



From Sitka AC

12/9/2021

To; Alaska Board of fish and Board Support

There is concern from some members of the public and at least one Sitka AC member, who would like to attend the meeting, about Covid and the upcoming January 2022 BOF meeting in Ketchikan .

This is in light of a large spike in new cases in Ketchikan Gateway Borough recently. As of today, December 8th, active cases for the last 7 days are 80 and 176 in the last 14 days.

The Sitka AC realizes the train might have already left the station but we would strongly urge that the Board of Fish consider postponing the meeting until the risk level goes down.

Board Support is doing an excellent job of mitigating and lessening the danger of exposure to all involved. We truly appreciate their work.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Heather Bauscher".

Heather Bauscher

Chair, Sitka Advisory Committee to ADF&G



Sitka, Alaska, Dec 15, 2021

Dear Commissioner Doug Vincent-Lang,

The Sitka Fish & Game Advisory Committee would like to communicate our extreme frustration and disappointment with the lack of ADF&G staff comments on 2020/21 Board of Fisheries proposals until Dec.13 for Commercial and subsistence proposals and sport fish proposals still not available on Dec. 15 2021. We understand regional staff comments were submitted by early October and they expected the comments to be available at the latest by mid to late October. The fact that these official written comments were unavailable to committee members and the public has made our and local staff jobs much more difficult and time consuming as we tried to understand the proposals without the "official"written staff analysis and positions.

While local and regional staff have done a superb job of doing their best to inform and advise us while dancing a difficult line without revealing "unapproved" analysis and positions, it is not the same as the committee having the written staff analysis and positions the BOF will have when considering the proposals. In effect ADF&G leaders have compromised the public, their staff, their advisory committees, and the Board of Fisheries by their negligence in getting these comments approved and out to us in a timely fashion so we could make the most informed comments.

Nevertheless we have done the best we could through numerous meetings and hours of testimony and discussion with staff and public to best advise the department and BOF.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Heather A. Bauscher".

Heather Bauscher
Chair, Sitka Fish & Game Advisory Committee.



To: Alaska Board of Fish
From :Sitka Advisory Committee
12/ 20 / 2021

Comments to Board of Fish on : Draft Northern Southeast Alaska King Salmon Stock Status and Action Plan RC6. For the Board's consideration.

The Chilkat and King Salmon River King Salmon Stock Status and Action Plan and the Unuk River King Salmon Stock Status and Action Plan brought on major changes in sport and commercial fisheries regionwide. In the Sitka area trollers were the most affected gear group. The Plan has succeeded in reducing the harvest of SOC King Salmon by the troll fleet to a great extent. It allows harvest of returning hatchery king salmon produced by Northern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association (based in Sitka.) During the trollers' spring hatchery access openings there is a low proportion of SOC king salmon in the catch.

The Sitka AC supports the goals of the 2018 Action Plans in the rebuilding of SOC and believes actions taken will help ensure the long-term viability of the SOC. We strongly support the Status Quo option for the Northern Southeast Alaska King Salmon Stock and Action plan RC6. The Sitka AC encourages the Board of Fish to take no further actions for the Sport fishery or Troll fishery around Sitka and it's adjacent outside coastal waters. If needed ADFG has EO authority in place if in-season actions are merited to protect SOC.

The current Action Plan should also protect the Taku River king salmon that appears to be heading toward a SOC designation .This is because of the similar migration patterns on Taku spawners as the timing of the Chilkat river, King Salmon river and the Unuk river spawners.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Heather Bauscher".

Heather Bauscher
Chair, Sitka Advisory Committee to ADF&G



To: Alaska Board of Fish
From :Sitka Advisory Committee
12/ 20 / 2021

Comments to Board of Fish on : Draft Northern Southeast Alaska King Salmon Stock Status and Action Plan RC6. For the Board's consideration.

The Chilkat and King Salmon River King Salmon Stock Status and Action Plan and the Unuk River King Salmon Stock Status and Action Plan brought on major changes in sport and commercial fisheries regionwide. In the Sitka area trollers were the most affected gear group. The Plan has succeeded in reducing the harvest of SOC King Salmon by the troll fleet to a great extent. It allows harvest of returning hatchery king salmon produced by Northern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association (based in Sitka.) During the trollers' spring hatchery access openings there is a low proportion of SOC king salmon in the catch.

The Sitka AC supports the goals of the 2018 Action Plans in the rebuilding of SOC and believes actions taken will help ensure the long-term viability of the SOC. We strongly support the Status Quo option for the Northern Southeast Alaska King Salmon Stock and Action plan RC6. The Sitka AC encourages the Board of Fish to take no further actions for the Sport fishery or Troll fishery around Sitka and it's adjacent outside coastal waters. If needed ADFG has EO authority in place if in-season actions are merited to protect SOC.

The current Action Plan should also protect the Taku River king salmon that appears to be heading toward a SOC designation .This is because of the similar migration patterns on Taku spawners as the timing of the Chilkat river, King Salmon river and the Unuk river spawners.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Heather Bauscher".

Heather Bauscher
Chair, Sitka Advisory Committee to ADF&G



Heather Baucher
Steve Ramp
Lucas Bastian
Jeff Feldpauch
Karen Johnson
Mo Johnson
Dick Curran
Woody Cyr
John Murray
Aaron Prussian
Tad Fujioka
Eric Jordan
Stacey Wayne sitting in for Andrew as secretary
Joel Markus
Andrew Thoms excused absent
Board support: Annie Bartholomew

Steve Bethune ADFG
Jake Wieleczkiewicz ADFG
Aaron Dupuis ADFG
Troy Tydingco from ADFG
Spencer Chute
Linda Behnken ALFA
Kent Barkau
Jason Jones ADFG,
Anna Laffrey, Erin McKinstry (KCAW)
Tony

Eric Moves to approve minutes from last meeting. Tad seconds
All vote to approve minutes as written
Open nominations for hunting and charter seats.
Spencer Chute is wanting to join as the charter seat.
Eric moves to close nominations Stacey seconds
Luke Bastian nominates Spencer and Karen Johnson seconds. All are in favor of Spencer as the new charter seat.
Tad nominates Kent Barkau to the hunting seat. Eric seconds. Kent accepts the nomination.
Stacey moves to close nominations for the hunting seat. Steve seconds. All are in favor of Kent Barkau for the hunting seat
Annie Bartholomew reports: Boards of fish and game met and the board of game decided to move their 2021 meetings to 2022.. Board of fish is going to compress all of this years meeting into the fall/winter/or spring of 2021/2022



Submit comments by March 2.

Steve moves that we resubmit our request to move the meetings to January. Tad seconds. Motion passes unanimously.

Steve moves to remove the shellfish proposals from tonight's discussion. Kent seconds. Eric calls the question. 8 in favor 1 opposed

Stacey moves to approve the agenda as amended. Steve seconds. All are in favor. Tad Moves to meet in a week Eric seconds. We will take up shellfish and any groundfish proposals that we would like Rhea to address. Motion passes unanimously. Eric suggests having a herring meeting and a salmon meeting later in March to allow staff the opportunity to explain the plan.

Proposal 215 Aligning sablefish season with federal sablefish. Stock assessment happens in the summer and so it would not work

John Murray calls the question

15 vote to oppose proposal 215.

John Murray moves to approve proposal 216. Dick Curran seconds.

Tad comments that processors would not be in favor. Vote 14 opposed one abstention, 0 opposed.

Proposal number 217. John Murray motions no comment and Eric seconds. 15 in support of "no comment".

Proposal 218 John Murray moves to support and Steve seconds. Comment it just seems to be a way to keep track of who is fishing where. Dick comments that it seems like a reasonable requirement.

John Murray calls the question. Vote is 15 in support and 0 opposed.

Eric moves to support Proposal 219 and Dick seconds. Dick Curran is in support of 219 as a good way to keep a more accurate count of catch. Linda from ALFA is in support. 15 in support none opposed.

Dick moves to adopt 220. John seconds. The proposal is to allow pots in Chatham. Dick recalls from the last cycle: "that the Board Of Fish does not have the authority to make this change. CFEC or State or the only entities that have the ability to make this kind of regulatory change. You might need the legislature to vote to approve this kind of change after consulting all of the IFQ holders". Linda Behkin: ALFA opposes this proposal. Chatham has a sharp edge and there is likely to be conflict between pot and hook and line to avoid gear conflict. The swift current causes gear to move from where it is set.

Steve calls the question. 0 in support and 15 opposed

Steve moves to support 221. John seconds. Linda explains that the department did some experiments and found that they need to adjust the size of the escape rings to be effective. Dick supports it.

Eric calls the question and vote to supports is 15 to 0

Mo moves to support 222 and Karen seconds. John asks for clarification if this is only in state waters or in state and federal waters. Linda from ALFA objects to the proposal because it includes Thornyheaded rockfish and those do not have a swim bladder and should be released. Tad moves to amend the proposal to remove the reference to thornyhead. Eric moves we postpone voting until we hear from Rhea, the groundfish biologist. Steve seconds. 15 in support



of tabling. Linda supports being allowed to support thornyhead being released. She believes the benefit of releasing outweighs the benefit of standardizing with the federal regulations.

Woody moves to support 223. John Murray seconds. John and Dick both feel the proposal has merit.

Steve moves to table. 12 in support of tabling . 3 abstain

Proposal 224 allowing rod and reel for personal use rockfish. Troy from the department recommends asking Rhea. Jeff comments that he thought you could keep rockfish if you have a SHARC card and are using sport gear., Troy comments that currently retention is not allowed. Tad comments that shellfishers can use commercial or sport gear for subsistence and he believes you should be able to use sport gear to fish for dinner. Eric comments that you can use a hand line if you want to subsistence fish for rockfish. Luke speaks out in support as does Woody. Steve believes enforcement would have a tough time knowing if someone were sport or subsistence fishing. Luke points out that we already do that with halibut. You fish those either way. Jeff points out that you should have your SHARC card with you. John wants there to be a clear line between sport and subsistence fishing.

Eric moves that we do not comment. Steve seconds 9 in favor of not commenting. 4 opposed. We will not comment.

