

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

RECEIVED

AC NAME: Central Peninsula

DEC 31 2007

LOCATION (town): Wainichik

BOARDS
ANCHORAGE

DATE (of meeting): 10-30-07

MEMBERS PRESENT: Steve Vanek, Dave Martin,
Mike Schuster, Gary Deiman, Doug Blossom,
Robert Chucas, Jeff Berger, John McCombes,
Ross Vanek,

MEMBERS ABSENT: Robert Miller, ~~Steve~~

QUORUM PRESENT: YES NO

RECEIVED

AGENCY STAFF PRESENT: Jeff Fox

JAN 02 2007

BOARDS

Time Meeting Called to Order: 7:20 PM

Old Business and New Business (See following pages)

Time Meeting Adjourned: 10 PM

Attn: Shannon
BoF - UCI
AC Comments

Steve Vanek
Signature, Committee Secretary

STATE OF ALASKA

Central Peninsula Fish & Game
Advisory Committee

Frank H Murkowski, Governor

David Martin, Chair
71605 Sterling Highway
Clam Gulch, AK 99568
Phone: 567-3306

Minutes of meeting 10-30-07

- ① Minutes of previous meeting read and approved
- ② Board approved the motion that the Chairman or his designee will be our representative at the Lower Cook Inlet Board meeting.
- ③ Doug Blossom - gave a report on Federal subsistence meeting - allowing one fish wheel in each river.
- ④ We began voting on upper Cook Inlet Proposal.

RECEIVED

JAN 02 2007

BOARDS

STATE OF ALASKA

page 3 of 77

Sarah Palin, Governor

Central Peninsula Fish & Game Advisory Committee

David Martin, Chair
71605 Sterling Highway
Clam Gulch, AK 99568
Phone: 567-3306

Sign in

10-30-07

Steve Dank	
Dave Knutsen	Clam Gulch,
Mike Schuster	Niitlicuk
Gary Deiman	"
Doug Brown	Clam Gulch
Bob Cross	CLAM GULCH
G.M. Berger	Niitlicuk
John McCombs	Niitlicuk
Teague Vaul	Niitlicuk

8

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

AC NAME: Central Peninsula

LOCATION (town): Niinicik

DATE (of meeting): 11-26-07 (Continuation of Oct. 30 meeting)

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Steve Vaneck, Ron Teague, John McCombs
Jeff Berger, Richard Mondor, Doug Blossom
Terry Hepner, Gary Deimon, Dave Martin

MEMBERS ABSENT:
Norbert Miller, Mike Schuster
Robert Lucas

QUORUM PRESENT: YES NO

AGENCY STAFF PRESENT: Robert Begich

Time Meeting Called to Order: 7:15 PM

Old Business and New Business (See following pages)

Time Meeting Adjourned: 10:00 PM

[Signature]
Signature, Committee Secretary

Sign-in 11-26-07
Central Peninsula

Steve Vanek
Jeane Vanek
John McLonky

Nimilchuk
Nimilchik
Nimilchik

J. M. F. B.

Acicicwick
NINILCHIK

Doug Blom

Clam Gulch

Ken T. Hsu

Nimilchik

Samy Deiman

"

Robert Begich

ADFG Sototuy

David Martin

Clam Gulch,

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

AC NAME: Central Peninsula

LOCATION (town): Ninilchik

DATE (of meeting): 11-6-07 (Continuation of 10-30-07 Meeting)

MEMBERS PRESENT: Dave Martin, Steve Vanek,
Robert Lucas, Jeff Berger, Rion Vanek
Gary Deimon, Mike Schuster, Doug Blossom

MEMBERS ABSENT: Terry Hepner, Rob Menden, Norbert Miller

QUORUM PRESENT: YES NO

AGENCY STAFF PRESENT: Jeff Fox

Time Meeting Called to Order: 7:25 PM

Old Business and New Business (See following pages)

Time Meeting Adjourned: _____

Steve Vanek
Signature, Committee Secretary

moved and seconded that we write a letter to Commission about getting reports out on time, passed Unanimously.

