some of the kazunoko users. Japanese could gift kazunoko to government officials, but government in Japan banned that. At which point are herring left more in the water? Lenfest Report found that forage fish are worth two times as much left in the water as a prey species for other fisheries. This proposal would make the market better (simple supply and demand) and increase the value of the resource. This proposal also follows the AK hatchery program- leaving more fish in the water will leave more fish for harvest and use. It will also decrease the number of fish going to feed</p>



		<p>farmed salmon. Everyone wins—more fish, markets better, keeping more fish in the water for other users.</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—would not like to have ADF&G involved in the markets, but it's simplistic to think that the decreased harvest would increase our value, because there are other sac roe fisheries. As far as leaving more fish in the water, having a hard time to see if more fish left in the water will lead to more salmon and halibut, seen a study to suggest more herring are competing with king salmon in Puget sound.</p> <p>Steve Reifentstahl (Public)—this proposal is predicated on markets of this year, if you look at gas prices now it'll suggest that it's going to be like that forever. Likely demand will increase and decrease. This is applying a biological context to economic argument. That the fishery exceeds market demand is untrue- all the herring harvested were sold. If GH is capped, it won't necessarily increase the value. Some years in the past have had fish left in the water it would have left thousands of dollars in the water. Read somewhere that in the future there's likely to be a depression in AK's economy (because of oil production) and coastal communities are the only ones that are going to be ok. Subsistence harvest has been down, and in 2003 the biomass was 30,000 tons, but had the 2nd highest subsistence harvest. In 2004, 50,000 tons biomass had the highest subsistence harvest. Dissolves the third argument.</p> <p>Kim—questioned Steve if the fish meal Steve is using for the local fish is from Japan? Are we utilizing the product best we can in Sitka.</p> <p>Steve (Public)—fish meal he uses at his hatcheries is from a large manufacturing firm probably utilizes not much herring. The soy meal and oil used in fish feed is used in fish farms. The fish feed we used is fish oils from hake and anchovies. We've experimented with soy oils, but not preferred diets for our fish. You asked about the oils here? The infrastructure is about \$5 million for capital, not feasible with the amount harvested here in Sitka. Most of the by product from salmon goes into pet feed.</p> <p>John—for this year's quota, what percent are you aiming to harvest at?</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—19.7 %is target harvest rate. Based on sliding scale discussed at the last meeting, set in regulation.</p> <p>Wayne—agrees with Steve, and thinks its speculation. Good info, but not all valid. Big impact in the economy. Look at Silver Bay Seafoods' entry into the market. Business models use this fishery at a 10% harvest rate, thinks it' won't be viable at that rate. Big impact, everything ever processed get sold. Value of fishery isn't always based on supply and demand.</p> <p>Bradley—what's the exchange value of subsistence product. Part of subsistence economy is trade.</p> <p>Jeff—not sure if there's been a study on the subsistence economic impacts. Lenfest report suggested herring worth two times more in supportive value to other fisheries. Asked by industry representative in spring in the Togiak fishery when the price dropped to \$50/ton.</p> <p>Bradley—off topic. Two different users will always have a conflict. One party says you have the opportunity you're not getting it, and everyone trying to assign a value to harvest. What's the fairest allocation?</p> <p>Tad—last meeting when we talked about herring proposals, we kept coming back to sanctuary from 3 years ago, [the core subsistence zone]. What was said last week is still valid today, in that we don't know if the area is working</p>
--	--	--



		<p>because it hasn't been in place long enough. What is the value of leaving the herring in the water-we don't know, but the Lenfest report is just an average, and it might not be particular to this situation. But if someone could come up with those numbers for our situation [Sitka Sound].</p> <p>Troy Denkinger (Public)—this proposal comes down to economics and I don't think we know its impacts. It comes down to economics. What we sell a herring to consumers is \$127 million in Southeast. 62% of fish processed by Sitka processors. If we went back to the 10% harvest rate like this proposal is suggesting, \$45 million lost in revenue. That's why we're so emotional. If this proposal went through 7 years ago, it would have been a loss of \$28million. Large impact, it sparks the community in the spring. Opposed because of the economics. Also, there's no science in this proposal/ economic. Increase effort you'll increase production. 2011 mentioned for subsistence harvest.</p> <p>Steve R. (Public)—read the Lenfest report. Great report. 3 ways to manage the fishery from the report. Good assessment, the better the harvest level. Some scientists think that harvest of 30% would be good too on forage fish. Wanted to speak to Lenfest report, because it supports the state in managing their fishery.</p> <p>Kim—has multiple feelings too. Not sure if she's the best representative for subs, because she's also a conservationist. If it came down to it, and she had to sacrifice subsistence harvesting for conservation, she would. Can only hope that ADF&G be conservative as possible for things. Concerned about the lack of 3 year olds. We have 3 years to know if the biomass is going back or forwards. We have to balance everything the best we can. My concern is for the fisheries and the environment. Not sure where to put herself in the midst of this. Not a scientist, but afraid for what's happening in Sitka. Cares about this, and all of the people involved.</p> <p>Moe—opposed to this because it's too heavily weighted to economic to even be at BOF written the way it is. When the price of pinks was so low, a lot of boats didn't fish. If we hadn't fish, and all the fish went up stream, we would have wasted a fishery. We've got to think about what herring eat too (seen them eat pink fry). All for herring stocks. Got to be a balance. 9 years ago, there as proposal to shut the fishery down saying it'll crash. He'll be the first to jump onto a proposal if the stocks' in danger, but doesn't think that's the case. Herring stocks are healthy, and the pattern has changed. Why are the subsistence users not getting their eggs? They have to change their technique. Fish are there and they've changed their patterned. This winter he's gone over 3 schools 3.5 miles wide and 3 fathoms deep. In seine seat, and knows how valuable the herring are. Opposed to proposal.</p> <p>Jeff—Lenfest has 3 tiered approach, we're at tier 2 right now. It sounds like there's agreement with supply and demand does drive herring markets. Supply has stayed steady. Not all the herring were harvested in Alaska; in Kodiak the processors left tons in the water.</p> <p>Jerry called question.</p>
BOF	126	Establish a commercial open pound herring spawn on kelp fishery in Sitka Sound.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action		No one motioned.
BOF	130	Create a commercial fishery for spiny dogfish in Southeast Alaska using pot gear.



<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	11	<p>Jerry moved to adopt, Dick seconded.</p> <p>Dick—there’s not much of a market for spiny dogfish and a pot fishery wouldn’t make that much money. The sales probably wouldn’t even pay the fuel bill.</p> <p>John—does support the fishery, but not region wide. Would prefer to see an experimental fishery in one district before region wide fishery, but he doesn’t want to amend the proposal.</p> <p>Linda Behnken (Public)—lots of unknowns for this fishery, and spiny dogfish are slow growing sharks. Opening up a fishery without research should be done on an experimental basis.</p> <p>Dick—might be better to market by-catch from the longline fishery.</p> <p>Kim called question.</p>
BOF	131	Allow pots in commercial sablefish fishery.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	10, 1 abstain	<p>Dick moved to adopt, Kim seconded.</p> <p>Dick—this proposal is for Chatham. The sablefish fishery in Chatham working well the way it is. A pot fishery would increase gear conflicts. Pots would reduce longline areas. Fishery’s going pretty well. Main concern is sperm whales. Seaswap tagged two whales and fishermen could call in and find out where the whales were and avoid them. He only had one conflict, and only took a few fish. Opposed to the proposal.</p> <p>Linda Behnken (Public)—pots tend to select for smaller fish, especially females, and they’re not sexually mature (in Bering sea). This proposal would add a growth problem. Need more research. Gear conflicts, our boats can’t do pots either.</p> <p>John—all four for all of southeast?</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—this proposal is for Chatham, but the other ones are for all of SSEI (Southeast Southern Inside—Clarence Strait).</p> <p>Kim—are the fisheries run concurrently?</p> <p>Dick—in Clarence, pots and longline have separate seasons. There’s only three pot boats. It’s never been done in Chatham. Problem is that the gear, once lost, doesn’t know the season.</p> <p>Roger Ingman (Public) does the longline fishermen lose gear too?</p> <p>Linda B. (Public)—our boats aren’t strong enough to pull pots and longlines up if they get tangled (not enough horsepower).</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—pots can be longlined in SSEI. John—up north, they just don’t run a string.</p> <p>Linda B. (Public)—pots are allowed up in the Bering Sea, but the boats are bigger and can leave larger pot strings. Some situations the longliners are working with the pots, but mostly the longliners and the potters have separated to different grounds.</p> <p>Roger I. (Public)—sperm whales in the gulf, but the bad thing are the smaller boats can’t put pots on the boats. Knows the pot fishermen around Ketchikan can’t haul all the pots at once. In between pots they have one coming up, one on deck, one in the water. Knows the small boats don’t want pots because they can’t have the pots on the boat [not enough room].</p> <p>Frank Bolivich (Public)—he is a Chatham longliner for black cod. Doesn’t see a problem with the way it is now. It’s a big headache because you can’t get in touch with anyone to find out where the pot gear is (for Dungeness crab). They used to have St. Lazaria tender over there, but it isn’t there anymore because there’s not a need for the tender vessel.</p>