Tad moves to support 225 to increase limit. Tad points out there is no annual limit for residents. John Murray feels supportive of this proposal. He feels the stocks are healthy and it would give the lodges more to catch. Steve likes that increased catch is abundance based. Tad points out that the proposals are not really abundance based because the threshold for raising is so low. Dick comments that the bag limits have not been raised for a long time he feels the stocks are about the same as when this was put in place. He feels the current bag limits are fair. Jeff wants to know if there is unallocated harvestable black cod? Troy says it is an allocative proposal. Linda says the allocations for sable fish are tight. She does not see a reason to increase given steady abundance. She agrees that this is a one way proposal and would not drop the limit if stocks drop. Troy points out that this proposal could include outside waters. The intent is not clear. Eric objects strongly to this as it is mostly to benefit out of state guides and anglers. Luke comments that it would be more fair to charter if their take would go up with abundance. Steve moves to amend the proposal to say that the limits should be reduced when the stocks go down. John seconds

With added language to reduce the limit by one fish for every decrease of 100,000lbs Linda thinks we should define the waters this proposal applies to. Steve wants Linda to redraft the proposal. She agrees to try.

Eric moves to table until next meeting. Steve seconds.

15 in support of tabling

John moves to approve proposal 226 and Tad seconds. Troy explains that the proposal mirrors the current management scheme. Tad asks if Thornyhead are included in the rockfish category and Troy says they are not. Tad moves to amend the proposal to include Thornyhead. Eric seconds. Tad explains this is a good opportunity to include Thornyheads in the limits. Steve ask the advantage of including Thornyheads. Tad explains they are found at a similar depth and it is not appropriate to not have a limit. Luke wants to know if Thornyhead are a species of concern. Troy says not that he knows. Luke says he is generally against limits if there is not a concern. Tad points out that it is a vulnerable species and there is not directed fishery of them. Steve



speaks out against an amendment. Linda points out that this species is vulnerable and having a limit is important. Jake from the department reports that Thornyheads are not generally caught by sport. 11 in favor of Tad's amendment. 3 opposed.

12 in favor of amended proposal 226 with 3 opposed.

Mo moves to adjourn the meeting. John Murray seconds. Steve calls the question. Eric would like us to adopt a policy to end meetings after 2 to 2.5 hours.



Minutes of Sitka Fish and Game Advisory Committee meeting February 17,2021

Agenda: Continue BoF Groundfish Proposals and begin Shellfish proposals as time allows.

Zoom meeting called to order by Vice Chair Murray at 18:10 after delay related to invalid Zoom links

Board members present:

John Murray -Power troll; Vice Chair
Steve Ramp -Resident sportfish
Luke Bastian -Hunting Guide
Karen Johnson - At large
Mo Johnson -Seine
Dick Curran -Longline
Woody Cyr -Trapping
Aaron Prussian- Hand troll
Tad Fujioka -Processor
Eric Jordan -At large
Stacey Wayne-Shellfish
Kent Barkau- Hunting

Board members absent (all excused):

Spencer Chute- Charter
Heather Bauscher- Alternate; Chair
Joel Markus- Alternate
Jeff Feldpauch-Subsistence
Andrew Thoms-Conservation; Secretary

ADFG staff present:

Annie Bartholomew (Board support)
Andrew Olson
Jake Wieliczkiwicz
Jacob Metzger
Troy Tydingco
Aaron Dupuis
Jason Jones

Other attendees:

Linda Behnken (ALFA)
Forrest Braden (SEAGO)

- Tad Fujioka volunteered to take minutes in the absence of Secretary Thoms
- Stacy Wayne volunteered to control screen sharing to display the proposals under discussion

Approval of minutes:

- M/S to approve minute from Feb 3 meeting as amended, passed w/o objection or discussion

Groundfish Proposals (continued from last meeting):

- M/S to support **Proposal 222** (previously tabled Feb 3) *to require retention of all rockfish and thornyhead in all commercial groundfish and halibut fisheries in SE; proposal AMENDED to exclude thornyhead, passes 12-0*
 - M/S to **Amend Proposal 222 to delete all references to thornyhead rockfish**
 - ADFG clarified that while thornyhead look like a rockfish, they are a different genus, and thus are not included in the current definition of “rockfish”
 - Clarified that the amendment would mean that bycatch thornyhead in excess of bycatch limits could be released, but the other rockfish would still have to be retained
 - ADFG indicated that they would support the proposal (which they sponsored) with or with thornyhead; Their intent was to have state regs match federal regs.
 - Thornyhead do not “blowup” when raised to surface, and thus can be released to swim back down. Most other rockfish will float if released so mandatory retention means that bycatch in excess of bycatch limits isn't wasted and is accounted for. However since thornyhead can survive release, it makes sense to let them go.
 - Unlikely that this would be an issue since thornyhead and rockfish are aggregated towards a common bycatch limit and thornyhead are worth more than most rockfish species, so fishermen would generally keep all their thornyhead anyway until they reach the combined



- bycatch limit.
- **Amendment passed 12-0**; question called on amended proposal
 - M/S to support **Proposal 223** (previously tabled Feb 3) to *require escape rings with 3-3/4" minimum diameter in P/U and subsistence blackcod pots*; **Proposal passes 12-0**
 - ADFG explained that the proposal was intended to pair with proposal 221 for commercial pots to create uniform escape ring requirements for P/U, subsistence and commercial blackcod pots; explained the 3-1/2" is what the Canadian fishery requires, 4" is the current requirement in SSEI fishery. ADFG did some experiments and found 3-3/4" to be the best compromise.
 - ADFG further clarified that the proposal's 3-3/4" size is a minimum. If somebody wanted to use 4" rings, that would be legal.
 - (To ADFG) What age sablefish are able to escape from a 3-3/4" ring?
 - ADFG: (in response) No sure about age, but fish up to about 3 pounds can get out of a 3-3/4" escape ring.
 - ALFA supports the proposal. The small fish are worth more in the water where they can grow up.
 - M/S to support **Proposal 225** (previously tabled Feb 3) to *increase sport blackcod limits as abundance increases*; proposal **AMENDED to specify that limits can go down as well as up, and should change in proportion to the change in AHO from 1.1M lbs baseline, passes 9-3**
 - ADFG clarified that the original proposal does not intend to impose an annual limit on residents and that the proposal would affect bag limits in entire SE region, that ADFG's only survey in in northern inside, hence the use of that survey to represent entire region
 - M/S to **Amend Proposal 225 to instead increase or decrease the regional bag limits and non-resident annual limits for sablefish by 25% or 50% when the Northern Southeast Inside (NSEI) Allowable Harvest Objective (AHO) has increased or decreased by 25% or 50% from 1.1M lbs, with the limits to be effective in the calendar year following the AHO determination.**
 - The 1.1M lb baseline used in the amendment is a more appropriate than the original proposal's 1.0M because the AHO was 1.1M when the existing bag limit was imposed.
 - The amendment is better than the original proposal because the original proposal didn't have a provision for limits to go down when abundance went down. An abundance-based harvest strategy needs to adjust in both directions.
 - The 25% and 50% increments are appropriate triggers. The AHO has been as low as 600,000 pounds (almost 50% below the 1.1M lbs baseline).
 - The AHO has historically been as high as 4.7M lbs, thus the current AHO of 1.1M indicates that the blackcod population is still relatively low. Hence makes sense to keep things conservative.
 - The current 8-fish annual limit is already quite generous. This amended proposal would allow for an annual limit of 12. That's too many! I'm opposed to limits that high.
 - **Amendment passes 11-1**; discussion on amended motion continues...
 - Opposed to allowing electric reels for sport blackcod fishing. Electric reels should be limited to commercial or possibly PU/subsistence
 - (response to above) Electric reels are legitimate sport gear- common in swordfish fishing
 - (rebuttal to above) I've caught swordfish and blackcod on conventional reels- You don't need electric reels for either!



- M/S to support **Proposal 227** to *set region-wide sport non-pelagic rockfish limit at 1/day 2 in possession, no yelloweye*; **motion fails 0-12**
 - ADFG explains that in 2020 they closed Demersal Shelf Rockfish (DSR) sport fishery for entire year in whole region but allowed 1 slope rockfish/day. They have been reducing the limits/seasons on DSR for many years. Slope rockfish accounted for about 14% of the non-pelagic rockfish harvest.
 - When sport demand for a resource exceeds the available allocation to the degree that it does for DSR, it is appropriate that resident harvest be prioritized over nonresident. The resident sport fishery is a quasi-subsistence fishery in that the harvest is utilized in very similar ways. Hence, for all of the good reasons that subsistence fisheries have mandated priority, this resident sport fishery should also be prioritized. This proposal does not do that. The proposal's bag limits are too high for non-residents and too low for residents.
 - ADFG further explained that in the outside waters the sport restrictions were being driven by needed to stay within the sport allocation. The allocation was less of a restriction on inside waters. But that there was a general conservation concerns for DSR region-wide. There was no directed commercial or PU fishery on DSR or slope rockfish in 2020 and the commercial bycatch allowance is 10% of the weight of the target species with most of the commercial DSR bycatch occurring in the halibut fishery.
 - ALFA has longstanding concern for DSR due to their longevity and slow maturity. ALFA members report their rockfish bycatch rates to ALFA so that they can let other fishermen know about the location of "hotspots" and avoid areas with concentrated rockfish. ALFA's fishermen have also collected high-resolution bathymetric data to be shared so that rockfish habitat can be avoided. These measures help to keep the DSR bycatch in the halibut fishery within the 10% allowance.
 - DSR bycatch in the lingcod dinglebar fishery was minimized once the fishermen started using bigger lures, but it took some time for the fleet to realize the advantages of the larger jigs.
 - (to ADFG) What about non-yelloweye DSR? Is there specific concern for those species? Quillback seem pretty abundant.
 - ADFG: (in response to above): The DSR complex is managed in aggregate because there is so much overlap of habitat. Our conservation concern inherently covers all of the DSR species.
 - (Follow up) What if we didn't manage them all together? While the habitats have quite a bit of overlap, there plenty of areas that don't overlap too. For instance, quillback are found both deeper and shallower than yelloweye.
 - Currently ADFG has a lot of flexibility to manage by EO. This might restrict their ability to continue to do so.
- M/S to support **Proposal 228** to *set SSEI sport non-pelagic rockfish limit at 1/day 1 in possession, no yelloweye*; **motion fails 0-7-5**
 - This is out of our area. We shouldn't be commenting on it. I'm not going to vote on it.
 - (rebuttal) It has implications for us as a precedent.
 - (to ADFG) is it true that ADFG's abundance estimates are based on outside waters only?
 - ADFG (in response): The survey only covers outside waters, but harvest records for both inside and outside are incorporated.
 - This would restrict ADFG's ability to manage by EO. I'm opposed to that.