A/C Comment# 8

Central Peninsula AC

Sign-in NOV. 6 - 2007

Steve Vaneck
 Fred Martin
 Mike Sebastian
 Allon Yost
 ROBERTO @ WEAS
 Jeff Beyer
 Jaqueline
 Mike Walep
 Jay Deiman
 M/S

Ninilchik
 Clem Gulch
 Ninilchik
 Ninilchik
 CLARA Gaultt
 Ninilchik
 Ninilchik
 Clem Gulch
 Ninilchik
 SOUTHERN AFG.

Doug Worman
 John McEwen

Clem Gulch, AK
 Ninilchik, AK

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

AC NAME: Central Peninsula

LOCATION (town): Ninilchik

DATE (of meeting): 11-12-07 (continuation of 10-30-07 meeting)

MEMBERS PRESENT: Steve Vanek, John McLamba
Ron Vanek, Jeff Banger, Richard Madden
Douglas Blossom, Mike Shuster,
Gary Deimon, Dave Martin, Bob Lucas

MEMBERS ABSENT: Norbert Miller, Terry Hepper

QUORUM PRESENT: YES NO

AGENCY STAFF PRESENT: Jeff Fox

Time Meeting Called to Order: 7:15 PM

Old Business and New Business (See following pages)

Time Meeting Adjourned: 10 PM

Steve Vanek
Signature, Committee Secretary

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

AC NAME: Central Peninsula

LOCATION (town): Niivilchik

DATE (of meeting): 11-19-07 (continuation of Oct. 30, 07)

MEMBERS PRESENT: Dave Martin, Doug Blossom,
Steve Vanek, Richard Mondor, John McLomb,
Norbert Miller, Robert Lucas

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bill Vanek, Mike Schuster, Jeff Bergen

QUORUM PRESENT: YES NO

AGENCY STAFF PRESENT: Robert Begich (Sport fish)

Time Meeting Called to Order: 7:30 PM

Old Business and New Business (See following pages)

Time Meeting ^{Recessed} Adjourned: 10 AM

Steve Vanek
Signature, Committee Secretary

Moved to put Doug Blossom's name for Fed. Subsistence Boards passed unanimously. also include Greg Gusselbacher and James Schomatter.

A/C Comment# 8

STATE OF ALASKA

Central Peninsula Fish & Game
Advisory Committee

page 11 of 44

Sarah Palin
~~Frank H. Murkowski, Governor~~

David Martin, Chair
71605 Sterling Highway
Clam Gulch, AK 99568
Phone: 567-3306

Sign-up

11-19-07

Steve Vanek

David Smith
Rud Menden

John McCombs

Robert Begich

Doug Blomum

NORBERT MILLER

BOB FETTER @ Lucas

Ninilchik

Clam Gulch

NINILCHIK

Ninilchik

ADF&G Soldotna

Clam Gulch

NINILCHIK

CLAM GULCH

VOTER RECORD/COMMENTS

Advisory Committee: Central Peninsula

Date: Oct. ~~20~~ NOV Page 12 of 44 Proposal Packet UCI

Use this form to record the votes and comments of members regarding Board of Fisheries and Board of Game proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a particular proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary for the committee to spend time on that proposal, just write "no action" in the Abstain column.

Proposal Number	Yes	No	Abstain	Summary of Discussion about this Proposal
73	9	0	0	Housekeeping
74	0	9	0	Pilots for spotting have been used off and on. No one is forced to hire a pilot. Fishermen should have the option to use a spotter pilot as another tool for fishing no different than a fast boat etc.
75	0	9	0	see #74
76	0	9	0	This small area was approved by the Board last cycle to the alleviate an unsafe drift area around Karlak Reef that is was caused by the old lines, currents etc. The new lines worked. The small additional area makes for a safe drift. Harvest is the same. Why would the Board approve ^{approve} this prop. and recreate an unsafe drift area of the past?

VOTER RECORD/COMMENTS

Advisory Committee: Central Peninsular

Date: Oct-Nov. Page 13 of 44 Proposal Packet UCI

Use this form to record the votes and comments of members regarding Board of Fisheries and Board of Game proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a particular proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary for the committee to spend time on that proposal, just write "no action" in the Abstain column.