			Jerry called the question.
BOF	132	Add pot gear as a legal gear type for permits currently limited to longline gear for commercial sablefish harvest in Southern Southeast Inside Subdistrict fishery.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	8, 3 abstain	Dick moved to adopt, Randy seconded. John—this is the Clarence fishery? Mike (ADF&G)—yes. Dick—are these proposals (132/133) the same? Are they already doing pots? Would rather let the fishermen in Clarence handle it. Never had problem catching fish or longlining when fishing down there. Should be decided by participants, doesn't think that there's many fishermen in Sitka for pots in SSEI. Kim called question.
BOF	133	Add pot gear as a legal gear type for permits currently limited to longline gear for commercial sablefish harvest in Southern Southeast Inside Subdistrict fishery.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action			No Comment (see above).
BOF	134	Add pot gear as a legal gear type for commercial sablefish permits currently limited to longline gear in the Southern Southeast Inside Subdistrict fishery.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action			Dick—kind of the same as 132/133? Mike (ADF&G)—we grouped them all together. Would give option for seiners to jump onto pot boat. No one motioned.
BOF	135	Update and clarify the areas where sablefish may be taken with longline gear in the Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	11	0	Dick moved to adopt, Kim seconded. Mike (ADF&G)—we consider this housekeeping. We only manage in NSEI and SSEI so having regulation written the way it is would have possibly for outside fishing and there's not. People are only allowed to retain black cod with tags in outside (not SSEI or NSEI). East Yakutat is not defined in regulations. Clean up in reg. Jerry called question.
BOF	136	Establish 50 fish harvest limit for personal use sablefish fishery.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	11	0	Dick moved to adopt, Kim seconded. Dick—there's two proposals. This was put in because there was a permit requirement for personal use fishery. Come up with limit that would be a generous limit per person: 250lbs/permit/person. That's probably a good estimate for use. 370 hooks is typically two longline skates. Set two skates and you could come up with 50 fish. If you set 10 skates, you could catch too much fish. There's no limit right now. Similar to salmon proposals. Kim—concerned but trying to understand. Has received a few fish from a commercial guy, because she can't get them herself. Worried about people going to harvest for people that can't them themselves (elders, disabled, etc). Wondered how it affects do-gooders. Dick—it's per person, so they can bring more people with them. They could do a proxy. Maybe a breakout session in BOF. He just wants to set some limit so people don't get 50,000 lbs. John—in personal use can you do proxy? Mike (ADF&G)—statewide allow proxies, but mostly for blind, above a certain age, or disabled. Proxy may not process more than two times the daily bag limit. That's how it is now.



			<p>Roger Ingman (Public)—but you can give personal use fish way. How many hooks are we talking about?</p> <p>Dick—350 hooks (2 commercial skates) per permit.</p> <p>Roger I. (Public)—What about personal use halibut? Can you proxy?</p> <p>Kyle Ferguson (AWT)—new to this.</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—any halibut caught here would have to be released. Based on gear limits for personal use halibut.</p> <p>Linda Behnken (Public)—that’s why. Under personal use halibut you can only fish 36 hooks, but under personal use black cod there’s no regulation.</p> <p>Kyle (AWT)—logic to follow other regulations.</p> <p>Linda B. (Public)—just wanted to put an upper bound on it.</p> <p>Kyle (AWT)—confusion with state and federal. With federal halibut, most people follow those regulations. Keep it consistent.</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—distributed handout, permits for personal use fishery from 2012-2014, but 2013 was the only full year of data. Proposal affects personal use fishery, so it’ll only affect the areas around Ketchikan and Juneau. No personal use fish in the subsistence area.</p> <p>John—as far as Sitka, we’d fall under the limit?</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—in state waters, yes. Can subsistence fish in hatched areas; in areas not hatched, you can only fish personal use (referring to handout).</p> <p>John—was this an oversight?</p> <p>Linda B. (Public)—wading into subsistence it’s worse than personal use. Just wanted to get a control on personal use fishing in southeast.</p> <p>Bradley—seafood serving size is rarely over 6oz if you weigh it. 250lbs is a lot of fish.</p> <p>Dick—that’s a lot of fish.</p> <p>Bradley—too much of an opportunity to sell black market fish.</p> <p>Kim—regarding number of hooks. 350 hooks is how many commercial skates?</p> <p>Dick—commercial on his boats is about two skates. Can catch about 25 fish.</p> <p>Tori O’Connell (Public)—easy to set to skates because they’re tied together</p> <p>Don’t need to adjust gear.</p> <p>Jeff called the question.</p>
BOF	137	Establish an annual limit and gear restriction in the personal use sablefish fishery.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	11	0	<p>Dick—we talked about both of these proposals (136/137) at the same time.</p> <p>John—question for ALFA. Are you going to try to put it in subsistence regulations?</p> <p>Linda Behnken (Public)—little bit of a stretch to say they have Customary and Traditional use because of the ability to catch sablefish. If we can make headway on personal use, but it’s a heavier lift for subsistence. Jerry moved to adopt, Kim seconded. No discussion.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>
BOF	138	Require groundfish fishermen using dinglebar, mechanical jig, or hand troll gear to report the specific location of fishing operation by latitude and longitude in logbooks and clarify the reporting of amount of hooks fished to be consistent with that information requested in the logbook.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	10	0	<p>Bradley left. Kim moved to adopt, Dick seconded.</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—long established reporting requirements for logbooks in the longline fishery. Jig fisheries are prosecuted differently, no start/end position of gear. Jig logbook is to nearest bay or headland. The info</p>



			<p>provided is slim by nearest head or bay. From lingcod fishery in Fairweather grounds it's reported at Lityua Bay 50 miles away. Trying to report to nearest statistical area. Nothing like narrowed down for lingcod. The proposal will help to address where effort is and the amount of fish where they are. In regulations, it's required to report number of hooks and number of hooks per line. Difficult to distinguish for staff what the data is coming in as. Logbook asks for total amount of hooks fished. The proposal will allow us to get data that's more straight-forward.</p> <p>John—is the data very confidential? People not keen to give away favorite spots.</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—we take confidentiality seriously, sealed stamped envelopes for logbook mail in.</p> <p>Roger Ingman (Public)—if you give lat/lon, would you micromanage versus opening a huge area?</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—there's no directed fishing inside, but it's prosecuted from International Border to Cape Suckling, all managed in different areas.</p> <p>Roger I. (Public)—would you think about opening only one smaller area in the district?</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—we open entire mgmt. area.</p> <p>Roger I. (Public)—would it change the way you're managing? Is it good for the fishermen to give a lot of data?</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—in the Demersal Shelf Rockfish fishery, we used that lat/lon data to determine habitat. We don't know how we'll use the data, but we don't have any data now, so it's hard to assign fish ticket data to districts. Level of detail now is minimal. Trying to gain more info on the resource. There's no stock assessment for lingcod. How we used the data is probably limitless.</p> <p>Kim—firm believer in the more info we have the better the fishery.</p> <p>John—unintended benefited, say east Yakutat, and a whole bunch of effort focused on one area, and maybe we can divide the district into smaller bits. Jerry called the question.</p>
BOF	139	Define mechanical jigging gear separate from dinglebar troll gear and establish limits on hooks to be used.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action			No one motioned.
BOF	140	Increase minimum commercial lingcod size limit to 30 inches from tip of snout, or 22.75 inches from front of dorsal fin, to tip of tail.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	10	<p>Dick moved to adopt, Jeff seconded.</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—we didn't introduce this. History for 27 inch size limit was in 1989 protecting sexually immature females and nest guarding males, which was info from BC. Population declined, so minimum 27 inch size limit was put into place. No fecundity study to show what this effect would have to the spawning biomass. Surveys between 1995 and 2005 indicate 1% of fish sampled were in this length range. Longliners tend to catch larger fish. Bulk of harvest would be out of the range suggested. Data from directed fishery show that sampled 20% lingcod of directed fishery were under 30 inches. This change wouldn't affect longliners so much but would impact the directed fishery and by-catch.</p> <p>Jeff—does it address any conservation concerns by ADF&G?</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—no, we think populations are doing well, and there's little trauma to the undersized fish release, though some mortalities.</p>



			<p>Dick—would the proposal increase handling mortalities? Mike (ADF&G)—depends on where they’re fishing. Would have some mortality, and some handling mortality. John—quotas in EYAK filled, but in SSEI? Mike (ADF&G)—no, most of the quota remains. Last year about 10-15,000 pounds left in the central gulf fishery. That harvest depends on lingcod prices, and on salmon. Roger Ingman (Public)—maybe if it’s not used we should close it. Linda Behnken (Public)—the existing size limit was shown to protect the stock and to throw in a proposal to change it just because seems silly. Jeff called question.</p>
BOF	141	Allow commercial salmon fishermen using troll gear in Sitka Sound to retain up to two lingcod per trip for personal use.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	12	0	<p>Tad was present during this proposal (taken up before he left), allowing us to have 12 voting members. Tad moved to adopt, Randy seconded. Tad—two separate but related issues. Trollers able to retain by catch lingcod in the LAMP. Issues with trollers near the LAMP, but choosing to not keep lingcod so they can fish in the LAMP later in that trip. Difficult for enforcement to allow retention without possession. Attempt to get at both issues. Something as restrictive as two fish per trip might address conservations concerns, and maybe even restrict to home pack. ADF&G can make that a requirement. Came out from a proposal three years ago. John—question for trooper, and Mike (ADF&G). What if this went through and you would cut off the dorsal fish/other fin? Made it so it’s not a saleable fish. Kyle Ferguson (AWT)—like the way you’d ID a sport caught king? Not sure, new the AWT, but thinks that would work. John—did the original regulation come up because of a concern for local lingcod abundance. Still an issue? Mike (ADF&G)—only commercial user able to retain was halibut fishermen during the 1997 survey. Status of lingcod in LAMP? John—I know some of the concern about the LAMP fishery. Mike (ADF&G)—lingcod population decline in the early 90s and area wide lingcod stocks are doing well. Tad—area wide lingcod stocks are doing well, but central Southeast troll outside quota has rarely been taken. Is that because fish and retention was assumed? Mike (ADF&G)—no, because it was assumed prior to 2000. Bradley—is there a reason why you don’t want to sell your by-catch? Tad—I’d rather be able to keep one to eat at home than not to be able to keep it all, or not even be allowed to troll in the LAMP because I had a lingcod onboard. Market is there. Kim—are people coming home every day from the LAMP and you could be catching two fish per day? For subsistence/personal use, I’ve been fishing out there. Every day is a trip. Doesn’t have a problem with taking fish home to eat it, and most of these are smaller boats that would be coming in daily. Tad—the person actually catches by-catch in the LAMP or by the boats that are fishing outside the LAMP and occasionally coming in to finish a trip. By-catch rates are not high, but can cause an end to a trip (2-5 lingcod per year).</p>