- M/S to support **Proposal 229** to *increase the CSEO sport lingcod slot limit from 30-35" to 30-45"*; **motion AMENDED to withdraw the proposal passes 12-0**
 - This is a proposal that we sponsored at the request of our former charter representative and chairman who is no longer a member of the AC.
 - ADFG: For simplicity in the past, the Central SE Outside (CSEO) area has had the same regulations as a couple of adjacent areas. The CSEO sport lingcod harvest has been ~30% under the allocation for the past several years. An increase in harvest opportunity is thus warranted for CSEO, but not for all of the other areas managed with CSEO.
 - This would primarily benefit the charter fleet.
 - The resource can support an increase.
 - The current 30-35" slot is so narrow that it is hard to find a lingcod of that size. Many charter clients don't want to bother to target lingcod because of that.
 - For the ones who do target them, you end up sorting through a lot of lingcod before you get one the right size. There is going to be some mortality associated with that. Also increased rockfish bycatch due to the additional fishing effort required to get the right-size lingcod.
 - (to ADFG) Would this proposal limit your ability to manage by EO?
 - ADFG: (in response), Yes; Our plan for 2021 is to decouple the CSEO regulations from the adjacent areas in order to fine tune the slot limits for each area. We expect that the CSEO allocation will be fully harvested with a slot limit of 30"-40", so that's what we intend to allow this summer.
 - (to ADFG) How much over the allocation would you expect to end up if the slot limit was 30-45" as proposed?
 - ADFG: (in response): We would estimate that extending the slot limit up to 45" would result in a harvest that was ~25% over the allocation. Those fish on the upper end of the slot are bigger and they add up fast!
 - This is the first that I have heard about ADFG's plan for 2021 and that a 30-45" slot limit would result in over-harvest. Hence I move that the motion on the floor to support proposal 229 be **amended to say that the Sitka AC withdraws Proposal 229 based on new information that was not available last spring.**
 - **Amendment** was seconded and **carried 12-0** without further debate
- M/S to support **Proposal 230** to *ensure resident DSR limit of at least 3/day including one yelloweye, year-round unless resident sport catch >10% total harvest*; **motion passes 12-0**
 - (to ADFG) how has resident DSR harvest changed over time?
 - ADFG: (in response) Resident harvest has been stable.
 - DSR stock assessments showed a decline around 15 years ago, but have been fairly stable recently. I don't understand why resident sport limits and seasons have continued to become more and more restrictive even as DSR stocks have leveled out.
 - In recognition that the DSR stocks are down by about 40% from historic levels, this proposal would still allow ADFG to use EO to reduce the resident sport limit to about half of the bag limit that is in regulation, but as long as the resident sport catch aren't larger than 10% of the total, it would mandate a year-round resident opportunity. Ten percent is hardly a big ask for a user group that should be prioritized.
 - How much of the local DSR sport harvest is by non-residents? Years ago when the Sitka AC was creating the LAMP to manage halibut we were shocked to learn that 93% of the local halibut was being caught by non-residents!



- Resident DSR was closed all last year! Resident harvest makes up only a small percentage of the total harvest even when it is allowed. That non-resident catch and effort have increased shouldn't be a reason to restrict residents.
- I strongly support this proposal. Denying resident opportunity is WRONG!
- ADFG explains that the proposal is very specific in how it limits ADFG's EO authority, rather than restricting all such EO management.
- This is a good and needed proposal. Thanks to proposer for submitting it.
- As part of a class project, the proposer's 7th grade daughter has written a letter of support for this proposal which the chair has distributed by email. The proposer states that he did not have anything to do with writing the letter and actively discouraged it, to no avail. A copy of the letter follows.

“I’m Alexandra Fujioka and I’m writing in support of proposal 230.

I support proposal 230 because I enjoy rockfish. I’m a resident of Sitka who has gone fishing many times as a kid. We went rockfish jigging recently in 2021 and I work on my dad’s commercial salmon troller, the FV Sakura. We jigged for a while and caught one rockfish. We had to let it go. I was looking forward to a rockfish dinner. I’m upset at the 2020 closing of the demersal shelf rockfish, as I’m a person who enjoys consumption of rockfish. Some reasons to support Proposal 230:

**This allows residents to keep more types of rockfish for food*

**Residents don’t catch as many rockfish as the nonresidents do in total number of fish numbers because of all the tourists that try to catch rockfish in Sitka.*

**Yellow eye rockfish are the most highly prized species of rockfish. They are very good to eat.*

**Because they are vulnerable to overfishing, if anyone should have the opportunity to catch them, it should be the locals. In some areas, subsistence has first priority over all other fisheries. Most residents in Sitka that are sport fishing probably keep the fish for dinner, instead of taxidermying them.*

**Because of the low survival rate of yellow eye when you have to let them go, being stuck with letting them go can result in almost as many deaths. They would go to waste if they ended dying after they have been let go. This way, at least you get to turn them into dinner. Who doesn’t like deep fried rockfish fish and chips?”*

- M/S to support **Proposal 231** to require non-residents who keep a lingcod to record the fish's length on their license; **motion passes 12-0**
 - The intent of this proposal which we have sponsored was to provide a mechanism for enforcing the annual limit. The non-resident limit is supposed to be one fish, but in the rare even that somebody catches a 55” fish they are allowed to keep that one too as a bonus fish. The problem is if somebody has already keep one fish in the slot limit, once that fish has been filleted and frozen back at the lodge, there's nothing to keep the fisherman from keeping a second slot limit-sized fish and claiming that the first fish was a 55” bonus fish.
 - ADFG: it is very rare to see a lingcod over 55”. In the last 5 years, the creel census has seen 2 of them.
 - There's no place on the fishing license to write the length
 - (response) Sport licenses are now purchased on-line and printed out. It would be easy enough for ADFG to change the license format.
 - SEAGO executive director: No problem on recording. The change could be built into the charter boat's elogbook software.



End of Groundfish proposals; begin shellfish proposals:

- M/S to support **Proposal 170** to *establish a C&T finding for all intertidal plants and shellfish*; **motion tabled**
 - **Move to table until subsistence rep is available, passed without objection**
- M/S to support **Proposal 172** to *change start of commercial shrimp season from Oct 1 to May 15* and take **No Action on Proposals 171 & 174** due to similarities to 170; **Motion passed as AMENDED to change closing date of “Feb 30” to “End of February” 11-1**
 - Proposal 170 is our proposal that was created and endorsed unanimously by the Working Group that we put together last spring. The specific opening date of May 15 is expected to be the most highly contested part. It was recommended to the Working Group by ADFG's Quinn Smith. If the season opens too soon after spawning the shrimp meat will be soft. If it opens too late, many of them will have already died due to rigors of molting/mating.
 - I like the process by which this proposal was developed. If you get a consensus of stakeholders you've done the hard work.
 - Harvest is down by several 100,000 pounds compared to early 2000's: 569,000 lbs in 2016-17 compared to over 1M lbs back then. Smaller quotas mean that the season has gotten shorter. It is now short enough to fit in between the spring spawn and the beginning of salmon season. Previously, the season was too long to fit in that window and since most shrimpers consider the shrimp fishery to be secondary to their salmon fishing they wanted a fall fishery. These days, the great majority of the shrimp harvest occurs in the first week of the season.
 - That's a big drop in production! (To ADFG) Is this a conservation concern?
 - ADFG (in response): The areas south of Sumner Strait are just fine, but much of the area north of Sumner Strait- including the local Sitka area are having problems. The Hoonah Sound fishery in District 13C has been declining ever since it was opened. It didn't open at all last year.
 - ADFG: There were similar proposals in the 2018 cycle. The department supported the change then, and in all likelihood will support the change this time too. However, the department can manage a sustainable fishery in spring or fall.
 - A spring fishery would allow for utilization of more current survey data. The survey occurs in the fall, but the data doesn't get compiled in time to be utilized in the fall fishery, so quotas are set on one year old data. If the fishery were in the spring, the most recent fall survey data could be used.
 - (To ADFG) Would the GHLL be adjusted to recognize that once shrimp have spawned, the weight of their eggs is not longer part of the harvest?
 - ADFG (in response) not sure about an egg weight adjustment, but we do currently adjust for molting.
 - How does Canada manage their stocks? Can we do what they do?
 - (response to above) The Canadian fishery is much larger. They dedicate more resources towards management. They use in-season male:female ratios. Their method works well for them, but I don't think that we can do the same.
 - I talked to several shrimpers about this. They were split. Some said, that it's a “No brainer” to avoid the time of year when they are carrying eggs. Others said, that the shrimp are harder to find in the spring. The season might take too long.
 - (In response to above) It might take some exploration, but they'll learn how to catch them in



the spring! It might just take them a couple of seasons to figure it out.

- Some of the shrimp markets don't want the eggs. It is harder to sell shrimp with eggs than those without.
- (Hunting guide representative) The spring Brown Bear hunting season ends May 20 in inside areas near where most of the shrimping occurs; locally that's Hoonah Sound. Having a bunch of shrimp boats in the area will spook the bears during the last week of the season, which at least now is also the best week for hunting. We should push the start date off until May 21.
- (In response) The May 15 date was identified by ADFG's Quinn Smith as the best date for quality. Opening any later increases the likelihood that the shrimp season will run into the salmon season. Many shrimpers also gillnet, and the gillnet season opens June 1 in hatchery terminal areas.
- (questioning above) Sure the hatchery season opens, June 1, but how many kings do you really catch? Isn't it just a warm-up for the real season?
- (Gillnetter, in response to above) The 2020 chum season was exceptionally bad, but the spring kings made up about half of my income this year. These spring hatchery openers are important! I don't think that I would bother to go shrimping if it was just ten days before my first gillnet opening since I would only have a week or so to shrimp because I would need time to change the boat over to gillnetting. Whereas if the season opened on May 15th, that would be twice as long of a season. That would be worthwhile.
- Sound like May 15 would work for outside areas, and areas without bear hunting, but Hoonah Sound is a major shrimp location and a major bear hunting area. The Hoonah Sound shrimp season is very short. Could it be designated as an exclusive area and open on the 21th while the rest of the region opened on the 15th, with a rule that if you fish anywhere else before the 21th you aren't allowed to fish Hoonah Sound?
- (ADFG in response) That could work for Hoonah Sound. We wouldn't want to delay Hoonah Sound opener without exclusive designation because there would be too much effort, but might work as an exclusive area
- (Hunting guide representative, in response) Actually, most of the region's shrimp harvest are from areas that close to bear hunting on May 20. I just gave Hoonah Sound as a local example.
- I support the process of the Working Group. We shouldn't change their recommendation without their approval.
- We can support this proposal as written and let the BoF sort out the opening date. I'm sure that they will get plenty of comments on it!
- Start date aside, I would like to change the ending date. The current ending date of the secondary season is February 30. That's not a valid date. **Move to amend changing “February 30” to “end of February”**. “End of February” rather than “February 28” avoids any issue with leap years.
 - Amendment seconded and carried unanimously without discussion; Question called on amended motion

Other business:

- Eric Jordan presented a map showing proposed expansion of the Goddard spring troll area. It included some of the water that used to be within the Biorka spring area that has not been opened recently.
- Tad Fujioka: (response to Jordan) The Biorka area developed a reputation for having low Alaska hatchery percentages and that's why it hasn't been opened recently. But that is not a fair



characterization of the Biorka harvest. The most recent years that it was open were years with very high coast-wide abundance of non-Alaska hatchery fish, and this drove the hatchery percentages down in all of the Sitka districts, not just Biorka. Compared to the other districts in the same years, the Biorka percentages were pretty similar.