Proposal Number	Yes	No	Abstain	Summary of Discussion about this Proposal
77	0	9	0	This proposal does not allow for adaptive abundance base management as directed by the SSFMP.
78	2	6	0	Opposed because the longstanding regulation that the South side of Chinlita Bay is drift & some the N side setnet. Should not change. Those in favor support the change.
79	9	0	0	see # 86
80	9	0	0	see #86
81	9	0	0	See #86
82	9	0	0	see #86
83	9	0	0	see #86
84	9	0	0	See #86
85	9	0	0	See #86
86	9	0	0	This proposal would allow adaptive abundance base management as directed by the SSFMP closing by EO ending date allows harvest of a harvestable resource that would otherwise go unharvested. <u>AC Comment# 8</u>

VOTER RECORD/COMMENTS

Advisory Committee: Central Peninsula

Date: Oct-Nov, Page 14 of 44 Proposal Packet UCI

Use this form to record the votes and comments of members regarding Board of Fisheries and Board of Game proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a particular proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary for the committee to spend time on that proposal, just write "no action" in the Abstain column.

Proposal Number	Yes	No	Abstain	Summary of Discussion about this Proposal
87	0	9	0	This proposal does not allow for adaptive abundance base management as directed by the SSFA BARC 39.222. Need to throw out any percent This would close the commercial season 2nd period in Aug, and lead to more and future overescapement of sockeye. Coho's are only being exploited at 10 to 40%. Plenty of Coho's. No conservation concerns.
88	9	0	0	1% doesn't work! promotes overescapement. 75% of Coho not exploited.
89	No Action			No action see #79
90	9	0	0	Fishing effort and participation really drops of this time of the season. It is real important to the fishermen that do continue fishing to be able for. This is not new. These periods used to be until taken away. This is great time for Direct marketers to get high quality product and get a high price. The surplus will not be caught by any other user group.

VOTER RECORD/COMMENTS

Advisory Committee: Central Peninsula

Date: Oct-Nov, Page 15 of 44 Proposal Packet ~~U C I~~ U C I

Use this form to record the votes and comments of members regarding Board of Fisheries and Board of Game proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a particular proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary for the committee to spend time on that proposal, just write "no action" in the Abstain column.

Proposal Number	Yes	No	Abstain	Summary of Discussion about this Proposal
91	9	0	0	as amended - Amendment: Remove the two restricted days rather than naming the days. Passed 9-0-0 FAAC/21.353 B Plenty of Susitna Sockeye
92	9	0	0	We don't need the coho restrictions Coho runs are strong.
93	9	0	0	Our processor says the fish are worth more earlier on. There is no problem with escapement in the Kaslof so should begin after 25,000 have entered the River.
94	9	0	0	See #93
95	8	1	0	Processor would rather have Thursday opener but rest felt that there would more likely be a Wed. E.O. opener than a Sat. opener.
96				no action because we supported MON. & Fridays, with a wed. opening that would likely be more E.O. is written to close it on wed. Have two days Regular period per week without any restrictions
97	9	0	0	

VOTER RECORD/COMMENTS

Advisory Committee: Central Peninsula

Date: Oct-Nov Page 16 of 44 Proposal Packet U C I

Use this form to record the votes and comments of members regarding Board of Fisheries and Board of Game proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a particular proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary for the committee to spend time on that proposal, just write "no action" in the Abstain column.

Proposal Number	Yes	No	Abstain	Summary of Discussion about this Proposal
98	7	2	0	No votes said set nets should not be closed until closed by C.O. If they are closed then someone should be able to fish there.
99				No action see # 98
100	9	0	0	Kings are under utilized so no reason not to open it.
101				No action see # 100
102	9	0	0	as amended - amendment: The amendment was to include set nets up to 105 fathoms. Passed 9-0-0
103	9	0	0	See # 102
104	0	9	0	monofilament is cheaper. Saves fishermen money and is not detrimental to the fishery. No drop out problem
105	0	9	0	Might make management more problematic.