			<p>Increase in landings would be fish caught outside the LAMP who thought they might fish later in the LAMP. The Central Southeast Outside troll by-catch allocation was based on data from years with unlimited by-catch. Since by-catch has been prohibited in the LAMP, have haven't reached the by-catch allowance.</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—addressing this proposal, it seems to asked as personal use not commercial. That wouldn't change the issue of commercial/personal use fish onboard the boat. 10 by-catch lingcod caught outside the sound, can't tell the difference between the commercial/personal use fishing.</p> <p>Jeff—wanted to makes sure there's not a problem with enforcement. Can't have other fish on board.</p> <p>Moe—do you think we can do commercial by-catch in the LAMP? Doesn't think there's high enough by-catch.</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—the last round this proposal went through the BOF process ADF&G was against, because there's no stock assessment and we don't know what the impact would be. Ran data on 2013 troll season, 1,350 troll salmon landings attributed to LAMP during open by-catch. When by-catch closed, 1,900 may or may not be from the LAMP. JUST salmon landings.</p> <p>Kim—can you catch and release lingcod? With that device for rockfish?</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—lingcod don't have that problem like rockfish do, some mortalities with release, but do much better than rockfish.</p> <p>Steve Reifentstahl (Public)—how do you do the biological assessment inside/outside LMAP.</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—no stock assessment for Southeast lingcod, rely on fish tickets and logbooks.</p> <p>Steve R. (Public)—you sense the biomass is increasing?</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—over the years we've had anecdotal reports. We don't feel there's a problem, but we don't have the stock assessment program. John—any numbers on D-class boats harvest?</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—has some numbers for 2001-2014. Lingcod catch in the halibut fisheries (commercial, subsistence/sport), average round pounds in LAMP was 1,645 longline catch pounds for commercial. Sport caught-8,500lbs/year. Subsistence fishery 15,400 lbs. Total for all groups is roughly 25,500 pounds.</p> <p>Jerry called question.</p>
BOF	142	Repeal Sitka Sound Special Use area lingcod regulations.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	9	0	<p>Kim moved to adopt, Jerry seconded.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&G)—housekeeping proposal. Regulations on book for sport lingcod. Sitka sound special use area were more conservative, but now they are less conservative.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>
BOF	143	Require all anglers releasing nonpelagic rockfish to release them at depth, and require at least one deep water release mechanism on board vessels used by sport anglers.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	1	8	<p>Jerry moved to adopt, Kim seconded.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&G) overviewed the deep water release mechanisms used by charter fleet. Charter has to take fish down to 100 ft or depth of capture, whichever is shallower.</p> <p>Roger Ingman (Public)—how much weight does it take to send a yelloweye down?</p> <p>Troy (ADF&G)—About 5 lbs for medium size fish. Some mechanisms are</p>



			<p>designed for adding multiple weights. Sportfish website has a link for a video for all of the mechanisms.</p> <p>John—what do you do to go out to catch a rockfish (charter goes out each day).</p> <p>Jerry—go out whenever possible, not always targeting bottomfish. Likes the idea of releasing at depth, but not like the idea of adding more gear to the boat. Likes it for conservation.</p> <p>Kim—bought one because thought it was going to come in regulations soon.</p> <p>Troy—no current definition for a release mechanism. Up to AWT for enforcement. Proposal would require all anglers to have some release device.</p> <p>Kyle (AWT)—proposal would be for saltwater. It would be handy to have a bucket with some line to throw over.</p> <p>Kim called the question.</p>
BOF	144	Repeal mandatory retention requirements for nonpelagic rockfish.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	1	8	<p>Jerry moved to adopt, Jeff seconded.</p> <p>Jerry—fact that you have to keep each one as you catch it is negative. What if I don't want to keep rockfish, just salmon? While I'm trolling, I don't want to have to stop and release them at depth.</p> <p>Tori O'Connell (Public)—no high grading in mandatory retention.</p> <p>Jerry—in that sense I like it. There's one thought, the 80% survivability/100% mortality [a statistic mentioned in the proposal] is true.</p> <p>John—Rockfish so hard to fillet, but doesn't see the waste issue.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>
BOF	145	Repeal Sitka Sound Special Use Area and Ketchikan Area nonpelagic rockfish regulations.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	9	0	<p>Jeff moved to adopt, Karen seconded.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&G)—similar to lingcod proposal. Sitka sound special use area has less conservative regulations than regional regulations. This regulation isn't necessary.</p> <p>John—call this housekeeping?</p> <p>Troy (ADF&G)—yes.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>

IX. Meeting: 6th of January for next meeting? Elections on the charter will occur, and the discussion about the seat will occur at the next meeting.

X. Adjournment: 9:36 PM

Minutes Recorded By: Jessica Gill, Secretary

Minutes Approved By:

Date:



Sitka Advisory Committee
January 14th, 2015
Sitka Sound Science Center, 834 Lincoln Street

- I. Call to Order: 6:32PM by John Murray, Chairman
- II. Roll Call: Jessica Gill, Secretary
Members Present: Jon Martin, Jerry Barber, Dick Curran, Kim Elliot, Jeff Feldpausch, Tad Fujioka, Jessica Gill, Randy Gluth, Moe Johnson, Karen Johnson, John Murray, Bradley Shaffer, Floyd Tomkins, Wayne Unger
Members Absent: Cody Loomis, Brian Massey, Peter Roddy
Number Needed For Quorum on AC: 8
List of User Groups Present: Charter, Hand Troll, Longline, Subsistence, Alternates 1 and 2, Trapping, Hunting, At-Large 1 and 2, Power Troll, Conservation, Processor
- III. Approval of Agenda:
No formal agenda, but we'll be discussing sport fishing proposals, troll proposals, and subsistence proposals.
- IV. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes: From meeting date:
John found minutes to be in order. Kim and Tad had comments. Kim motioned to approve minutes, Tad moved. Minutes approved.
- V. Fish and Game Staff Present:
Grant Hagerman, Dave Gordon, Troy Tydingco
- VI. Guests Present:
Eric Jordan, Harvey Kitka, Carl Petersen, Joel Markis
- VII. Old Business:
None
- VIII. New Business:
None
- IX. Next Meeting: Monday Feb 2nd. Everyone seems to be in agreement. Seine proposals will be covered.



Southeast and Yakutat Finfish, Feb. 23–March 3, 2015

Alaska Board of Fisheries

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form

BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
BOF	146		Revise the amounts reasonable necessary for subsistence for salmon in Districts 12 and 14.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action	TABLED		<p>Jeff moved to adopt, Randy seconded. 13 voting members.</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—in part it’s housekeeping, but Customary & Traditional use designation doesn’t exist for Districts 11 (Cape Fairweather to Yakutat) and 16 (Juneau). Division of Subsistence is doing surveys in Angoon, and they will likely come to BOF to reduce the ANS.</p> <p>Tad—doesn’t feel comfortable without knowing the revised numbers.</p> <p>Jeff and Randy withdraw their motion for adoption based on lack of information on revised ANS numbers.</p> <p>Majority vote to table.</p>
BOF	148		Allow for designation of community subsistence harvesters for Hoonah residents.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	1	5, 7 abstain	<p>Kim moved to adopt, Randy seconded. Only 13 voting members.</p> <p>John—there’s got to be some limits on community harvest permits.</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—common practice throughout SE. There is state proxy permit (for blind, disabled, elderly), which is restricted to harvesting 2 permits. ADF&G issues community harvest permits (CHPs) to various agencies based on abundances. Hesitation on stocks that are low, but if there’s surplus fish a CHP is allowed. Way its worded is for Hoonah residents only, which could cause problem, but perhaps for only an area instead of an individual group or organization.</p> <p>John—there’s not prolific runs up there.</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—not a lot of information on the systems they’re asking for.</p> <p>Jeff—any escapement data?</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—in 2002, meetings with different parties yielded requests for more fish, and ADF&G raised limits.</p> <p>Jerry called question.</p>
BOF	153		Allow subsistence harvest of salmon with purse seine and gillnet gear in portions of Districts 12 and 13 near Angoon.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	3	8, 1 abstain	<p>Jeff moved to adopt, Tad seconded. 13 voting members.</p> <p>Jeff—Extraterritorial Jurisdiction petition might be influencing this and we might want to weigh in on this before it gets tossed around in the federal courts.</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—restrictions on general permit gear near sockeye streams. Proposal wants to join gillnets together, ideally for more fish in Angoon. He suggested that if someone gets a subsistence permit, and wants to use gear outside of the permit stipulations, they can ask ADF&G, and it’ll be allowed.</p> <p>Tad—compared to other proposals intended to help Angoon which would eliminate commercial harvest opportunities, he likes this proposal the best.</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—ADF&G would specify locations for regulation</p>



			Jerry called the question.
BOF	155	Allow party fishing in Southeast Alaska saltwater fisheries.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	2	11, 1 abstain	<p>Jerry moved to adopt, Tad seconded.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&G)—similar proposals before, can't give ADF&G's stance. Boat limit, not person limit, specific to SE.</p> <p>Jon—issues with enforcement? In charter world, may be positive and alleviate some issues within the charter fleet.</p> <p>Tad—possible on boat conflicts (whose fish is whose)? Who does enforcement write the ticket for if they have extra fish?</p> <p>Jon—Captain is responsible for adhering to limits.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&G)—typically ticket goes to guides, but if enforcement can pin it on a particular person too, they will.</p> <p>Jon—definitely some enforcement issues, and might need some clarification before BOF.</p> <p>Floyd—do boats already bringing parties out have boat limits?</p> <p>Troy (ADF&G)—from a legal standpoint whoever caught the fish is responsible/owner.</p> <p>Bradley—thinks that if the proposer knew that this would pertain to a commercial guide operation, he might change the proposal.</p> <p>Jerry—common in fleet to party fish, but was illegal years ago.</p> <p>Consensus was that the fish you catch is your fish. And possible enforcement issues.</p> <p>Jon—thinks there is room for a little bit of clarification in this proposal for party fishing.</p> <p>Eric Jordan (Public)—possible increase in catch and release mortality with this proposal, both for groundfish and salmon.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&G)—once you've caught your bag limit, you can continue to fish.</p> <p>Tad called the question.</p>
BOF	156	Allow the use of bow and arrow to take salmon in the Southeast Alaska Area by certified bow anglers.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	2	10, 2 abstain	<p>Jerry moved to adopt, Bradley seconded.</p> <p>Jessica—is this a common practice?</p> <p>Randy—it's illegal in the state.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&G)—there are a few places in AK that you can fish with bow and arrow. But not in SE.</p> <p>Bradley—his understanding with other states is that it's for invasive species.</p> <p>Floyd—it's been mentioned before for redoubt salmon, but thinks it's a bad idea.</p> <p>Jerry—thinks it's nice to have more bow hunting opportunities, but the bow hunters' education class would be difficult to include fishing. Doesn't like the proposal.</p> <p>Randy—different than traditional bow hunting, and you'd need deeper waters with line on the arrows. Arrow doesn't travel far because it's heavy. Probably wouldn't be used a lot, and not by a lot of people.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>
BOF	157	Reduce the king salmon size limit from 28 inches or greater in length to 26 inches or greater in length in the Southeast Alaska Area.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	14	<p>Bradley moved to adopt, Jerry seconded.</p> <p>Kim—used to have a lot bigger fish, and with the increase in hatcheries a</p>