- Next AC meeting to be February 24th.
- Meeting adjourned at 9:04 PM



Minutes of Sitka Fish and Game Advisory Committee meeting February 24,2021

Agenda: BOF proposals Shrimp and Miscellaneous, and shellfish proposals (170, 173 -213)

Notice of Proposed Changes in the Regulations of the Alaska Board of Game

Notice of Proposed Changes on Southeastern Alaska Commercial Salmon Fishing Regulations of the Alaska Board of Fisheries

Notice of Proposed Changes in the Regulations of the Alaska Board of Fisheries

Other Business

Zoom meeting called to order by Vice Chair Murray

Board members present:

John Murray- Power troll; Vice Chair

Luke Bastian- Hunting Guide

Mo Johnson- Seine

Woody Cyr- Trapping

Tad Fujioka- Processor

Stacey Wayne- Shellfish

Spencer Chute- Charter

Steve Ramp- Resident sportfish

Karen Johnson- At large

Dick Curran- Longline

Aaron Prussian- Hand troll

Eric Jordan- At large

Kent Barkau- Hunting

Jeff Feldpaush- Subsistence

Other attendees:

Taylor White (Guest),

Department staff present:

Annie Bartholomew (Board Support)

Aaron Dupuis

Jake Wieliczkiwicz

Jason Jones

Lauren Sill

Troy Tydinco

Board members absent (all excused):

Andrew Thoms- Conservation; Secretary

Joel Markus- Alternate

Heather Bauscher- Alternate; Chair

- Luke Bastian volunteered to take minutes in the absence of Secretary Thoms
- Stacy Wayne volunteered to control screen sharing to display the proposals under discussion

Approval of minutes: M/S to approve minute from Feb 3 meeting, Tad will modify as agreed, passed w/o objection



Approve Agenda: amended to start with members of the public to be heard w/o objection

Taylor White asked for a letter of support from the committee to assist in applying for funding for further Pinto Abalone research to fill current and historic gaps in information on harvested pinto abalone and sea otter populations in Sitka Sound using models developed with quantitative surveys, local interviews, and Traditional Ecological Knowledge.

- Eric moves committee write letter of support, volunteers to write letter with Taylor's assistance
- Tad seconds
- Stacey voices support
- Steve hasn't seen letter previously forwarded, still supports
- Kent also hasn't seen previously forwarded letter, still sports
- John is in support, willing to assist
- Eric will present draft letter to board at next meeting

Question is called, vote is 14-0 in support

M/A to consider **Proposal 170**

- Lauren Sill- gives overview of proposal, which would create a new regulatory category of "Beach Seafood" and grant customary and traditional preference, Local area 13 is already C/T for most listed species
- Kent- SE RAC doing something similar covering anything harvested for subsistence; Ketchikan is a non-subsistence area, special permits required.-in support
- John Murray- some of the language is concerning
- Steve- will this effect established bag limits and the departments ability to manage
- Lauren- F&G can still manage, if there is a shortage there is already a subsistence priority. Proposal would combine all of SE except non-subsistence areas. Most substance communities already have c/t finding. Additional harvest possible but not likely. No change to Juneau and Ketchikan areas.
- Steve- if no effect in Ketchikan area, why did they write the proposal?
- Lauren- not sure, SE RAC moving towards lumping together all SE areas outside of non-subsistence areas.
- Mo- asks if listed species already have c/t finding in area 13
- Lauren- area 13 is well covered, seaweed harvest is not covered by BOF
- Eric- asks if this would change determination in Sitka for geoducks and seaweed?
- Lauren-geoducks may not be included in "Beach Seafood"
- Jeff- locally the geoduck fishery is small, geoducks may not be included since they are generally subtidal
- Tad- the title "Beach Seafood" leaves room for misunderstanding, is there a precedent for the term "Beach Seafood"?
- Lauren- the board does look at harvest methods when considering c/t finding
- Steve- should add language "include all beach seafood" mid paragraph



- Eric- asks about definition of intertidal, geoducks sometimes found intertidally, should this be changed to exempt geoducks and seaweed? Asks Annie for direction
- Annie- committee would need to make a motion to support with amendment to exclude geoducks/kelp
- Lauren- the board may appreciate direction concerning geoducks and kelp, though the BOF has no authority over kelp
- Jeff- geoducks should be considered in proposal as harvest is limited by tide, intertidal is self defined, mentions commercial beach asparagus harvest has been kept away from town to allow for subsistence use
- Tad- supports as written, including geoducks and kelp
- Eric- confers to Jeff and Tad, supports as written wants minutes to reflect that committee considered amending proposal then decided to leave as-is
- Stacey- defers to Jeff, sees no effect on other users
- Steve- agrees not to amend at this time and let the board figure it out
- Tad- wanted to point out that dungies are not included in proposal though they are taken intertidally in some places

Motion to support passes 14-0

M/S support **174** as it is time sensitive

- John- proposal would reauthorize antlerless moose hunts that are commonly used by local Sitka residents
- Steve- supports the continued opportunity to hunt antlerless moose
- Kent- hadn't seen the proposal until now
- Luke- voices support
- Tad- proposal sunsets every year, hasn't been an antlerless hunt in Gustavus since 2008, feels 100 permits is too high as long as this is on the books and the department can implement without delay

Motion to support passed 14-0

Steve moves the Sitka AC offers "No Comment" on other BOG proposals to be considered March 18th as they are outside our local area

Seconded

Passes by unanimous consent 14-0

M/S adopt **276** concerning Seine management plan

- Mo- be good to hear from the department on this
- Aaron Dupuis- for Deep Inlet fishery it would roll over gear ratio mix from 2020 to 2021, If we have questions concerning the N Chatham sockeye cap he can take questions and get back to us
- Mo- in support, all 3 parts of the plan are contentious and shouldn't be changed without full board discussion
- Eric- supports Mo's suggestion, there should be no change without full in-person board procedure



- Tad- in support, though N Chatham issue is probably a mute point this season with projected returns, this is a good compromise position for this season
 - Woody- 1 to 1 in Deep Inlet is very reasonable, in support
- Question called, passes 14-0 in support

John asked if there is any interest in discussing Neets Bay/ Carol Inlet/ Anita Bay or SSE issues to be considered- no interest

M/S support additional regulation changes to **Title 5 including 41.005, 41.070, 41.075** to allow department to prevent invasive species

- Steve- supports anything allowing state to limit invasive species
- Stacey- move to table until we all have time to review
- Steve- not an actual proposal, the department is asking for comment, March 14 comment deadline
- Tad- heard that this will not go before the board, just a notice of proposed changes to regulation
- John- seems like we should support to reduce invasive species, time sensitive
- Stacey- withdrawing motion to table since we now have it in front of us
- Steve- lets limit the resolution to consider Items 1(41.005), 2(41.070), and 3(41.075)
- Tad- it should still be legal to import these species to use for food if they are dead
- Steve- 41.070 states "live animals"
- Tad- 41.075 doesn't see where invasive species list is limited to live animals

Question called, passes 14-0

M/S offer No Comment for proposals **171,173,174**

Question called, passes 14-0

M/S take up **175**

- John- doesn't see the problem being addressed, hours are already limited, why slow the fishery further, how would this reduce capture of small shrimp?
- Jeff- looking at last years harvest, most of the districts were over their GHl- will this proposal reduce overage?
- Aaron Dupuis- this would slow the fishery and could reduce overages, the department is mostly neutral
- Steve- how would this slow the fishery?
- Woody- more time pulling line means less pulling pots
- Mo- also more run time between sets
- Tad- asks department if this change would compromise usefulness of CPUE data
- Aaron Dupuis- could cause some issues, the department could probably adjust
- John- what would that do?
- Tad- If the fishery is slowed then some pots will soak longer giving a higher CPUE
- Aaron Dupuis- the value in the CPUE is in consistency, it is used to see long term trends

Question called, motion fails 1-13



M/S offer No Comment on proposals **177-182** as they are out of our area
Question called, passes 14-0

M/S support proposal **183**

- Questions of whether this effects us
 - Aaron Dupuis- in 13C East of Point Elizebeth is a personal use fishery, these pots are popular down south
 - Steve- likely many of these pots have been used by folks who didn't know they weren't legal
 - Aaron Dupuis- there are probably lots of them in the water that people don't know are illegal
 - Tad- clarifies that language concerning rigid pots in paragraph 2 should be in bold as that is the language they wish to add
 - Aaron Dupuis- The regulations were put into effect to reduce unwanted bycatch, somebody would have to look into making sure that this change wouldn't allow more bycatch
 - Tad- In favor
 - Stacey- in support, doesn't see any harm
 - Troy Tydinco- tunnel eye opening and escape hatches are developed together, changing the eye opening without changing escape hatches could allow bycatch to get in but not get out.
 - Steve- why not include subsistence regulations in the change
 - Stacey- not in support if this will increase bycatch
 - Kent- would this make the opening larger than the escape hatch?
 - Troy Tydinco- yes, this would make the entrance larger than the escape hatch
 - Kent- concerning for flat fish that can fit through a 8x2 opening but not a 4x4 opening
- Question called motion fails 4-9 with 1 abstaining