VOTER RECORD/COMMENTS

Advisory Committee: Central Peninsula

Date: 01 NOV Page 17 of 44 Proposal Packet UCI

Use this form to record the votes and comments of members regarding Board of Fisheries and Board of Game proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a particular proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary for the committee to spend time on that proposal, just write "no action" in the Abstain column.

Proposal Number	Yes	No	Abstain	Summary of Discussion about this Proposal
106	2	4	0	Those in favor believe with global warming the fish will swim deeper thus more likely to cause in river problems when too many fish hit the river.
107	0	9	0	we do not favor 200 Fathom nets or 140 fathom set nets
108	0	9	0	
109	0	9	0	King salmon are a commercial fish that are bought by the general public. They are not an incidental catch.
110	0	9	0	There is no standard available in Alaska - Economic hardships for fishermen.
110	0	9	0	These nets won't work in Cook Inlet, could get a permit from the commissioner.
111	0	9	0	This is counterproductive. Will require more openings to catch sockeye. Kings are a commercial fish that the general public wants to buy. Not all King salmon travel along beach.
				A/C Comment# 8

VOTER RECORD/COMMENTS

Advisory Committee: Central Peninsula

Date: OCT-NOV Page 19 of 44 Proposal Packet WCI

Use this form to record the votes and comments of members regarding Board of Fisheries and Board of Game proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a particular proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary for the committee to spend time on that proposal, just write "no action" in the Abstain column.

Proposal Number	Summary of Discussion			
	Yes	No	Abstain	
117	0	9	0	Hatchery Fish are not counted now in the escapement goal except for Fish Creek so this proposal does nothing.
118	5	1	0	Return to simpler management plan to manage for escapement goals.
119	0	9	0	This proposal does not meet the criteria. It is not a harvest problem. The Problem is in River and in the Lakes.
120	0	9	0	There are no escapement goals so how do you determine it is a stock of concern. This proposal is just to get more coho into the system.
121	0	9	0	This is another attempt to get more coho by reducing commercial fishing. sockeye is an in river problem
122	0	9	0	see #121

VOTER RECORD/COMMENTS

Advisory Committee: Central Peninsula

Date: OCT-NOV Page 20 of 44 Proposal Packet UCF

Use this form to record the votes and comments of members regarding Board of Fisheries and Board of Game proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a particular proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary for the committee to spend time on that proposal, just write "no action" in the Abstain column.

Proposal Number	Yes	No	Abstain	Summary of Discussion about this Proposal
123	0	9	0	Because of problems in the lake there would not be any fish return to Fish Creek without the hatchery component
124	9	0	0	This may help or may not, might be worth a try
125				No action because the proposal is too complex, we agree with some parts but not other parts, we would prefer individual proposals
126	9	0	0	This helps clarify the Commission's authority. The Abstention person did not understand the issue
127				No action - see # 128 to 131
128	9	0	0	We support all the proposals that say the Dept. should manage for escapement goals as the over all priority.
129	9	0	0	
130	9	0	0	

VOTER RECORD/COMMENTS

Advisory Committee: Central Peninsula

Date: Oct-NOV Page 21 of 44 Proposal Packet UCI

Use this form to record the votes and comments of members regarding Board of Fisheries and Board of Game proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a particular proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary for the committee to spend time on that proposal, just write "no action" in the Abstain column.

Proposal Number	Yes	No	Abstain	Summary of Discussion about this Proposal
131	9	0	0	
132	0	9	0	adopting this will ensure that escapement goals will be exceeded which we oppose. achieving escapement goals should have priority.
133	9	0	0	The time frame in this proposal helps clarify the Reg.
134	9	0	0	This proposal gets rid of some of the junk in the existing plans.
135	9	0	0	} These go along with #134.
136	9	0	0	
137	9	0	0	
138	0	9	0	The problem is in River and not a harvest problem.
140	0	9	0	In River problem not a harvest problem.
141	9	0	0	Can allowing some limited fishing.

AIC Comment# 8

VOTER RECORD/COMMENTS

Advisory Committee: Central Peninsula

Date: Oct-Nov Page 22 of 44 Proposal Packet UCF

Use this form to record the votes and comments of members regarding Board of Fisheries and Board of Game proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a particular proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary for the committee to spend time on that proposal, just write "no action" in the Abstain column.