			<p>27.5 inch fish will weigh as much as a 30 inch fish.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&G)—28 inch has been around for a while and it's because it used to be a marketable size. In SE seeing a decrease in weight at age in salmon, but not sure how changing the size would affect things, because no info on size of released fish.</p> <p>Tad—his understanding was the 28 inch size limit was with regards to spawning/non-spawning fish. Proposer is a guide from Juneau, and is looking to increase number of fish his clients are taking home.</p> <p>Moe—majority of shakers he releases are 26-28 inches, and if they didn't get shaken off, the season would be over by now.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&G)—it's a sport proposal the way it's written.</p> <p>Floyd—would this increase the downward trend in size at age of released fish?</p> <p>Grant (ADF&G)—fish are maturing earlier, and there has been an increase in abundance of smaller fish (younger fish), and a decrease in weight at length.</p> <p>Eric Jordan (Public)—historically, raised size limit from 26 to 28 to meet treaty regulations. Smaller size will have the fishermen targeting the smaller fish.</p> <p>Kim—are the smaller fish tagged?</p> <p>Grant (ADF&G)—from commercial troll fishery, the small tagged fish are mostly non-Alaskan hatchery fish.</p> <p>Bradley called the question.</p>
BOF	158	Modify the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan by eliminating inseason reductions to the annual limit.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	14	<p>Jon moved to adopt, Jerry seconded.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&G)—for King salmon sport fisheries management plan ADF&G has to have sport harvest 20% of harvest, minimize restrictions for sport fishers, and minimize in-season changes. In high abundance years, all fishers, resident and non-residents, have high harvest limits, but non-residents have annual limit. In low abundance, the harvest changes based on abundances, and non-resident bag limits decrease throughout season.</p> <p>There was significant discussion that the reduction in non-resident annual limits as the season progresses was a feature that the charter representatives who helped set up the management plan specifically wanted. There is more opportunity to take coho and other species later in the season. Kings were more important to the charter operations earlier in the season.</p> <p>Jon—management plan is for all in SE. Proposers are charter operators on the inside. Thinks the plan is working well here in Sitka, but on the inside they might have a harder time catching fish. Will not support as written.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&G)—no allocation specifically to sport guides, and percentage of fish harvested has not changed.</p> <p>Eric Jordan (Public)—in other areas, proposal is possibly allocating fish to certain areas (on the inside).</p> <p>Tad—the limit for non-residents would stay at an average throughout the season, not high or low, if the proposal was adopted.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&G)—we know the quota changes in advance, so we could set that average throughout the season.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>



BOF	159	Establish nonresident annual limits for coho, sockeye, chum, and pink salmon in salt waters of the Southeast Alaska Area.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	11, 3 abstain	<p>Jerry moved to adopt, Kim seconded.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&G)—no conservation concern for these species.</p> <p>Jon—doesn't support this unless conservation concern, it would be bad for small scale operators.</p> <p>John—can see local conservation concerns, but not justified if no concern.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&G)—conservation concerns are regionally. Local stock concerns are addressed through emergency orders.</p> <p>Jon—this proposal is for saltwater.</p> <p>Jeff—possibly proposal has come out of Kake with charter fleet wiping their runs in pillar bay.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>
BOF	160	Establish nonresident annual limits for coho, sockeye, chum, and pink salmon in fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	1	7, 6 abstain	<p>Jerry moved to adopt, Randy seconded.</p> <p>John—similar as proposal 159, but for freshwater.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&G)—no conservation concern for a particular species, and when ADF&G does have a conservation concern, ADF&G issues emergency orders.</p> <p>Jon—possible conservation concerns for coho in freshwater with a possible increase in guide operations.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>
BOF	162	Prohibit multiple hooks and barbed hooks in all fresh waters of the Yakutat Management Area.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	14	0	<p>Jerry moved to adopt, Kim seconded.</p> <p>Jerry—proposal from Yakutat AC. In favor because it could reduce mortality of catch and release fish.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&G)—no conservation concern in these fish/area.</p> <p>Eric Jordan (Public)—thinks barbless hooks makes a huge difference in catch and release, and that the Yakutat AC has a good idea here.</p> <p>Kim—in support based on conservation and fish health.</p> <p>Jon—do barbless hooks reduce mortality?</p> <p>Troy (ADF&G)—yes and higher reduced mortality when fishing without bait.</p> <p>Jon—important to note that sport fishermen weren't opposed to this proposal.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>
BOF	187	Allow commercial salmon drift gillnet gear in Southeast Cove Terminal Harvest Area.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	2	6, 6 abstain	<p>Tad moved to adopt, Jerry seconded.</p> <p>Tad—proposal doesn't make sense. Gillnetters are already far ahead in their allocation. Doesn't think it needs to be put into place at this time.</p> <p>Eric Jordan (Public)—gillnetters want to be included in additional or new opening areas.</p> <p>John—doesn't think this is a BOF proposal [issue]; UGA should be able to meet with the Regional Planning Teams for this proposal and not move it to BOF.</p> <p>Kim called the question.</p>
BOF	188	Modify commercial seine and troll fishing schedules in Southeast Cove Terminal Harvest Area.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action	TABLED		Tad moved to adopt, Jerry seconded.



			<p>Tad—Chum Trollers Association (CTA) proposal. Trollers need block of days to be effective. SE Cove is new fish, and this was an attempt to maximize the benefit to the troll fleet. Run peaks about mid-July.</p> <p>Jeff—peak was consistently about 20th of July. Area would be good for trollers, with bright fish.</p> <p>Eric Jordan (Public)—thinks fleet would want a seine opening at least once a week.</p> <p>Tad—10 day block would be better, once a week openers wouldn't have fish enough buildup.</p> <p>Eric J. (Public)—would really like some consistency and collaboration from all gear groups when coming to BOF.</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—this proposal is just a chum opener.</p> <p>Moe—not in favor of block closures. In the past, it's not clear if the effort will be there. Fishing could be messy with block closures and fish building up.</p> <p>Carl Petersen (Public)—no opening this board cycle, because fish will be there for cost recovery for the first two years. Would like to have 5 day contiguous troll openings.</p> <p>Jeff—seiners might be getting a chance at the fish in Hidden Falls before they go to SE Cove.</p> <p>Moe—there could be a possibility for giving the trollers the first 72 hours. A lot of sentiments were repeated from Proposal 176.</p> <p>Eric J. (Public)—suggests the AC make a motion to change the schedule from 5 consecutive days troll, 2 days seine. Up until June 8, seine openings at SE Cove same time as openings at Hidden Falls, then after June 8, 5 days troll, 2 days seine.</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—would not be open for chum outside THA.</p> <p>Kim—Table discussion on hidden falls/deep inlet/se cove so gear groups can discuss.</p> <p>Moe moved to table, Wayne seconded. Majority vote to table.</p>
BOF	220	Modify the winter boundary line for the commercial salmon troll fishery.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	8, 6 abstain	<p>Tad moved to adopt, Dick seconded.</p> <p>Grant (ADF&G)—proposal continuation from 2003 Yakutat proposal. Safety concerns at that time fishing so close to the reef. Winter harvest for kings has gone up from 4% to 10% of winter catch with the 2003 lines. After discussing with proposer, the actual area is about ½ mile further. 2003 line is 26 miles, addition is an extra 30 square miles.</p> <p>John—might support if fishing is after January. Can't support with size of area.</p> <p>Eric Jordan (Public)—if the AC adopts this, you can have very large winter king catches, which can have huge repercussions.</p> <p>Kim called the question.</p>
BOF	222	Correct regulatory language to clarify a contribution rate of Alaska hatchery-produced salmon for the spring salmon troll fisheries.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	14	0	<p>Kim moved to adopt, Jerry seconded.</p> <p>Grant (ADF&G)—spring troll fishery management plan. Managed based on Alaska hatchery production.</p> <p>Jessica—clarification on if proposal would increase hatchery production.</p> <p>Grant (ADF&G)—no, it would just do some housekeeping on the regulation.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>