M/S approve proposal **184**

- Tad- proposal was written to have the board clarify an ambiguous situation, urge the board to take the position that sport pots not be longlined
- Troy Tydinco- regulations allow longlining of pots, but it is not addressed in sport regulations, asking board for clarification
- Stacey- asks Troy to clarify that sport fishing in our area is mostly non-residents, how many pots are they allowed, are they fishing them on a single buoy?
- Troy- residents could sport fish shrimp, it is mostly non-residents, the Sound is closed to sport shrimping, Non-residents are allowed 5 pots per person-10 per vessel, residents are allowed 10 pots per person/20 per vessel
- Eric- what is the % of resident vs non-resident shrimp harvest? Are guides taking clients shrimping?
- Troy- doesn't have percentages in front of him, there is guided use
- Stacey- in the year we looked at for the conservation proposal the sport fishery took 10k pounds, commercial took 15k pounds
- Luke- wondering what year the data is from as sport regulations only allow 3 pounds of shrimp per person, surprised to hear that the sport fishery took 10k pounds in the area



- Steve- did 10k pounds from sport include subsistence? Annual sport regulations state no longlining of pots is allowed, are the statutes not clear that the department can disallow longlining of sport pots? If so we should support this proposal, this only effect sport, not subsistence or personal use.
- Stacey- 10k pounds was sport as there was no subsistence data from 2018
- Troy- we just want it to be clear
- Steve- so the department wants to continue to keep the sport shrimp pots from being longlined?
- Troy Tydinco- yes, we have been saying that the sport fishery may not longline pots, but we are out on a limb in doing so
- Steve- in support
- Tad- wants the record to be clear that in the past the department has been opposed to allowing the same gear to be used in sport and subsistence fisheries, to allow longlining of pots in both fisheries would be inconsistent with that precedent, supports motion that sport pots be single set
- John- how does this effect areas outside of area 13?
- Troy Tydinco- the sport fishery is open everywhere
- Stacey- some history on sport fishing of shrimp...most of it is by charter fisherman, creates a lot of conflict in the Prince of Wales area between sport and subsistence users. This is a diminishing resource, users are fighting for the resource which was supposed to be addressed by the smaller sport limits. Agrees that charter should be able to get their clients a taste of shrimp but doesn't want to increase the charter take.
- Jeff- concerned that subsistence could get included
- Aaron Dupuis- there is limited subsistence data from 2018
- Stacey- good subsistence data coming in now
- Steve- moves to support as written and also amend to recommend BOF prevent sport longlining of pots
- Eric- department is remaining neutral
- Tad- amendment is friendly
- Luke- support the proposal, with a 3# sport limit what is the difference whether the pots are longlined or not?

Question called, passes as amended 12-2

M/S take up **185**

- Eric- its our proposal, its been covered
- Karen- is this only for market squid or all squid, it isn't clear?
- Steve- it was intended to be only for market squid
- Eric- moves to amend and insert "Market" before squid

Question called for amendment, passes 14-0

Question called on proposal 185 as amended, passes 14-0

M/S support **186** and amend to add "market" before squid

Question called, passes 14-0



Next meeting to be March 3rd
Meeting adjourned



Sitka Fish and Game Advisory Committee Minutes

03/03/2021 18:00 via Zoom teleconference due to Covid-19

ATTENDEES

Committee Members:

Eric Jordan, John Murray, Spencer Chute, Karen Johnson, Moses Johnson, Steve Ramp, Stacy Wayne, Jeff Feldpaush, Kent Barkau, Woody Cyr, Tad Fujioka, Aaron Prussian.

Department Staff Present: Annie Bartholmew, Jake Wieliczkiwicz, Troy Tydinco, Aaron Dupuis, Joe Stratman.

Other Attend. Taylor White, Anne Beaudreau, Jesse Gordon,

Excused Absences: Lucas Bastian, Andrew Thomas, Heather Bauscher, Joel Markus.

AGENDA

Last Meeting Follow-up

Approved Minutes from Luke last week. Passed without Objection.

New Business

- Dive and Shellfish proposals 187-214
- Review Letter regarding abalone research for Taylor White.
- Other Business

NOTES

- Spencer Chute substitute secretary for taking of minutes.
- Stacy Wayne Volunteered to control screen sharing, along with audio recording for future review of minutes.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Review Letter for Abalone research Taylor White



Eric moved to approve, stacy seconded letter.

No opposition to letter. Motion passes.

Getting Information on abalone out is a good thing.

2. M/A to consider Proposal 187 Holiday Closures for Cucumber Dive Fishery

Steve Motioned, Stacy Seconded.

- Lots of geoduck and sea cucumber divers in Sitka so Ac should weigh in.
- Question to ADFG on Flexibility.
- ADFG explains issues regarding closures due to Processing restraints, low participation.
- Shifting days of week away from historic MON/TUE opening.
- Unclear if proposal adds days to dive week
- Stacy calls to question.

AC Vote: 10-0-2abstain

M/A Proposal 188 Cucumber fishery

- Stacy Moves to Approve, Steve Second.
- Dive Association is a good representation of our local divers.
- 2013,2019 October first fell on second day of dive open. So roll over to following week.
- putting common practice into regulations

Vote: 12-0

M/A Proposal 189

- Stacy motion to Approve, Spencer Second.
- Large Geoduck dive fleet out of Sitka.
- Geoduck limits currently 2 divers per vessel, increasing to 4 divers, ADFG neutral. Localized depletion of geoduck allocated consequences, limit permit holder to 1000lb/ day no vessel cap.
- Could this lead to abuse of sharing quota between divers on boat.
- Allocative consequences, unsure of local dive association stance on this proposals.



- Would this change the vessel cap, small daily limits for fishery.
- How would this proposal affect current regulations.
- No vessel cap like cucumber dive fishery.
- Major concern for sharing quota between divers.

vote:1-10-1(abstain)

Proposal 190 Tad motion to support, Steve Second

- Harvestable surplus but no harvest.limited personal use limits.
- No crab fishery if no crab survey, change to personal use, and allow for personal use. ADFG allocation based red king crab management plan.guide line harvest level. Modify red kc department would open, daily bag limit 3 per person if commercial fishery is open. No survey in hoonah sound, so no red king crab fishery in hoonah sound district 13.
- ADFG:Survey has been done Annually in Ushk bay, Deadman's Reach, Rodman Bay, stock health is poor in those areas. So no personal use opening.
- Proposal encompasses the entire southeast region. This proposal allows for commercial opening on years with smaller amounts of crab abundance.
- Stacy opposes proposal to protect southeast stocks. Limited fishery level would not build to excess of sustainable levels.

Vote:0-12

Proposal 191 Steve motion to Consider, Tad Seconds

- Steve: Cant support because it goes against ADFG data surveys.
- Proposal is asking for historic Guided Harvest Limit(GHL)
-
- Adfg: this proposal seeks to modify management plan, so that commercial fisherman can harvest crab from all areas except section 11a. 5 hour notice on closures due to cpe. Biomass estimated to estimate populations in non surveyed areas. Proposal was addressing budget issues with king crab survey. Department was able to procure funding to survey crab. Much more aggressive fishery.
- AC members hold opposition.



- mo made Motion to Amend and take no action due to continuing survey being done by ADFG. Eric seconded.
- What is foreseen in future budgets for crab survey.
- ADFG: No big hit for FY1, above pay grade and not able to elaborate.

Vote to take no action 3-8-1 abstain

Vote on proposal 191: 0-11-1abstain

Proposal 192,193,194,195 no comment. No objections.

Proposal 196: pot limit for golden king crab to mirror tanner crab pots. Steve Motion to Consider, Eric Second

- Lighten fishing pressure on golden crab
- Improve management level precision. Lots of gear for fishery, boats are small. Closure prediction 3-7 days out, tide, weather, major factors, hard to hit target accuracy for ADFG

Vote 11-0-1 abstain

Proposal 197 no comment

Proposal 198 steve motions to discuss. Spencer Second

- Industry will work out issues on its own.
- Proposal aims to Adopt february 20th start time regardless of tide cycle
- Proposal would be a detriment to small boats
- Currently fishery opens based on Weather delay criteria that can potentially delay start. Based on smallest tides for week of february 10-17.

vote : 0-11-1

Proposal 199, 200 no comment



Prop 201 Tad Motioned to Discuss Stacy second extend commercial crab closed areas to allow better access to personal use and sport crabbing

- Modification GPS coord. On northern boundary from Nesemini Point to favorite anchorage to allow an area for personal use and sport fish but also to not completely push out commercial fisherman in that area.
- Adding 2 miles of good crabbing for personal use/ sport along goose cove/ Deadman's reach, leaving 2 miles open to commercial fishing north of favorite anchorage. Best crabbing is in this area.
- "Luxury fishery with small amounts of meat." Current area is large enough as it is.
- Areas that have good crab are in commercial area
- Not much good crabbing ground below kakul narrows. Hard fishing from Dorothy Narrows to Kakul Narrows.

Vote amended language: 6-4-2abstain

Vote on Proposal as Amended: 6-4-2Abs

Proposal 202-210 no comment

Proposal 211: Tad moves to support. Kent second. repeal and amend sitka sound special use area.

- Current season Oct 1-november 30th open to commercial crabbing proposal wants to add extra season in Sitka Sound Special Use Area(SSSUA).
- combined effort 2840lbs by 3 permits average over 10 years.
- Wants to extend season into february to allow commercial crabbing in SSSUA.
- Marginal crabbing in SSSUA currently, adding to the season would further put strain on crab population and take away from sportfishing/personal use.

Vote: 0-12 oppose



Proposal 212/213 Steve motion for discussion, stacy 2nd.

- Asks to extend pot storage to 7 days in fall season.
- Days are short, weather is poor in most cases. This proposal would help crabbers move gear out of areas in a lawful amount of time.
- Comments :Is there Likely repercussions for staggered closings by extending gear storage from 3 days to 7 days. what is the reason for 3 day gear storage instead of the 5 day or 7 day.
- Stored gear being used for fishing when an area is closed.
- Are there potential enforcement problems in gear storage?
- ADFG: more challenging for troopers to enforce gear storage.
- Weather factors heavily on proposals and requests made year by year depending on if incimate weather has been a factory in getting gear off of the grounds.

Proposal 213 friendly amendment to combine the two proposals together.

Vote on 212&213: 11-0-1 abstain

Proposal 214: round pot designation only to help enforcements Tad moves. Steve Seconds.

- Why is it imperative for a pot to be square.
- ADFG: legal gear definitions refer to a diameter measurement.
- Only legal type of legal pot was a round pot.
- Troopers having issues in commercial fishery with enforcement of legal size of dungeness pot when said pot wasn't round.
- Reason for the proposal is troopers asked ADFG submit to clarify the regulations and make it easier to enforce.
- Not in favor of making guys who already have invested in square pots to get rid of pots to buy all new round pots.