Proposal Number	Yes	No	Abstain	Summary of Discussion about this Proposal
142	9	0	0	Coho stocks are abundant. Should allow more opportunity to fish them. Commercial catch and participation low but important. High price fresh market.
143	9	0	0	These are not significant Susitna stocks caught on the East side
144	9	0	0	Give the commission more flexibility.
145	9	0	0	See # 143
146	9	0	0	This gives more time to fish to get closer to the cap
147	9	0	0	Gives more fishing time to get closer to the cap
148	0	9	0	Leave as is - but give more time for fishing - Evaluate later.
149	9	0	0	The cap is the determining factor so allow fishing closer to river because the cap is not never reached.
150	—	—	—	No action - see # 147

A/C Comment# 8

VOTER RECORD/COMMENTS

Advisory Committee: Central Peninsula

Date: OCT-NOV Page 23 of 44 Proposal Packet UCI

Use this form to record the votes and comments of members regarding Board of Fisheries and Board of Game proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a particular proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary for the committee to spend time on that proposal, just write "no action" in the Abstain column.

Proposal Number	Yes	No	Abstain	Summary of Discussion about this Proposal
151	2	7	0	Those in favor felt drifters ought to be given the opportunity to harvest Northern District Kings. The king catch is not even close to the cap. High quality high priced product this time of year. ^{low participation} Those opposed said leave it status quo.
152	7	2	0	This proposal would allow adaptive abundance base management as directed by the SSFP 5 AAC 39,222. Opposed wanted status quo.
153	9	0	0	All gear groups and areas should be open. See Prop #157
154	No Action			All gear groups and areas should be open. See Prop. #157
155	No Action			
156	No Action			
157	9	0	0	This proposal does allow adaptive abundance base management as directed by the SSFP 5 AAC 39,222

VOTER RECORD/COMMENTS

Advisory Committee: Central Peninsula

Date: Oct-NOV Page 25 of 44 Proposal Packet UCI

Use this form to record the votes and comments of members regarding Board of Fisheries and Board of Game proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a particular proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary for the committee to spend time on that proposal, just write "no action" in the Abstain column.

Proposal Number	Yes	No	Abstain	Summary of Discussion about this Proposal
163	0	9	0	This closes a traditional drift area that has been used by drifters since drifting started. No reason for regulation of area closer. Should be done by EO if needed. Drifters only catch 30% of Susitna sockeye. Area is needed to comply with SSFP 5AAC 39,222
164	0	9	0	Micro manages the Dept. Doesn't allow compliance with SSFP 5 AAC 39,222
165	0	9	0	This proposal does not allow adaptive abundance base management as directed by the SSFP 5 AAC 39,222. This fishery has a small harvest but is important to the fishermen who participate. High quality and high price. Direct market. No conservation concern on Coho. Plenty of Coho for all users. Only 10 to 20% exploitation on West side. Commercial catch is insignificant to total Coho return. Doesn't comply with SSFP 5AAC 39,222

VOTER RECORD/COMMENTS

Advisory Committee: Central Peninsula

Date: OCT-NO, Page 26 of 44 Proposal Packet UCI

Use this form to record the votes and comments of members regarding Board of Fisheries and Board of Game proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a particular proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary for the committee to spend time on that proposal, just write "no action" in the Abstain column.

Proposal Number	Yes	No	Abstain	Summary of Discussion about this Proposal
166	9	0	0	Windows and other mandatory restrictions don't work. They just lead to over-escapement. This proposal would allow more adaptive based management as directed by SSFP 5 AAC 39.222
167	9	0	0	This simplifies plans and clarifies board intent. Complies with SSFP 5 AAC 39.222.
168	NO ACTION			See #166
169	0	9	0	This plan would not comply with SSFP 5 AAC 39.222. It also would not work and would only contribute to overescapement and waste the harvestable surplus by impeding the Department from achieving the escapement goal.
170	0	9	0	Should be manage by EO not regulation.