BOF	225	Change the sunset date in the District 12 and 14 Enhanced Chum Salmon Troll Fishery Management Plan.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action			Bradley left, voting members down to 13. Tad—225, 226, 227 all pretty similar and in the interest of time, he'd like to move to adopt 227 and comments for 227 echo thoughts for 225 and 226.
BOF	226	Remove sunset clause from District 12 and 14 Enhanced Chum Salmon Troll Fishery Management Plan.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	13	0	Tad moved to adopt, Jerry seconded. Eric Jordan (Public)—recommends discussing 226 in addition to discussion on 227. Tad—comments from 227 apply here. Tad called question.
BOF	227	Remove sunset clause from District 12 and 14 enhanced commercial chum salmon troll fishery and allow fishing 7 days per week.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	13	0	Tad moved to adopt, Jerry seconded. Tad—proposals to make Chatham fishery a more viable fishery, and remove sunset clause. Proposal 227 changes the openings to 7 days. At 4 days, it doesn't work because of lack of tenders in the area. Originally at 4 days to removed conflicts with Juneau sport fleet, but didn't see any there when he fished. Would allow fleet to follow fish through Icy Strait east. Grant (ADF&G)—227 would give more time to trollers, allocative. ADF&G is in favor of continuing management plan. Kim called question.
BOF	228	Close the commercial troll fishery for coho salmon from August 1–10.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	11, 2 abstain	Tad moved to adopt, Jerry seconded. Grant (ADF&G)—10 day mandatory regional troll closure to allow fish to pass to Angoon for additional harvest opportunities for resident. Tad—seems excessive to close Yakutat to Ketchikan for just Angoon. Grant (ADF&G)—for coho, those systems aren't monitored. Indicators with coded wire tags in northern streams, which have been within or above escapement goals within the last decade. Berner's River and Auke Creek are the indicators for NSEI, and similar to the Angoon streams. Escapement in Auke Creek is very high. Proposal eliminates existing closures based on stock assessments, and the whole region would shut down for 10 days. Jeff—any subsistence data from Angoon with ANS/subsistence needs not being met? Grant (ADF&G)—limited subsistence harvest data, 2012 study: 314 coho by rod and reel, 530 sport caught coho. Majority of fish caught in saltwater. John—seen ADF&G have closures when needed, and if there was a need, we'd have one. Seems like overkill. Kim called question.
BOF	230	Restrict commercial salmon fishing with troll gear in Section 15-C beginning July 1.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	12, 1 abstain	Tad moved to adopt, Randy seconded. Tad—vindictive proposal, contrary to 1994 agreement for hatchery fish. In July, that district [15C] is managed for sockeye not chum or coho. His encounter rate for kings in 15C is about 10% of king encounter rate during the same time of year while fishing for coho. Grant (ADF&G)—little to no effort by troll in this area. Kim—the regulation doesn't specify species.



			Eric Jordan (Public)—proposal speaks to sub-legal king mortality, but he believes the gillnetters should not mention by-catch mortality. Tad—reducing the number of days open in this proposal for troll will essentially kill trolling in this area. Kim called the question.
BOF	231	Reduce the area open to commercial salmon fishing with troll gear in Naha Bay during the summer.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	12, 1 abstain	Tad moved to adopt, Kim seconded. Eric Jordan (Public)—millions of hatchery chum returning to Neets Bay, but fish come into Naha Bay, and acts as a fish trap, and fishery goes on for about 10 days. Doesn't think the fish there are at that time are Naha fish, they are Neets fish. This proposal wouldn't conserve Naha Bay fish at all. It's a hatchery chum fishery. Grant (ADF&G)—no conservation concern in Naha Bay. Jerry called question.
BOF	232	Clarify power troll gear specifications regarding hand troll gurdies and fishing rods.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	12	1	Kim moved to adopt, Jerry seconded. Grant (ADF&G)—Housekeeping. Level of detail is much more detailed in hand troll versus power troll regulations. Proposal would help alleviate questions about power troll legal gear. Would not change regulation at all. You cannot fish hand troll from power troller. Some questions regarding the regulation itself were asked. Tad—ATA hand troll rep generous, and suggested that if the power troller wants to fish with hand troll gear, they should go for it (more expensive permit). Grant (ADF&G)—this does not change the regulation at all. Kim called the question.
BOF	233	Allow downriggers as legal commercial salmon hand troll gear for the entire year.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	13	0	Kim moved to adopt, Tad seconded. Kim—has a hand troll permit, and it's getting hard for her to hoist lines and downriggers by hand. Doesn't believe too much impact on fishery if was allowed. Tad—ATA opposed to proposal in past, but this cycle it was unanimously supported. Jerry called the question.

X. Adjournment: 9:53 PM by John Murray.

Minutes Recorded By: Jessica Gill, Secretary

Minutes Approved By:

Date:



Sitka Advisory Committee
January 6, 2015
Sitka Sound Science Center, 834 Lincoln Street

- I. Call to Order: 6:29PM by Chairman John Murray.
- II. Roll Call: Jessica Gill
Members Present: Jerry Barber, Dick Curran, Kim Elliot, Jeff Feldpausch, Tad Fujioka, Jessica Gill, Randy Gluth, Moe Johnson, Karen Johnson, John Murray, Bradley Shaffer, Floyd Tomkins, new member Jon Martin
Members Absent: Cody Loomis, Brian Massey, Peter Roddy, Wayne Unger
Number Needed For Quorum on AC: 8
List of User Groups Present: Hand Troll, Longline, Subsistence, Alternate 1, Trapping, Alternate 2, Hunting, Seine, At-Large 1, Power Troll, At-Large 2, Conservation, Charter
- III. Approval of Agenda:
No formal agenda. Troll proposals will be covered tonight.
- IV. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes: From meeting date: Dec. 18
Floyd moved to adopt the minutes from December 18, and Kim seconded. 12 members were in favor.
- V. Fish and Game Staff Present:
Patty Skannes, Grant Hagerman, Troy Tydingco
- VI. Guests Present:
Steve Reifenstuhl, Matt Donahoe, Linda Danner, Carl Petersen, Joel Markis, Lawrence SpottedBird, Heather Riggs, Eric Jordon, Don Bird, Richard Shafran, Joel Hanson
- VII. Old Business:
Designated seats/seating—
John asked if the AC would be interested in forming a subcommittee to discuss the at-large seat, not active seats, seats with little interest, other seat etc. Bradley suggested we reallocate seats if seats aren't filled within 12 months. Reallocate inactive seats (guide/charter) for better representation for Sitka. Kim looked at which kinds of policies are in place. She found that if a member misses 3 meetings, they can be replaced unless their absences were excused. She also found that alternates are treated the same as regular members. As long as a regular seat doesn't show up, they can vote, and they're not alternates for specific person, just as voters. John will talk to Cody regarding his guide seat. Discussion continued.
Elections—
Tad nominated Joel Hanson as charter representative. Jerry seconded. Joel summarized his experience and background. He is not a licensed guide himself, but he does train guides every year.
Jeff asked if Heather Riggs was interested. Jeff nominated, Jessica seconded. Heather summarized her background and experience. She is now a biologist at Sitka Tribe of Alaska (STA). She hasn't guided, but monitored the guiding fishery for Fish and Game. Joel would like to abdicate his nomination as Heather seems more qualified.
Tad moves to elect Heather by unanimous vote. Randy seconded. Bradley would like to discuss the fact that three STA employees would be sitting on the AC if Heather is



elected. Discussion ensued. If it's going to remain a charter seat, it should be someone that is actually chartering.

Jeff nominated Jon Martin, Jessica seconded. Jon is a charter fisherman in the summer, wildlife biologist at UAS, and also in the UAF PhD program.

Tad withdraws his motion for unanimous consent, Randy withdraws his second.

Kim called question. Jerry reminded the public they can vote. Eric's understanding was that vacant seats can only be voted on by committee members. Heather withdrew her nomination. John called the vote and it was a majority vote. Jon Martin was elected to the AC in the Charter seat.

VIII. New Business:

John asked committee members if they would like the proposals the AC will be discussing at the meetings in email prior to the meetings. Group was in agreement.



Southeast and Yakutat Finfish, Feb. 23–March 3, 2015
Alaska Board of Fisheries

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form

BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
BOF	174	Establish a Taku River king salmon management plan.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	12, 1 abstain	<p>Tad moved to adopt, Jerry seconded.</p> <p>Patty (ADF&G)—Staff comments are not done yet. Very allocative, so ADF&G can't take a position.</p> <p>John—it doesn't look like much is happening based on numbers harvested.</p> <p>Patty (ADF&G)—the Taku has wild stocks so coded-wire tagged (CWT) fish are low. ADF&G can look at recoveries of CWT fish through fleet, but statistics on that info isn't good, but genetics data indicate a few thousand of fish per year, and it seems as though Taku returns have declined because of the troll fishery, not natural fluctuations. Proposal is suggesting sweeping management activities when escapement is predicted low. Currently, if threshold was lower than lower bound, ADF&G would take action.</p> <p>Tad—taking the tagged Taku fish over a long time scale and aggregating tags for the last few years has some results. Of the CWT fish that were caught, over half of fish came from net fishery not troll fishery. And if you look at troll fishery the proposal is trying to close, it was about 1% of Taku fish. Seemed like very drastic changes in the proposal.</p> <p>Matt Donahoe (Public)—raising the bottom of the escapement range to mid-range, and it seemed like the proposal arbitrarily cut the escapement half.</p> <p>Eric Jordan (Public)—thinks this is a significant threat because of the BOF composition and with conservation groups. Thinks there are problems that need to be addressed in the real world—high interception of small kings, high mortality in all fisheries—but doesn't think that this proposal is representing the conservation concerns. Suspects most of the fish caught in the Juneau sport /troll fishery are probably not Taku kings. Encourage voting in opposition to this.</p> <p>Jerry called question.</p>
BOF	175	Evaluate potential changes to enhanced salmon allocations.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	12, 1 abstain	<p>Tad moved to adopt, Jerry seconded.</p> <p>Matt Donahoe (Public)—Alaska Trollers' Association sees this proposal as a fish grab from trollers, and is opposed.</p> <p>Moe—Did NSRAA Board bring up this proposal at their meeting?</p> <p>Steve Reifentstahl (Public)—the NSRAA board opposed this proposal.</p> <p>Tad—Gillnetters have harvested well above allocation for decades, and it suggests to me that they want to change the allocation permanently. When sport charter fleet got a halibut allocation, the BOF equivalent regulations were made to keep charter fleet within allocation. The charter fleet sued, and the judge on the case said that historic overfishing should not a basis for continued harvest at that rate and provides incentives for wrong behavior.</p> <p>Steve R. (Public)—this is not a gillnet proposal from the united gillnet</p>