Vote: 4-4-4



Next Meetings Agenda

Brief discussion for next meeting: next wednesday march 10th 2021 6pm

125-142 proposals

Eric proposes to delay meetings until after the board of fish meetings.

Meeting happens 03/08/2021

Consensus is to schedule a meeting for 10th of march and having the ability to cancel meeting until further date.

Vote to meet 3/10: 8-2-1abstain

Meeting schedule passed, meeting set 3/10/2021 18:00

Meeting adjourned. 20:27



Sitka AC

10/21/21

6pm

Present: John, Joel, Kent, Karen Johnson, Eric Jordan, Aaron Prussian, Woody, Tad, Steve, Mo Johnson, Stacey

Quorum is met

Minutes approved

Karen Johnson/Eric Jordan

- There is an opportunity for SAC to provide a NPFMC comment regarding halibut bycatch in the Alaska trawl fisheries
- Express concerns regarding supporting an official comment for the NPFMC
- Reported on mortalities for halibut bycatch in 2021

John Murray/Stacey

- In support and would like to agree on an option for abundance based management (ABM) for halibut

Eric

- Motion: The SAC to NPFMC that we favor reducing halibut bycatch as much as possible as soon as possible. Additionally, we feel that the additional bycatch of salmon, shellfish and sablefish need to be reduced as much as possible as soon as possible.

Stacey

- Agree to have a letter written based on the general motion from Eric.

Motion passes

Tad

- Nominate Heather, Eric, Karen to write the letter with Linda's review to get a draft tomorrow to the AC prior to the October 25th

Kent

- Motion to limit the AC meetings to 2 hours
- Seconded

Motion passes

John

- In person meeting for Board of Fish in the future
- In person meetings with the Sitka AC in the future

Eric

- Motion- The Sitka AC is disappointed that the BoF is hosting an in-person meeting. We request that the BoF postpone the meeting until it is safe to meet in person in light of the



new delta variant. If the BoF is going to host an in person meeting, we request that the staff use mitigation measures to protect the public and staff.

Comments:

Stacey

- Referenced the need to have certain issues discussed at the meeting.

See mitigation plan:

https://www.entangledsealions.adfg.alaska.gov/static/regulations/regprocess/fisheriesboard/pdfs/2021-2022/21_22_bof_bog_mitigation_plan.pdf

Woody

- If the meeting does not take place, we request the BoF define a time that they will be meeting to discuss pressing issues.

Steve

- It has been 4 years since the last meeting. There needs to be a plan to have in-person and remote options to attend the meeting.

Tad

- Traveling to another community involves a different risk factor that should be taken into account.

Eric

- With the discussion around the topic, I will withdraw the motion.

John

- BoG: If Covid-19 prevents a regulatory meeting, they wish to have public comment.

Tad

- Motion: The SAC should meet online until Sitka's Covid 19 levels are below moderate levels and members use mitigation measures to safely meet.
- Second: Stacey

Motion passes

Steve

- Keep the option to meet virtually.

7pm



**Sitka Fish and Game Advisory Committee
October 27th, 2021
Zoom Machine Virtual**

- I. Call to Order: 6:01pm by Heather Bauscher, Sitka AC Board Chair

- II. Roll Call
Members Present: 12

Members Absent (Excused):1
Members Absent (Unexcused):2
Number Needed for Quorum on AC:
List of User Groups Present:

- III. Fish and Game Staff Present:
 - a. Steve Bethune-- Area Game Biologist
 - b. Try Tydingco- Sport Fish
 - c. Jake Wieliczkiewicz-- Sport Fish Biologist
 - d. Mike Vaughn-- Assistant Troll Biologist

- IV. Guests Present:
 - a. Forest Braden-- SE Alaska Guide Association Executive Director
 - b. Katie Rooks
 - c. Seth Bone
 - d. Josh Nelson

- V. Approval of Agenda
John Murray moves to set a hard stop for all Sitka AC meetings at 2.5 hours
Jeff Feldpausch seconds
Vote: unanimous

- VI. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes
 - a. Minutes from the last meeting were not set out. They will be sent out for approval before the next meeting.

- VII. Reports
 - a. Chair's report
 - i. Received communication from board support; meetings can be held in person as per ADFG direction



- ii. meetings won't be held in person unless covid level falls below moderate
- b. Jeff Feldpausch-- reported that No-Thoroughfare Bay Aquaculture Permit granted despite comments opposing it
- c. ADF&G

- i. Steve Bethune

- 1. DEER: Spoke about the meeting of the SE Subsistence RAC met to talk about a variety of proposals on deer hunting from rural communities that submitted proposals around meeting subsistence needs
- 2. BROWN BEAR POPULATION SURVEYS:
 - a. 2013 reconvening of brown bear management team which reaffirmed strategy for unit 4. however, no new population estimate
 - b. Need for research for the state team to do a population estimate for unit 4
 - c. Never been a formal survey for baranof island
 - d. Andrew Thoms moves to write a letter asking for population survey on bears for Baranof Island
 - i. Stacy seconds

Vote: Unanimous

- 3. LOCAL COMMUNITY BEAR PROBLEMS

- a. This year was the biggest problem bear year ever
- b. Would like to reconstitute the bear task force
- c. There are changes that need to be made. Looking for options and creative ideas.
- d. Motion: Move the Sitka F&GAC notify the Sitka City & Borough Assembly that we have a bear problem in Sitka.

We recommend the Assembly work with ADF&G, NPS, and the Sitka Bear working group to consider ordinances or other action to mitigate the problem.

- e.

- i. VOTE: 11 in favor, 1 against



d. Others

VIII. Set next meeting date

IX. Other

X. Adjourn



| Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals | | | |
|---|--|---------------|---|
| January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK | | | |
| Proposal Number | Proposal Description | | |
| Support/Support as amended/Oppose/No Action | Number Support | Number Oppose | Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments |
| <p><i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i></p> | | | |
| 80 | Amend regulation to address payback provisions when the State of Alaska king salmon fisheries exceed Alaska’s annual king salmon all-gear harvest ceiling, as follows: | | |
| Support with Amendment | 11 | 0 | <p>John Murray Moves to Support, Tad Fujioka Seconds</p> <p>Grant Hagerman (ADFG) gave some background on what the proposal does and ADFG’s views on it.</p> <p>Amendment on proposal Board of Fish from Sitka AC: Motion: Include an Amendment stating: Overage should come out of the gear group that created the overage.</p> |
| 81 | Allocate any Alaska all gear-allocation king salmon remaining after September 1 to the commercial troll fishery, as follows: | | |
| Support with Amendment | 12 | 0 | <p>John Murray moves to support Tad seconds</p> <p>Grant Hagerman (ADFG) gave some background on what the proposal does and ADFG’s views on it.</p> <p>Motion and second to amend proposal: Add “The Troll Fishery AND Sport Fish with the current 80/20 split will be able to harvest excess fish” to line 6; Amendment passed unanimously</p> <p>Discussion: *The Subsistence representative pointed out that in the absence of a saltwater Subsistence Chinook fishery, SE residents use the sport fishery to fulfill their subsistence needs. Thus it is appropriate that some of the extra fish be allocated to resident sport fishermen. * Department staff clarified</p> |



| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | that under their interpretation of the proposer’s intent they would only distribute an underage if the all-gear catch was below the all-gear allocation, but would not attempt to distribute extra fish from one gear group’s underage if a different gear group had already over-harvested and taken the 1st group’s underage. |
| 82 | Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to align with the provisions of the 2019–2028 Pacific Salmon Treaty annex, as follows: | | |
| Support with extensive amendments | 12 | 0 | <p>Tad Moves and Eric Seconded to support a modified proposal as follows:</p> <p>1st Amendment to clarify that nonresident sport king fishing opportunity should always be adjusted to ensure that the resident fishery remains open:</p> <p>5 AAC 47.055. Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan...</p> <p>(4) provide stability to the sport fishery by eliminating inseason regulatory changes, except those necessary for conservation purposes or achieving the sport harvest allocation.</p> <p>(5) at Alaska winter troll fishery CPUEs less than 6.0 and equal to or greater than 2.6; a resident bag limit of two king salmon 28 inches or greater in length will be established in areas where conservation management measures for all anglers prohibited king salmon retention or closed fishing for king salmon once they reopen.</p> <p>(6) [at Alaska winter troll fishery CPUEs less than 6.0 and equal to or greater than 2.6; and the department projects that the king salmon sport harvest allocation is going to be exceeded, the department shall, by emergency order, adjust the nonresident seasons and bag limits so to stay within the sport allocation; the department shall prohibit resident king salmon retention or close the resident sport king salmon fishery only if nonresident angler closures are insufficient to remain within the sport fishery allocation.</p> <p>(7) at Alaska winter troll fishery CPUEs less than 2.6 and equal to or greater than 2.0; and] If the department projects that the king salmon sport harvest allocation is going to be exceeded, the department shall, by emergency order, adjust</p> |



| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>the nonresident seasons and bag limits so that there are no closures for residents.</p> <p>2nd Amendment to delete the proposed July 1-July 31 resident closure under (g) (2) that would apply to years when the CPUE is 2.6-3.8:</p> <p>(2) when wild stock management measures are unnecessary:</p> <p>(A) a resident bag limit of one king salmon except from July 1 through July 31 resident anglers may not retain king salmon;</p> <p>(B) a nonresident bag limit of one king salmon except from July 1 through July 31 nonresident anglers may not retain king salmon;</p> <p>(C) from January 1 through June 15, a nonresident total harvest limit is three king salmon, 28 inches or greater in length, a harvest record under 5 AAC 75.006 is required;</p> <p>(D) from June 16 through December 31, a nonresident total harvest limit is one king salmon,</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>*Strong view from one AC member that ADFG shouldn't be making allocation proposals, hence the need for the amended language.</p> <p>*The Processor representative pointed out that in the absence of a saltwater Subsistence Chinook fishery, SE residents use the sport fishery to fulfill their subsistence needs. Thus it is appropriate that priority be given to the resident sport fishery as it is a quasi-subsistence fishery.</p> |
|--|--|---|



| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>* It was pointed out that it would be politically unpalatable for the resident sport fishery to be closed in July when the biggest commercial king fishery is taking place.</p> <p>*A member said that he was found the July resident closure of the original language to be offensive. He was glad that the motion on the table got rid of it.</p> <p>*It was pointed out that with the Taku and Stikine Chinook stocks likely to be listed as Stocks of Concern the wild stock management measures were likely to be in place for the foreseeable future, so we ought to be especially concerned with the aspects of the proposal that address that scenario.</p> <p>*The ADFG Sportfish biologist explained that 2021 was the first year of electronic logbooks for charter guides. This new technology enables the department to keep close tabs on the catch. Thus they can project the seasonal harvest well in advance, and can take inseason management actions well before the sport allocation is in danger of being exceeded.</p> <p>*Troy Tydingco answers questions about proposal and ADFG's perspectives</p> |
| | | | |



Adjournment:

Minutes Recorded By: _____ Andrew Thoms Tad Fujioka _____
Minutes Approved By: _____ Full AC _____
Date: _____ 11/4/21 _____



**Sitka Fish and Game Advisory Committee
November 4, 2021
Zoom**

I. Call to Order: 6:05 pm by Heather Bauscher]

II. Roll Call

Members Present: 11

Members Absent (Excused): 1

Members Absent (Unexcused):5

Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 9

List of User Groups Present:

| |
|---------------------|
| hand troll |
| Subsistence |
| Hunting |
| Seine |
| At Large |
| Power Troll |
| Conservation |
| Processor |
| Resident Sport Fish |
| At Large |
| Trapping |
| Alternate |

III. Fish and Game Staff Present:

- a. Aaron Dupuois-- Area Biologist
- b. Sherry Dressel--Biometrician
- c. Kyle Herbert
- d. Jason Jones
- e.