A/C Comment# 8

VOTER RECORD/COMMENTS

Advisory Committee: Central Peninsula

Date: OCT-NOV Page 27 of 44 Proposal Packet UCI

Use this form to record the votes and comments of members regarding Board of Fisheries and Board of Game proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a particular proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary for the committee to spend time on that proposal, just write "no action" in the Abstain column.

Proposal Number	Yes	No	Abstain	Summary of Discussion about this Proposal
171	8	1	0	Move for consistency
172	9	0	0	The Kaslof River Special Harvest Area should be in the managers box of tools to harvest surplus and keep from overescapement.
173	9	0	0	See #172
174	0	9	0	See #172
Nov. 12 meeting ↓				
175	0	10	0	No concerns for conservation No conservation concerns for Kaslof Kings, Kaslof Kings are healthy.
176	0	10	0	His numbers are wrong. Windows cause gross overescapement. Does not comply with SSFP 5 AAC 39.222
177	10	0	0	This proposal does allow adaptive abundance base management as directed by the SSFP 5 AAC 39.222

VOTER RECORD/COMMENTS

Advisory Committee: Central Peninsula

Date: Oct-NOV Page 28 of 44 Proposal Packet UCI

Use this form to record the votes and comments of members regarding Board of Fisheries and Board of Game proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a particular proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary for the committee to spend time on that proposal, just write "no action" in the Abstain column.

Proposal Number	Yes	No	Abstain	Summary of Discussion about this Proposal
178	0	10	0	Kasilof sockeye run is spawning limited. We support the Departments escapement goal of 150,000 to 250,000. Kings are healthy.
179	0	10	0	See #178
180	10	0	0	Let area biologist manage biologically in accordance with SSFP 5AAC 39,222. and have the flexibility to manage. Lower goals are met. There has been gross overescapement in both rivers.
181	2	7	1	Leave as is. Current distances are working and the farthest for this small area. Don't go down the road of changing the gear areas. because it will be a never ending road. Best to catch fish in all areas and only use terminal when needed.
182	0	10	0	Can do already by FO. Leave as is.

VOTER RECORD/COMMENTS

Advisory Committee: Central Peninsula

Date: Oct-Nov Page 29 of 44 Proposal Packet UCI

Use this form to record the votes and comments of members regarding Board of Fisheries and Board of Game proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a particular proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary for the committee to spend time on that proposal, just write "no action" in the Abstain column.

Proposal Number	Yes	No	Abstain	Summary of Discussion about this Proposal
183	0	10	0	Leave as is. See SSFP 5AAC.39,222
184	0	10	0	Leave as is. See #181 justification
185	Amended 10	0	0 ^{on amendment}	Amendment: When the terminal area is going to be open the Dept. may open the beach within 1/2 mile from shore and will not count as fishing time against windows and the time doesn't count during windows. This will give more room and catches more of the highest harvestable surplus which is the whole objective of the terminal. Better solution than changing set & drift areas within the terminal area in prior proposals.
	10	0	0 ^{on amended proposal}	
186	No Action			See #181

VOTER RECORD/COMMENTS

Advisory Committee: Central Peninsula

Date: Oct-Nov Page 32 of 44 Proposal Packet UCI

Use this form to record the votes and comments of members regarding Board of Fisheries and Board of Game proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a particular proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary for the committee to spend time on that proposal, just write "no action" in the Abstain column.

Proposal Number	Yes	No	Abstain	Summary of Discussion about this Proposal
208	0	10	0	Creates waste and bigger in River problems.
209	0	10	0	Terminal harvest area would open to soon
210	3	7	0	Too hard to determine what would be 50% out in the inlet.
211				No action see # 212
212	10	0	0	Dip netting does not have priority. Kenai sockeye plan says commercial fishing has priority. Dip netting is a new fishery formed on an already fully allocated stock. Should only be on uncaught surplus.
213				No action see # 212
214				
215	0	10	0	The only reason there would be a large surplus of sockeye in the River is because the Commercial fishery is restricted in order to produce the surplus.