			association (UGA). Kim called question.
BOF	176	Establish new enhanced salmon allocations by gear type.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	8	4, 1 abstain	<p>Tad moved to adopt, Randy seconded.</p> <p>Tad—the heading is not the correct language by Board Support. This proposal would put the hatchery boards on notice that trollers expect hatchery salmon allocations to be distributed as regulations require.</p> <p>John—SSRAA does a pretty good job of the allocation issues.</p> <p>Linda Danner (Public)—SE salmon allocation plan, determined which portion of fish should be allocated to each gear group, through access to terminal harvest areas (THAs), change allocation percentage, and species raised. Chum Trollers’ Association (CTA) has tried to change access, and it hasn’t been easy and has been sent through multiple boards. SSRAA gets the allocation close, but not NSRAA’s Board. The 1994 Enhanced Salmon Allocation Plan addressed in the proposal has solution for not achieving allocation goals, but does not account for intentional noncompliance. When voting on boards, there’s 5 seats for seine, gillnet, trollers, and there are always 10 votes against; would like to have that loophole close. CTA would like to have hatchery boards go to BOF with regards to allocations. Which would result in less contentious BOF meetings because of allocations is a hot topic issue. Proposal is designed to be utilized by gear group lowest in their allocation. Gives time frame for allocation, and BOF oversight for compliance. SSRAA is excluded because they’re already doing a good job on allocation; DIPAC and NSRAA aren’t. All gear groups can utilize this proposal.</p> <p>Carl Petersen (Public)—Asking for oversight from BOF.</p> <p>Steve Reifentstahl (Public)—ATA is opposed to this, UGA, SSRAA board, and NSRAA board are opposed. Proposal is in conflict with regulation. Proposal is for all of SE including SSRAA. NSRAA has plans for troll allocation. Outside of the CTA, everyone is opposed to this. 46% of NSRAA’s budget is for king/coho for troll fleet.</p> <p>Linda D. (Public)—king/coho program has become important for net fleet in last few years. Most of cost recovery is done by net fleet, and in 2014, none of the fish went to trollers, and the nets disperse fish too much for trollers.</p> <p>Moe—how many members on CTA?</p> <p>Linda D.—366 tollers delivered chum in round this year, and there is 100+ members.</p> <p>Moe—trolled for many years, and sees this proposal as against net fleet. Believed there’s ample opportunity for trollers to fish for hatchery fish, but the effort isn’t there. Fishery in THA for one area this year was closed for 2 weeks, which gives a good build up of fish. When opened for trolling, only 14 boats fishing out of the 1,000 permits. Trolling gear isn’t effective.</p> <p>Matt Donahoe (Public)—ATA sympathetic to CTA’s plight. Imbalance needs to be addressed. Net take of kings is much larger than troll take.</p> <p>Steve R. (Public)—Important for everyone to know that these hatchery programs have been very successful.</p> <p>Linda D (Public)—DIPAC percentage is 1% instead of 27-32% of the THA fish per the Enhanced Salmon Allocation Plan. After so many years, she’s looking for some oversight in the allocation. Not sure how else to change it.</p> <p>John—why the trollers don’t fish in Juneau area?</p> <p>Linda D. (Public)—we’d need a tender. Net fishers want to fish in THA</p>



			<p>because the fishing is better. Just give this proposal a try!</p> <p>Eric Jordan (Public)—issue is that between \$5-12 million in fish is harvested by nets that were allocated to trollers. It's a significant amount of money that is being harvested by net fleet instead of trollers [of fish that were allocated to trollers]. Tried to get consensus on NSRAA board, but not in net fishermen's interest to give the allocation to trollers. If BOF asks what the plan is to get NSRAA into 30% of allocation for trollers, what will NSRAA tell them?</p> <p>Steve R. (Public)—NSRAA would allow trolling in eastern channel, access for spring kings, hidden falls fish, 20 million chum in SE cove.</p> <p>Eric J. (Public)—no plan for trollers to catch the fish next year?</p> <p>Steve R. (Public)—the plan is there's opportunity.</p> <p>Eric J. (Public)—so no plans for next year or within the first couple years then.</p> <p>Tad—disclaimer: he is vice chair of CTA; Linda Danner is chair of CTA.</p> <p>Moe—larger schools outside harvest area (THA), trollers get to fish first. Concern over lack of effort when there's troll openings and quality concerns. As a seiner, he doesn't complain if he goes to fish a certain place or a certain species. Trollers can't either. Thinks there's already enough opportunity for trollers, and they don't need any more fish.</p> <p>Carl P. (Public)—NSRAA board decided to have more net effort when DIPAC gave money to NSRAA. Can't run a fishery on 30,000 fish.</p> <p>Tad—this proposal does not call for specific closures, but does call for hatchery boards to develop a plan that works for allocation.</p> <p>John—this has been going on for 15+years. Trollers are fishing kings not chum. Doesn't see the goodwill coming from the net fishermen. Risky proposal, but thinks there's need to be more pressure in allocation. Will support. Hooks aren't very effective. Would like to see some compromise.</p> <p>Steve R. (Public)—coho program at sawmill cove, and thinks there's goodwill already, and budget shows that. NSRAA is trying to promote chum program.</p> <p>Jeff called question.</p>
BOF	177	Close common property commercial salmon fishery in a portion of Mist Cove Special Harvest Area to allow hatchery operations.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	8	4	<p>Jerry moved to adopt, Kim seconded.</p> <p>Steve Reifenthul (Public)—closed areas by Emergency Order for many years, language ran through ADFG, so special harvest area would close hatched area on map [handed out at meeting]. Reason because facility in cove to rear and do cost recovery safety is jeopardized. It's been done by EO, and this proposal would put it in the regulations. Lots of conflict with people getting on docks and safety issues. Lots of interactions between gear. Area is open to other users when not doing cost recovery.</p> <p>Kim—subsistence fishermen closures?</p> <p>Steve R. (Public)—Closed to all fishing.</p> <p>Jon—would the stream mouth be open for guiding?</p> <p>Steve R. (Public)—yes, the facilities are around the corner.</p> <p>Tad—does this proposal apply year round?</p> <p>Patty (ADF&G)—it's only in the summer.</p> <p>John—178 and 177 are the same proposal.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>



BOF	178	Close common property commercial salmon fishery in a portion of Mist Cove Special Harvest Area to allow hatchery operations.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action			Same as above.
BOF	179	Close common property commercial salmon fishery in a portion of Kasnyku Bay Special Harvest Area to allow hatchery operations.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	8	4	<p>Jerry moved to adopt, Dick seconded.</p> <p>Steve Reifenhohl (Public)—same idea as with 177/178 proposals. Primarily protecting staff in operations area.</p> <p>Tad—did there used to be a hand troll fishery there?</p> <p>Jerry—there is some going on there.</p> <p>Don Bird (Public)—hand troller, and had fished there before. Opposed because NSRAA created the line, and enforced it without going through BOF process. Line is further out than necessary for commercial use. For sport fishermen there shouldn't be a line at all. Like at Medvejie. For the scope of work, it's an area larger than necessary.</p> <p>Steve R. (Public)—this is a closed area from ADF&G process. He's not NSRAA, he's just the representative for the Board of Directors.</p> <p>John—Typically the closure is done through EOs?</p> <p>Steve R. (Public)—had closed off by barrier net, and closed through EO.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&G)—It's always been open for sport until it needs to be closed, fishing prohibited within x number of feet of fish weir/ladder.</p> <p>Moe—what's the timing of the barrier net?</p> <p>Steve R. (Public)—it goes in June 12th, but we're trying to preclude fishing there prior to that date. Protection for area before/after barrier net is in place.</p> <p>Tad—what's the time frame of this proposal?</p> <p>Steve R. (Public)—it would be closed June through end of coho season.</p> <p>Patty (ADF&G)—specifies during summer troll season.</p> <p>Steve R. (Public)—Only this tiny area we're talking about, and only open when there's a closure of the troll fishery.</p> <p>Floyd—reword the part closing the waters. Should read the portion of the waters xyz is closed.</p> <p>Steve R. (Public)—no preference, as long as it arrives at same ending.</p> <p>Jerry—what kind of safety issues? And what is the difference of changing the line?</p> <p>Steve R. (Public)—that would be inside the barrier net that protects brood stock. Plenty of fish outside that net during the rest of the season. Safety issue as boats would tie up to net. This line is outside the barrier net. People tie up to net pens, which is a liability.</p> <p>John—is 180 the same?</p> <p>Steve R. (Public)—yes 179/180 are the same.</p> <p>Joel Hanson (Public)—Boat Company sends people there often, used to take skiffs in and fish, and it got out of control. Wouldn't recommend getting rid of the boundaries for safety.</p> <p>Jeff called question.</p>
BOF	180	Close common property commercial salmon fishery in a portion of Kasnyku Bay Special Harvest Area to allow hatchery operations.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action			See above.



BOF	223	Change the king salmon harvest percentage for the initial opening in the summer salmon troll fishery from 70 percent to 60 percent.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	9	3 abstain	<p>Tad moved to adopt, Jessica seconded. John—question for ADF&G. High abundance years can you guess what a 10% increase in August harvest would be? Grant (ADF&G)—it would be about 20,000 kings. John—sticking to reasons given in proposal. Helps the homebodies, those that are sticking to Sitka to fish. In Southern SE, some of best catches come from August. Only a few extra days on a later opening. Tad—looked at in depth if it had been in place every year. If you reduce the effort from July to August, it looks like the average troller in SSEO would be ahead \$900, in NSEO the average troller would be \$600 ahead. Most of Sitka trollers he’s talked to are in support of this. Tendency to catch 85% of fish in July. Matt Donahoe (Public)—Right now it’s allocated 70/30 July/August, which would essentially double the August catch. Perhaps maybe a 65/35 ratio. In high abundance years, how would it work if ADF&G plans on a 21 day open and it closes after 6 days (like this year) what happens then? Moe—if you’re taking fish from July to August, what would happen to seiners who target in July? Patty (ADF&G)—management of seine fishery in district 4 is run independently from trollers. Moe—would that mean there’s a 10% increase in the seine catch? Grant (ADF&G)—it’s a possibility. Tad—quota goes up for all fleets if August quota goes up. Jerry called question.</p>
BOF	224	Allow the commissioner to open a season during which a trip limit is in effect for king salmon in the commercial summer salmon troll fishery.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	12	0	<p>Randy moved to adopt, Tad seconded. Matt Donahoe (Public)—not very many fish left of the quota (about 10,000 fish), which ADF&G can’t open up the fishery with that many fish. With regards to the treaty, we’re at the end of the “totem pole” for allocation. We don’t want to leave Alaskan fish on the table. Proposal is to not open a fishery; they could allocate fish per trip. Boats would register to fish in this system. Floyd—how is the registration process? Matt D. (Public)—for Lingcod, you just sign up and tell ADF&G which areas you’ll be fishing. Worried about moving these unfished fish to other fleets as a buffer. When quota is low, that’s when fish are left on the table, and that’s when they’re most valuable. Eric Jordan (Public)—but this proposal would have high grading. Suggests it’s got to be a trip limit in POUNDS to avoid high grading. Average weight of fish per boat, and a limit for the season. Not a trip limit, a rest of the season limit. Matt D. (Public)—would leave up to BOF. Eric J. (Public)—Can be adjusted in-season? Matt D. (Public)—proposal is flexible. Patty (ADF&G)—ADF&G doesn’t have comment, but we would want registration, know how many treaty kings left, divide number of fish between number of boats intending to fish.</p>