IV. Guests Present:

- a. Kyle Rosendale, Sitka Tribe of Alaska
- b. Troy Denkinger, Seine fisherman
- c. Matt Kinney Seine Fisherman
- d. Justin Peeler, Sitka Seine Fisherman
- e. Matt Jackson
- f. Kelly Warren Sitka Herring Fisherman
- g. Dale Bartel Sitka Herring Fisherman



- h. Chandler Oconnell
 - i. Jessalyn Former Board of Fish Staff
 - j. Skinney tribal citizen and herring fisherman
 - k. Carlos Schwantes Sitka Herring Fisherman
 - l. Peter Bradley historical researcher on herring fishing
 - m. Maya community member and environmental anthropologist
 - n. Victoria O'connell former ADFG Fisheries Biologist
 - o.
- V. Approval of Agenda
- Eric Jordan moves to change the agenda to take up reconsideration of crab proposals
 - Jeff Feldpausch seconds
- move to approve agenda, all agree.
- VI. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes
- a. John Murray moves to approve minutes from meeting on October 21st, 2021
 - b. Karen Johnson 2nds
- John Murray moves to approve minutes from meeting on October 27th, 2021
Karen Johnson 2nds
- VII. Reports
- a. Chair's report
 - b. ADF&G
 - c. Others
- VIII. Public Comment
- IX. Old Business
- a. Bear Letter-- no one has written yet. we will take up next meeting
 - b. King Salmon-- more proposals to work on
 - c. Justin Peeler is asking us to reconsider action taken on crab proposals that they were not able to be around for when we took up because they were fishing. crabbers didn't feel like they had a chance to speak to proposals.
 - i. Eric moves that we reconsider crab proposals
 - ii. Woody Cyr seconds
 - d. AC decides to re-examine the crab proposal again after we get through all the proposals
- X. New Business



- a. Heather opens with a discussion on how the meeting is going to go
 - b.
- XI. Select representative(s) for board meeting
- XII. Set next meeting date
- a. MONDAY at 6:00pm for continuance of Herring Proposals
- XIII. Other
- XIV.** Adjourn 8:49



| Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals | | | |
|---|----------------------|---------------|---|
| January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK | | | |
| Proposal Number | Proposal Description | | |
| Support/Support as amended/Oppose/No Action | Number Support | Number Oppose | Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments |
| <p><i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i></p> | | | |
| | | | |
| <p>156</p> <p>Oppose 5 in favor 7 Oppose</p> | | | <p>Modify harvest rate control rule for Sitka Sound sac roe herring fishery, as follows:</p> <p>Department Staff Aaron Dupois</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gives overview of proposal • Sherri Dressel was asked when a report on past season’s biomass will come out. She is trying to get it out as soon as she can • Dr. Dressel was asked about the history of the Sitka Sac Roe fishery and how GHM for Sitka was set up. She read from some of the departments history of the fishery management • Tad asked about the theoretical unfished biomass; Dr. Dressel responded that the last unfished biomass analysis was done in 1998 and at that time it was estimated at ~67,000 tons. While the 2021 spawning population estimate has yet to be completed, the current biomass, even after the commercial harvest is known to be well in excess of this number. • Dr. Dressel predicted that the 2022 forecast would be somewhere in the neighborhood of the biomass at which Proposal 156 would provide for the same harvest rate as the current formula. (120,000 tons) Even if the forecast was short of 120,000 tons, it wouldn’t be short by very much, thus the harvest rate would be close to the same as the current formula, but that a small difference in harvest rate could translate to a significant difference in quota when applied to such a large biomass. <p>Kyle Rosendale-- Sitka Tribe of Alaska</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kyle gave presentation on Sitka Tribes Proposals 156, 157, 158 (in AC files) <p>Public Testimony:</p> <p>Matt Jackson spoke in favor.</p> <p>Justin Peeler spoke against.</p> <p>Ben Hughey Spoke in favor.</p> |



Tory OConnell former fish and game fisheries biologist spoke in favor

Peter Bradley Spoke in Favor

Troy Denkinger Spoke against and answered questions from AC members about the fishery and markets.

Committee Discussion:

John Murray asked proposer some questions on a reference

Jeff Feldpauch referenced all the other Sac-Roe Herring Fisheries across Alaska that have failed and asked that Sitka take more conservative approach

Eric Jordan gave some observations on what he has seen in herring population and has noticed herring are moving offshore and not near-shore as before. Thanked everyone for being respectful.

Kent Barkau-- question for Dr. Dressel on survey methodologies and urged caution in management for ocean warming and ocean acidification reasons

Heather Bauscher-- big concern on lack of research and monitoring on this fishery and lack of good data

Moe Johnson--- talks about experience in the ocean winter troll fishing especially. has seen amazing the amount of recruitment of young herring over the last 3 years. Looking out for health of population of herring it looks good for the future. feels that the BOF should come up with an upper limit on sac roe fishery. Would like to see fishermen put a proposal forward with an upper limit.

John Murray-- conflicted on proposal and lack of good information coming from ADFG

A committee member expressed disappointment that the 1998 analysis was still the department's most recent estimate of unfished biomass. Last BoF cycle the committee had been told that a new estimate was underway.

ERIC JORDAN reiterated MOE JOHNSON's comment that there SHOULD BE AN UPPER LIMIT ON HOW MUCH HARVEST CAN OCCUR

Heather Bauscher states that the department needs more resources for collecting data.



| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | | | |
| • | | | |



Adjournment:

Minutes Recorded By: _____ Andrew Thoms _____

Minutes Approved By: _____

Date: _____



**Sitka Fish & Game Advisory Committee
November 8, 2021, continuation of meeting begun November 3, 2021**

Call to Order: 8PM by Chair Bausher Via Zoom

Roll Call

Members Present:

Jeff Feldpauch Subsistence
Kent Barkau Hunting
Moe Johnson Seine
Karen Johnson At Large
John Murray Power Troll
Tad Fujioka Processor
Steve Ramp Resident Sport Fish
Eric Jordan At Large
Heather Bauscher Alternate

Members Absent (Excused): Aaron Prussian hand troll, Dick Curran Longline, Andrew Thoms Conservation,

Members Absent (Unexcused): Spencer Chute Charter, Woody Cyr Trapping, Luke Bastain Guide, Joel Markis Alternate, Stacy Wayne Shellfish

Number Needed for Quorum on AC:7; quorum established

Fish and Game Staff Present: Kyle Hebert, Jason Jones, Sherri Dressel,

Guests Present: Anna Laffrey, Paulette Moreno (ANS Exc Com member) , Chandler O'Connell, Peter Bradley, Andy Erickson, Chuck, Lee House, Matt Jackson (subsistence, PU, hunter/fisherman), Dave, Al Stavmount, Johnny and Emily, Justin Peeler (Sitka herring seiner & member Herring Conservation Alliance), Jacyn Schmidt, Matthew Kinny, Tony Bird, Andy Erickson, Rob Woolsey (KCAW reporter), Taylor White, Louise Brady, Tom Gamble (Tlingit & Haida delegate), Carlos, Kyle Rosendale (STA), Juan Cediell, Chris Combs, Anna Laffrey, Alex Jenkins

New Business

John Murray moved and Karen Johnson 2nded to have the AC write a letter to ask ADF&G to allocate resources to reevaluate the Sitka Sound herring harvest rate strategy including natural mortality and unfished biomass.

Sherri Dressel (explanation given at prompting of chair): The Department has lost 3 Biometricians and only replaced one of them, so is way behind on data analysis. Suggest to request that a biometrician position dedicated to herring be hired. Field staff has



collected herring survey data over the years, but the limited biometric staff has been assigned to address the herring lawsuit rather than analyze the new data. The Unfished Biomass calculation can be performed several ways. Most common would be use a Bayesian Age Structured Analysis. Biometry staff has a new Sitka Sound herring model, that has been close to being able to be utilized, but no progress has been made for several years. The new model would be able to compute unfished biomass, but old model does not. AC should think about what questions they have. What do they want the model to do? What are the harvest objectives?

Eric Jordan: Does the Dept have Conservation Concerns at this time?

Sherri: There are two ways to answer this. Is the population at a level now that is a concern? -No; The stock is at the highest point since department records began in 1960s. But if the question is about whether or not the current harvest strategy could lead to concerns in the long run if it is continued to be applied, that's different. Under the best available science that we have from Sitka, the strategy is considered to be conservative, but that conclusion is based on data from the 1990s. Per analysis done in BC, each stock is different and the optimal harvest strategy is different.

Tad Fuijoka: Is it in any way possible for this letter to result in data being produced in time for the BoF meeting in January?

Sherri: No

Kent Barkau: ADF&G might not have a concern for the stock, but STA does.

Paulette Moreno: On Oct 6-10 the ANB/ANS met and passed a resolution stating their concerns for the health and well-being of the herring and calling for a 5 year moratorium on the sac roe fishery. The knowledge of local elders should be incorporated in the harvest strategy.

Justin Peeler: I think that writing this letter is a good idea. Industry writes letters like this all the time to support their specific fishery. (To Sherri) What other fisheries does the biometry staff provide support for?