A/C Comment# 8

VOTER RECORD/COMMENTS

Advisory Committee: Central Peninsula

Date: Oct-Nov Page 33 of 44 Proposal Packet UCI

Use this form to record the votes and comments of members regarding Board of Fisheries and Board of Game proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a particular proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary for the committee to spend time on that proposal, just write "no action" in the Abstain column.

Proposal Number	Yes	No	Abstain	Summary of Discussion about this Proposal
216	0	10	0	This can be done by E.O. now should allow more openings without windows for commercial fishermen outside of the special harvest area.
217				No action
218	9	1	0	The P.U. Fishing has gotten out of hand. Something must be done.
219				No action
220	10	0	0	a dip net is not a gill net. Look at any dip net on a charter boat.
221	7	3	0	while the majority approved this; the others felt the Board did not have the authority.
222	3	7	0	this would be too hard to enforce
223	0	10	0	This would be too dangerous
224	0	10	0	This is an attempt to reclassify sport fishermen as subsistence
				A/C Comment# 8

VOTER RECORD/COMMENTS

Advisory Committee: Central Peninsula

Date: Oct-Nov Page 35 of 44 Proposal Packet UCI

Use this form to record the votes and comments of members regarding Board of Fisheries and Board of Game proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a particular proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary for the committee to spend time on that proposal, just write "no action" in the Abstain column.

Proposal Number	Yes	No	Abstain	Summary of Discussion about this Proposal
233	0	10	0	too hard to enforce, would cause conflicts in the river.
234	0	6	0	The forecast is down for the Kaslof, not a good time to liberalize bag limit.
235	0	6	0	Not enough known about the stocks. Won't be any enforcement, there is too much air access.
236	6	1	0	This would give kids an opportunity to fish with family
237				No action. see # 236
238	7	0	0	as amended: amendment is: move the clause all the way to Moose River
239	0	7	0	We don't agree
240				No action. See # 241
241	7	0	0	Mortality during Spawning

A/C Comment# 2

VOTER RECORD/COMMENTS

Advisory Committee: Central Peninsula

Date: Oct-Nov, Page 36 of 44 Proposal Packet UCI

Use this form to record the votes and comments of members regarding Board of Fisheries and Board of Game proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a particular proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary for the committee to spend time on that proposal, just write "no action" in the Abstain column.

Proposal Number	Yes	No	Abstain	Summary of Discussion about this Proposal
242	7	0	0	Reduce mortality from people who don't know how to release.
243	3	4	0	Split vote - opposed no votes want to keep a fish.
244	7	0	0	No action all # 243
245	7	0	0	
246	7	0	0	should not anchor in a major spawning area.
247	0	4	0	The larger female are spawners
248	7	0	0	The lake can sustain a higher harvest level.
249	0	4	0	Its not worth the time or effort for one fish. There hasn't been a harvest decrease in the last few years indicating the lake is sustaining itself. Males don't fix here.
250	7	0	0	Good idea to catch more pike
251	7	0	0	catch more pike
252	7	0	0	prevent the spread of pike
				A/C Comment# <u>8</u>

NO reason data to support

VOTER RECORD/COMMENTS

Advisory Committee: Central Peninsula

Date: Oct-Nov Page 37 of 44 Proposal Packet U C J

Use this form to record the votes and comments of members regarding Board of Fisheries and Board of Game proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a particular proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary for the committee to spend time on that proposal, just write "no action" in the Abstain column.

Proposal Number	Yes	No	Abstain	Summary of Discussion about this Proposal
253	0	4	0	Too hard to enforce
254	—	—	—	No action - Fed. Law not State.
255	0	4	0	This makes the regulations more complicated for people to understand. We don't believe the proposer's reasons. Fish are smaller because more big ones are caught.
256	0	4	0	Don't believe that jacks only produce jacks.
257	0	4	0	No scientific evidence to support this.
258	0	4	0	More reporting requirements with this proposal
259	0	4	0	There are no stages in the Kenai River to amount to anything
260	0	4	0	Same as above
261	0	4	0	Need more time to see if slot limit works. Agree with Depart.
262	—	—	—	No action - see # 261

A/C Comment# 8

VOTER RECORD/COMMENTS

Advisory Committee: Central Peninsula

Date: Oct-Nov Page 38 of 44 Proposal Packet U.C.I

Use this form to record the votes and comments of members regarding Board of Fisheries and Board of Game proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a particular proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary for the committee to spend time on that proposal, just write "no action" in the Abstain column.