			<p>John—Wants to amend Trip Limit to TRIP LIMIT IN POUNDS. That would remove high grading.</p> <p>Matt D. (Public)—but the treaty is in fish, not pounds.</p> <p>Tad—trying to get total mortality fish instead of actual landings, but Southern US won't go for it because our fisheries are cleaned up.</p> <p>Matt D. (Public)—Alaska would have gotten 53,000 more treaty fish based on 2011 numbers when reviewing the fisheries.</p> <p>Moe—pounds sound even more complicated. Not sure how you'd get away with high grading.</p> <p>Eric J. (Public)—based on this discussion, let's keep at number of fish.</p> <p>Kim called question.</p>
BOF	229	Allow commercial salmon fishing with troll gear in an area between North Chatham Strait and Homeshore.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	13	0	<p>Tad moved to adopt, Randy seconded.</p> <p>Matt Donahoe (Public)—problem with area is that it's only open 4 days, Wants to open shore to trolling. Proposal will stay out of shallow water because territorial fishermen are fishing in there. Open up the area on a map that was handed out. Gives trollers a little more area, stays in the same district. An issue about going up into Lynn Canal, but proposal doesn't go up there.</p> <p>Floyd—clarification: whenever anything is open up there, this section's open too?</p> <p>Matt D. (Public)—would like it to be open at the same time as Homeshore is.</p> <p>Patty (ADF&G)—under management plan, likely to have conservative openings to gather data (not open for 7 days as the areas next to it are), and species restrictions.</p> <p>Matt D. (Public)—language can be changed just want to be able to move through there with gear without having to pull it. Need ground to troll, unlike nets.</p> <p>John—is management plan working for district 12 and 14?</p> <p>Patty (ADF&G)—it's been in place, but it sunsets at the end of 2014, and it's up for editing this board cycle. Happy with the way it's going so far.</p> <p>Eric J. (Public)—thinks it should not be proposed as a separate area, maybe be an extension of northern Chatham area. The only difference is you'd be able to keep certain species. Thinks it's a good idea to extend the northern Chatham area.</p> <p>Matt D. (Public)—the problem with Homeshore is that its only open four days a week.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>

IX. Next Meeting Date: January 14th at 6:30PM.

X. Adjournment: 9:50PM

Minutes Recorded By: Jessica Gill, Secretary
Minutes Approved By: John Murray, Chairman
Date: January 14, 2015



Sitka Advisory Committee
February 2, 2015
Sitka Sound Science Center, 834 Lincoln Street

- I. Call to Order: 6:33 by John Murray, Chairman
- II. Roll Call: Jessica Gill, Secretary
Members Present: Jerry Barber, Kim Elliot, Tad Fujioka, Jessica Gill, Randy Gluth, Moe Johnson, Karen Johnson, Jon Martin, Brian Massey, John Murray, Floyd Tomkins, Wayne Unger
Members Absent: Dick Curran, Jeff Feldpausch, Cody Loomis, Peter Roddy, Bradley Shaffer
Number Needed For Quorum on AC: 8
List of User Groups Present: Hand Troll, Subsistence, Trapping, Alternate 1, Hunting, Seine, At-Large 1, Charter, Resident Sport Fish, Power Troll, Conservation, Processor
- III. Approval of Agenda:
No formal agenda was developed, but John Murray suggested the proposals to discuss.
- IV. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes: From meeting date: January 14th, 2015
Brian motioned to adopt, Kim seconded. John mentioned these minutes are great. Minutes passed unanimously.
- V. Fish and Game Staff Present:
Dave Gordon
- VI. Guests Present:
Steve Reifentstahl, Joel Markis
- VII. Old Business:
No old business was discussed.
- VIII. New Business:
Tad moved to have chair and secretary to write thank you letters to SSSC and the Sentinel for hosting and publishing our meetings. John mentioned he was working on this letter. Jessica asked for a quick turn around on minute approval to submit to BOF. It was determined that an email poll will suffice for approval of the minutes.



Southeast and Yakutat Finfish, Feb. 23–March 3, 2015

Alaska Board of Fisheries

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form

BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
BOF	182	Modify fishing ratios and sunset date in the Deep Inlet Terminal Harvest Area Salmon Management Plan.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	9	0, 3 abstain	<p>Brian moved to adopt, Kim seconded.</p> <p>Brian—what’s the main change for this proposal from what’s currently in place?</p> <p>Steve Reifenstuhl (Public)—regulation sunsets this year; this proposal continues it for the next 3 years. Tied to allocation issues.</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—the current 1:1 gillnet:seine rotation sunsets at the end of 2014 with BOF meeting and it needs to be addressed again. Proposal 182 no specifics to season/regulation end date. Unclear about ratio of salmon allocation (open for debate at BOF?). Joint RPT would meet prior to BOF meeting with recommendation to BOF as to what they want to support.</p> <p>Steve R. (Public)—the JPRT includes representatives from gillnet, seine and troller from SSRAA and NSRAA areas.</p> <p>Discussion about current regulations ensued.</p> <p>Brian called the question.</p>
BOF	183	Modify commercial salmon fishery purse seine and drift gillnet fishing time ratios in the Deep Inlet Terminal Harvest Area.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	7	2, 3 abstain	<p>Tad moved to adopt, Kim seconded.</p> <p>Tad—likes additional opportunity allocated to whichever gear group is behind in their allocation, but there’s no language about the trollers. The trollers have been behind in allocation the longest.</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—allocative proposal, and whichever the industry wants to do, ADF&G will abide. The way he understands, after next season, if seiners their allocation, the time ratio the following year will be 1 gillnet:1 seine. Doesn’t change to 1:1 ratio at all [like proposal 182]. If the seiners are not behind, the ratio will be 2 gillnet:1 seine. The proposal is poorly worded and hard to understand.</p> <p>Discussion about the sunset clause of current regulation ensued.</p> <p>Steve R. (Public)—both net gear groups behind this proposal, but not trollers.</p> <p>Brian called the question.</p>
BOF	189	Remove reference to 5 AAC 33.366 Northern Southeast Seine Salmon Fishery Management Plans and clarify language regarding fishing openings.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	10	0, 2 abstain	<p>Tad moved to adopt, Randy seconded.</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—housekeeping proposal. Northern Southeast Seine Management Plan addressing seining at Hidden Falls THA. Clarifying language. Tried to strike difficult language in section 2, intention is to avoid writing an emergency order within a week of the chum troll fishery. Not sure if language is valid, as cost recovery has changed for this area.</p> <p>Brian called the question.</p>



BOF	193	Restrict and prohibit commercial purse seining in portions of Districts 12 and 14.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	0	10, 2 abstain	<p>Brian moved to adopt, Kim seconded.</p> <p>Brian—another move to close areas to commercial guys.</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—Connected to ETJ petition, and centered on Kanalku stock. Federal Subsistence Board hired mediators to come up with solution to local problem. Kanalku system has a falls on it, so they blasted the falls to make it easier for the fish to get up to the lake to spawn. Not a very large system, 3-4K fish. State did some sampling of the seine fishery, to get baseline data throughout SE. Report just got published, lots of sockeye throughout Icy Strait (600,000 sockeye pass through). Kanalku fish don't really show up on the north side seine fishery. Subsistence fishery ends mid-July, and seine doesn't open mid to late July.</p> <p>Moe—already area closed around this stream, and the fleet doesn't even catch them. One day a week opener would hurt the fishery.</p> <p>Steve R. (Public)—45,000 extrapolated in sampling, 0.7% were Kanalku fish in 2013. Results of mediator team came up as economic hardship and change that Angoon needs (runway, hydropower dam).</p> <p>Jon—would that 0.7% , roughly 200-400 fish, hurt the stock?</p> <p>Steve R. (Public)—no I don't think so.</p> <p>Brian called the question.</p>
BOF	194	Close a portion of Lisianski Inlet to commercial salmon fishing with purse seine gear.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	1	6, 5 abstain	<p>Moe moved to adopt, Karen seconded.</p> <p>Tad—proposal 194 is closing waters that are already closed?</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—yes, but if there's a surplus of pink and chum, we can open certain areas in regulations. Restriction vs closure. Proposal 194's attempt is to close these waters permanently. Can get build up of fish in Lisianski Inlet, and occasionally extend the openings after normal openings. Wild stock seine fishery. Population estimates done by aerial surveys.</p> <p>Wayne called the question.</p>
BOF	195	Close a portion of Lisianski Inlet to commercial salmon fishing with purse seine gear.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action			Discussion regarding coho escapement in the Lisianski area ensued. No coho conservation concerns throughout SE.
BOF	196	Establish new salmon statistical areas in District 13.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action			Discussion regarding why the Pelican proposals have been requested. Pelican has been interested in developing a hatchery, but nothing has come to fruition and it's not a great location.
BOF	197	Establish new salmon statistical areas in Lisianski Inlet.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action			Did not discuss.
BOF	198	Establish closed waters around sockeye salmon streams in the Angoon area.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	11	0, 1 abstain	<p>Brian moved to adopt, Tad seconded.</p> <p>Brian—looks like a housekeeping proposal.</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—way to cope with some stock concerns for area, and this would put it in regulation. This area has already been closed by emergency orders for 10 years.</p> <p>Kim—Basket Bay is difficult to get subsistence fish, and it's a beautiful area, so would like to see the area closed to commercial fishing.</p> <p>Steve R. (Public)—it's waters that don't see a build-up of fish typically.</p> <p>Jon—clarified that this is just for seine and gillnet fishing.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>
BOF	199	Prohibit commercial fishing for salmon with purse seine gear within the possessory boundary of Angoon for five years.	



<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	12	Brian—can we vote on 199 and 200 together? Brian moved to adopt 199 and 200, Kim seconded. Discussion of Goldschmidt and Haas possessory boundary and what is encompassed of this boundary. This is related to ETJ petition. Discussion about the area to be closed was discussed at length. Kim called the question.
BOF	200	Close waters within the Admiralty Monument proclamation boundary to commercial fishing for salmon with purse seine gear.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	12	See above, moved with 199.
BOF	201	Close certain waters of Chichagof Island and Admiralty Island to commercial salmon fishing with purse seine gear.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	4	7, 1 abstain	Tad moved to adopt, Brian seconded. Tad—for consistency, if we supported proposal 198, we should support this one. Steve R. (Public)—it’s similar, but not very defined as the ADF&G one is (198). John—is 198 more closed area? Dave (ADF&G)—not sure if they’re markedly different. Tad—Basket Bay might be slightly larger in proposal 201. Tad called the question.
BOF	202	Clarify measurement standards for the commercial salmon purse seine vessel length limit in the Southeastern Alaska Area.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action			Seine fleet will be meet with BOF to discuss this with ADF&G.
BOF	203	Establish and define a maximum speed at which a commercial salmon fishery purse seine may be towed.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action			Brian—is there way to enforce this? Dave (ADF&G)—no. Difficult to enforce speed on seine. Tad—proposal 139 which is a department-sponsored proposal similarly imposes a speed limit on jig gears. If enforcement of a speed limit is practical in the case of 139, is proposal 203 feasible? If infeasible, then shouldn’t proposal 139 be infeasible too?
BOF	204	Prohibit the use of spotter planes during open commercial salmon fishing periods where purse seine gear is allowed.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	4	8	Brian would like to move 204 and 205 together. Tad seconded. Brian—percentage of boats using spotter planes? Moe—maybe 4 planes used by boats in co-op fisheries. Tad—heard about from seiner: 1) When you do go by yourself seining, next thing you know you’re not alone anymore on the grounds because of the planes. 2) Spotter planes are a big cost to fleet, and don’t significantly increase the number of fish they harvest. The seine fleet has plenty of catching power to harvest all the harvestable surplus. Floyd—in herring opening, no one will offset the cost if it’ll increase the catch. Likes to level the playing field. Moe—doesn’t think it’s important, and useless regulation. Maybe they’ll be used during the salmon seine openings, but not too much during the season. Kim—drones not as obtrusive, and thinks most fishing boats might all have drones in the near future anyway. Privacy an issue. A lot of plane traffic over Deep Inlet, where she lives, and can be noisy. Jerry called the question.
BOF	205	Prohibit the use of unmanned aircraft during open commercial salmon fishing periods where purse seine is allowed.	



<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	4	8	See comments on 204.
BOF	267	Repeal exception for use of footwear with felt soles while sport fishing.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	1	11	<p>Jerry moved to adopt, Tad seconded.</p> <p>Kim—problem is large number of out of state fishermen. Repealing this is not a good idea, and you can get around slippery spots in non-felt soles.</p> <p>Tad—BOF decision not based on good science, but it is a potential vector, and ADF&G’s position at the time was that banning felt soles was not necessary, adequate, or a meaningful way to prevent the spread of disease or invasive species.</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—Sportfish supports the idea of felt soles.</p> <p>Brian called the question.</p>
BOF	239	Remove Registration Area A from the 72-hour Dungeness crab pot storage limitation requirement.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action TABLED	9	3	<p>Tad moved to adopt, Kim seconded.</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—unbaited open pots can be stored for 72-hours. Proposal is requesting 7 day to retrieve pots.</p> <p>Tad—in February and August, they get 7 days to retrieve pots, why not during this closure?</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—could be due to enforcement not being out there, or wanting to stay out longer than necessary.</p> <p>John—in support, for safety of fleet.</p> <p>Brian—proposer wants to amend areas, and add area A to the removal request. But thinks it should be discussed at BOF.</p> <p>Kim—what about amending the removal to 7 days to remove pots instead of eliminating the clauses [areas].</p> <p>Jerry moved to table the proposal.</p>
BOF	261	Modify prohibitions on importation and release of live fish to specifically address amphibians in Alaska.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	5, 7 abstain	<p>Jessica moved to adopt, Kim seconded.</p> <p>Jessica—in invasive species regulations, amphibians are considered fish.</p> <p>Jon—this is an emerging issue in invasive species and diseases. Thinks the proposal is a good idea, but the way the proposer is going at it is not the right way. Someone buying a frog from a pet store wouldn’t know about invasive species, being a vector or carrying diseases already. Very challenging. Perhaps prohibiting transport of frogs is the way to go.</p> <p>Proposal could be rewritten.</p> <p>Floyd—is this a good first step?</p> <p>Jon—from a regulatory standpoint, the proposal needs work.</p> <p>Kim—can we be in support of the idea of the proposal, and not just the actual proposal?</p> <p>Floyd—it would take a resolution drafted from the AC.</p> <p>Jon—the proposal is trying to get a little more teeth in regulations of the movement of these animals.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>
BOF	262	Modify permitting requirements to specifically address the collection, transport, and possession of amphibian in Alaska.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	9, 3 abstain	<p>Jon moved to adopt, Brian seconded.</p> <p>Jon—anybody can transport diseased amphibians, without clear and appropriate gear. Needs to have certain regulations regarding what an amphibian is [see comments on proposal 261]. Likes the concept of proposal, but not the way it’s written. Does anybody know what</p>



			<p>“reasonable precaution” is?</p> <p>Tad—would like to think that some kid can handle a frog without getting a ticket.</p> <p>Jon—the current regulation is like that. And this proposal would make it not required to have a permit to conduct research, which is ludicrous. All vertebrates have permits needed to conduct research.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>
BOF	265	Ban the use of live earthworms as bait in freshwater sport fishing.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	12	<p>Tad moved to adopt, Jon seconded.</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—in overpopulated lakes you can use live bait.</p> <p>Floyd—rationale is not in harmony with the regulation requested.</p> <p>Tad called the question.</p>

IX. Adjournment: 8:35 PM by John Murray

Minutes Recorded By: Jessica Gill, Secretary
 Minutes Approved By:
 Date:



Craig Advisory Council meeting February 3, 2015

Quoram in attendance:

Brian Castle
Ellen Hannan
Dave Creighton
Steve Stumpf
Fred Hamilton
Stu Merchant
Doug Rhoades
Mike Douville
Charles Haydu

Members not in Attendance:

Bill Farmer
Steve Merritt
Kirk Agnitsch

Public in Attendance:

Jeff Reeves
Craig Schwanke

Meeting called to order @ 7:07 PM

Agenda approved

Minutes approved from last meeting January 29, 2015

Elections:

Doug Rhoades-Alternate
Steve Merritt-Vice-Chair

New Business:

Discussion on Craig AC's Klawock River proposals. RAC (Regional Advisory Council) recommended closure on the federal portion of the mouth of Klawock River (just upriver of Fireweed Lodge). Federal restriction would be in place for July and August then no restrictions after August 31. We feel our **proposal 151** takes the RAC recommendation further by closing the fishery up river from the Klawock River Bridge. After a lengthy discussion **the Craig AC is dropping proposal 149 and amending Proposal 152 (See below).**

BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports	Number	Number	Comments/Discussions, Amendments to proposal



or Opposes	Support	Oppose	
BOF	152		Horsepower restriction Klawock River subsistence fishery
	9	0	Amend proposal to leave HP restriction the way it is until August 31 then lift HP restriction. No restrictions on the days of the week that you can fish after August 31.
BOF	127		No more than 1,000 blades of Kelp per herring pen
	9	0	The Craig AC recommends no more than 500 blades of Kelp per pen
BOF	128		Combine 2 closed herring pounds to make 1
	0	9	
BOF	129		Allow herring to be retained for up to seven days
	0	9	This will lead to added mortality due to a longer duration in the pen. Releasing at night helps them escape predators.
BOF	130		Create spiny dogfish fishery using pots
	9	0	
BOF	131		Allow pots in commercial sablefish fishery
	9	0	
BOF	132		Adds pots as legal gear in the long-line fishery
	9	0	
BOF	133		Adds pots as legal gear in long-line fishery
	9	0	
BOF	136		50 fish limit for personal use sablefish
	9	0	
BOF	176		Establish new enhanced salmon allocation by gear types
	7	1	1 vote abstained. We fell this proposal addresses accountability for what is being caught.
BOF	184		Open Kendrick bay to troll fishery
	9	0	
BOF	207		Increase commercial drift gillnet salmon fishing opportunity
	9	0	Open an area for gillnetters that is not open when seiners are fishing and allows protection from the weather.
BOF	208		Establish a drift gillnet mesh size restriction when king salmon fishery is closed
	0	9	King salmon that are present are generally Anita Bay hatchery fish. The Craig AC prefers an area restriction over a mesh size restriction.
BOF	209		Increase mesh depth to 120 meshes
	0	9	
BOF	210		Allow single monofilament net in gillnet fishery
	0	9	Our AC gillnetters opposed this stating,



			"monofilament can be too effective".
BOF	223		Change harvest percentage for Trolllers from 70 to 60 % for king salmon on the first opening
	0	9	Sometimes King Salmon are not available on the second opening. Trolllers do not want to risk leaving fish "on the table".
BOF	228		Mandatory 10 day closure for Coho fishery August 1-10
	0	9	
BOF	257		Repeal footgear with felt soles
	7	2	Other materials on the same boots can transfer organisms as easily as felt. Felt soles are safer than non-felt soles. There should be a decontamination method instead.

Stu Merchant attending BOF Meeting on behalf of the Craig AC.

Meeting Adjourned At 9:18pm