Proposal Number	Yes	No	Abstain	Summary of Discussion about this Proposal
263	7	0	0	Mainstream spawning kings need more protection. They have not recovered to pre-slot limit days.
264	0	7	0	Don't need to extend this below the bridge.
265	7	0	0	House-keeping
266	0	7	0	Leave this as E.O. authority ^{opposed}
267	0	7	0	This is going backwards. Overhaul of early part of run.
268	7	0	0	This gives more needed protection to the early run of kings
269	6	1	0	The one opposed didn't think many fish are being taken of out of there.
270	0	7	0	This can be done by E.O. and should be done that way.
271				No action - see # 270
272	0	7	0	The dept. sets the escapement goals.

A/C Comment# 8

VOTER RECORD/COMMENTS

Advisory Committee: Central Peninsula

Date: Oct-Nov Page 39 of 44 Proposal Packet UCI

Use this form to record the votes and comments of members regarding Board of Fisheries and Board of Game proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a particular proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary for the committee to spend time on that proposal, just write "no action" in the Abstain column.

Proposal Number	Yes	No	Abstain	Summary of Discussion about this Proposal
273	7	0	0	
273	7	0	0	Management for escapement goal.
274	7	0	0	Managers need flexibility to manage for escapement goals
275				No action - Not legal
276				No action - not legal
277	7	0	0	as amended. amendment is that all people not just non-residents cannot take more than 125 lbs of fish out of state. 5-2-0 on amendment.
278	8	1	0	as amended: amendment:- a socheye hooked other than in the mouth <u>must</u> be retained and fishing is ended when daily bag limit is reached. The one opposed doesn't want any fish snagged kept.
279				
279				No action - all # 280

A/C Comment# 8

VOTER RECORD/COMMENTS

Advisory Committee: _____

Central Peninsular

Date: Oct-Nov, Page 40 of 44

Proposal Packet U.C.T.

Use this form to record the votes and comments of members regarding Board of Fisheries and Board of Game proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a particular proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary for the committee to spend time on that proposal, just write "no action" in the Abstain column.

Proposal Number	Yes	No	Abstain	Summary of Discussion about this Proposal
280	9	0	0	No who who concern so should raise the bag limit.
281				No action see # 280
282	9	0	0	should be able to fish who longer. No who concerns.
283				No action - see # 285
284				No action
285	9	0	0	We support this proposal for drift only.
286				No action - see # 285
287				
288				
289	9	0	0	as amended! The amendment was to make this a year round regulation not just in July - Motara phased out over legs.
290	8	1	0	No action - see # 289 the no vote wanted to vote on this one
291				NO action - see # 289
292				
293				
294				

A/C Comment# 8

VOTER RECORD/COMMENTS

Advisory Committee: Central Peninsular

Date: oct-nov Page 41 of 44 Proposal Packet UCF

Use this form to record the votes and comments of members regarding Board of Fisheries and Board of Game proposals. The boards are particularly interested in hearing the reasons why proposals are supported/opposed. If committee members believe a particular proposal does not pertain to their jurisdiction, it is not necessary for the committee to spend time on that proposal, just write "no action" in the Abstain column.

Proposal Number	Yes	No	Abstain	Summary of Discussion about this Proposal
295				no action - see # 289
296				
297	0	9	0	Windows don't work in salt water or fresh water
298	0	9	0	an enforcement nightmare
299	0	9	0	Need to keep the sanctuary areas. This opens it all.
300				no action - solves nothing
301	0	9	0	we don't agree with this - no good reason
302				no action - no authority, Parks has authority
303	5	4	0	Pretty much a wash
304	5	4	0	a wash again
305	1	8	0	This starts to late
306	0	9	0	unenforceable
307	7	2	0	we prefer this solution to protect resident and unguided anglers.