Sherri (in response to question) All state fisheries- groundfish including sablefish and pollock, shellfish including Bering Sea crab, and SE shrimp, diving fisheries like geoducks an cucumber, salmon; Unless new resources are procured prioritizing herring means deprioritizing these other.

Justin: That's my point; ADF&G needs more resources, not just shifting the existing ones.

Jeff Feldpauch: Does ADF&G consider all herring populations in SE to be a single stock?



Sherri (in response to question): SE has multiple stocks. Sitka is separate from Craig for example.

Tad: In light of this letter having no effect on upcoming BoF meeting, **Move to Table** until after comment deadline; 2nd by Kent; **Passes without Objection**

| Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals | | | |
|--|---|---------------|--|
| January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK | | | |
| Proposal Number | Proposal Description | | |
| Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/ No Action | Number Support | Number Oppose | Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments |
| <i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i> | | | |
| 157 | Modify harvest rate for Sitka Sound commercial sac roe herring fishery based on forecasted age structure, as follows: | | |
| Oppose | 3 | 5 | one member disconnected prior to voting |



M/S Tad/Kent

Jason Jones (explains proposal): Proposal would discount the biomass of 3 and 4 year old (young fish) by 50% when setting the GHL. Official department comments were expected to be available Oct 22, but aren't yet. Will be at least a week before they are out, maybe longer.

John Murray: Is there a possibility that the fishery would be shut down by this proposal?

Jason Jones (in response): No, in-season management wouldn't change. It would reduce the harvest rate, potentially down to 65% of the current formula, but it wouldn't stop the fishery.

Sherri Dressel: The proposal is addressing fishery selectivity, but the calculation that the current 20% harvest rate is based on, already incorporated that, so this would be doing it twice. That would be biometrically odd.

Jeff Feldpauch: Does the current system take into account the 110g threshold of the current market? If the industry isn't able to locate fish over 110g, they don't open a fishery.

Sherri (in response): Using a computer simulation, the 20% harvest rate was found to be safe given a range of selectivity, natural mortality and recruitment.

Tad Fujioka: When was this analysis done? Observed natural mortality, etc has changed recently. Did the simulation include recent values?

Sherri (in response): The simulation was robust over a range of values, but I don't know if current Sitka conditions were within the range that was evaluated. The unfished biomass was last calculated in 1998.

Kyle Rosendale (STA):Based on average historical observations, proposal 157 would have reduced the GHL by less than proposal 156, but in some years when there were lots of young fish, proposal 157 would have meant a larger reduction. There are many things besides just the biomass that affect the subsistence harvest; Older fish lead the young fish to the spawning areas and select the spawning substrate. TEK describes a contraction of the duration of the spawn. This has made it more difficult to place hemlock boughs where they will collect good eggs. This proposal is to ensure that herring continue to spawn in the traditional locations.

John Murray: How can you have a fishery without targeting the older herring? That's the point of the fishery.

Jeff Feldpauch: Look at the situation in 2020. The GHL was 25,000 tons, but it was based on a population that was 83% 4 year olds, fish were too small for the commercial markets. Industry only wanted age 6+. There weren't enough old fish to



fill the GH. The current GH is based on all fish, but the fishery is only targeting old ones. The proposal is aimed at not allowing unwanted young fish to drive the GH. If the fishery wasn't so selective, it wouldn't be a problem, but the current system causes over-exploitation of the older fish.

Tad Fuijoka: The proposal says that it will prevent the older fish from being harvested at >20%, but that could still happen under the GH that is proposed.

Kyle Rosendale (in response): Not if the small fish continue to be harvested at around half the rate of the old ones. The harvest rate on the older fish would only be >20% if the fishery became more selective.

Chandler O'Connell: I support proposal 157. A younger, less age-diverse population is more vulnerable. I am happy that more herring were present in the spring of 2021. Maybe this is due to two years without fishing. Subsistence needs still are not being met. Herring also are eaten by so many other fish that we benefit from.

Justin Peeler: The written description of this proposal does not address the real goal of the proposal. When we didn't fish in 2019 and 2020, that didn't have anything to do with the big return that we had in 2021. The big year class came out of a year that did fish. Industry declined to fish on the big year class when it was young. When we fish we don't select for old fish now, but under this proposal we will be more selective.

Matt Jackson: I am originally from Ketchikan. There was a herring fishery there back then. ADF&G said that the fishery was conservative, that the stock was healthy. But they fished it right up until it collapsed. We need to be more conservative than what ADF&G considers to be conservative. Proposal 157 would help subsistence users because the older herring lead the younger ones. The fishery needs to be managed for subsistence first. A commercial fishery is ok, but only if the subsistence needs are assured first. The ANS hasn't been met in at least 8 of the past ten years. ADF&G doesn't have data available on 2021 yet, so it might be 9 of the past ten. Greater temporal and spatial distribution would help subsistence users. If the seiners don't catch as many that isn't a waste of the resource- that's more food for salmon, halibut and other fish. There have been lots of environmental changes recently, we need to be extra conservative if we are operating on an out-dated model.

Alex Jenkins: I just fed my 100 year old grandmother some Sitka salmon that was supported by Sitka herring. There are a lot more stakeholders in this issue than just 50-some seiners. Subsistence herring eggs from Sitka are shared statewide. The seine fishery targets the older fish. 86% of this year's return was from just one year class. How can that be a healthy stock? It's actually a fragile stock. All other herring fisheries in SE have closed. Proposal 157 is a common sense measure.



Paulette Moreno: As a woman and a traditional harvester, I spent 100 hours over a three week period this spring gathering eggs. The ANB/ANS resolution calling for the 5 year moratorium also expressed support for the STA proposals. Tlingit management of 10,000 years has worked.

This year I observed a couple of things. 1) The fish were moving around alot. That was due to the scarcity of older fish to lead them. 2) The quality of the eggs on hemlock varied. Yes, there were some good sets, but there were also a lot of poor and mediocre sets. It took ten times as much effort as it should have taken to get top-quality product.

Matthew Kinny: Only 15 households participated in the subsistence fishery in recent years. That's why the harvest isn't as big as it used to be! What does subsistence mean? Does subsistence mean product shipped out of town, or only eggs eaten in Sitka?

Anna Laffrey: A lot more than 15 families in Sitka ate herring eggs. STA distributed herring eggs to 100s of people this spring. Herring eggs are a great protein source, better than a commercial protein shake.

Tad Fujioka: Two points, first, somebody (Matt Jackson) mentioned the disparity within ADF&G between the apparent priorities of the commercial fishery and the subsistence fishery. That is apparent in the data. We have good data from the commercial fishery. Initial harvest estimates come out the morning after each opener and revised catch data shortly thereafter. Both are readily available by News Release. On the other hand the subsistence data lags greatly. We don't even have last spring's data out yet. When it is released it isn't as easy to find. You have to look much harder to find it.

Second point is the parallels between the herring stock and the blackcod stock. Blackcod fishermen only really want the larger older blackcod. They are worth 5x as much per pound as the youngest ones. The younger fish are better off left alone to grow bigger and more valuable. Yet management bases the blackcod quota off of the total biomass, young and old combined. We try to target the big ones as best we can, but when there are lots of small ones, getting some is unavoidable. We want the quota to be smaller so that we can leave more young fish in the water for them to grow up. The small fish are just bycatch in the effort to catch the bigger fish. The herring situation seems to be the same. The 3 and 4 year olds are unavoidable bycatch in the fishery targeting the bigger fish. If the harvest is reduced in the years when the catch is mostly young fish anyway, those young fish will grow bigger and return when they are more valuable. Just looking at how much the proposal reduces the GHL in a given year is only seeing half the picture. You also have to take into account how much the proposal will increase the GHL in subsequent years.

John Murray: How selective is the fishery?



Kyle Hebert (in response): The fishery attempts to take the largest fish that they can, but seines are not selective the way gillnets are. The fishermen are selective, but the gear isn't. The department samples the catch and the spawning escapement. The fish that are caught are somewhat older than the escapement. The schools have a mix of sizes, the fishermen can't sort within a school.

Sherri Dressel (also in response to same): This proposal reduces the overall Harvest Rate, which reduces the Harvest Rate on the older fish, but won't make the fishery any more selective.

Kent Barkau: Sometimes fishermen turn loose a set after it has been sampled if the fish don't meet the buyer's standard. So they are being quite selective in that situation.

Sherri Dressel (in response): Sets can be released if they aren't held too long. In a race for fish, they won't release a set. The number of sets released affects the selectivity.

Mo Johnson: How many participants were there in the subsistence fishery? What is the 5 year trend?

Kyle Rosendale: Don't know the 5 year trend or the 2021 participation level. Do know that participation was down in 2020 due to COVID. Also, when efficiency is low, participation is low. In 2018 and 2019 fishing was bad in the core area, so participation was low.

Mo Johnson (follow up): Decades ago there were subsistence fishermen that would bring their boats from Angoon, Hoonah, Kake, etc. Now it is just locals and a few Kake boats. There ought to be numbers on this. Harvest is down because participation is down, not because of poor management.

Eric Jordan (returning to earlier topic): The department staff has said that the age composition of the harvest and the escapement isn't all that different, but STA says that the fishery is selective. How can both of these statements be true?

Sherri Dressel (in response): The discrepancy comes from words not being precise enough to describe the numbers. The age compositions of the harvest and escapement are similar, but not exactly the same. I have the numbers. Does anybody want me to put them up? (Nobody responds; At this point we have been discussing this single proposal for about 2 hours.) Both of the statements are true. The fishery catches more older fish and fewer younger fish, but when there is a big year class in the escapement, you see it in the catch too. But this factor was already incorporated in the 20% harvest rate.



Jeff Feldpauch: The fishery is hyper-selective. They make multiple test sets. They won't fish at all without acceptable roe quality and minimum size. That was 110 grams last year. Fishermen are cherry-picking within an opening. Sometimes fish are held several hours and sampled multiple times before being released. In 2020, the age 4 year class made up 80% of the biomass, but the population was deemed "healthy" on the strength of that one year class. That's not a healthy population, that's just one healthy year class.

Mo Johnson: Does ADF&G have any concern about the age composition?

Sherri Dressel (in response to previous question screen shares Fig 5 Subsistence Technical Paper 474 "Subsistence Harvest of Herring Spawn in Sitka Sound 2019"): This shows the 5 year trend in subsistence harvesters from 2015-2019 was down continuing a trend of at least 15 years. There were only 29 harvesters documented in 2019.

(Then goes on to address the most recent question): The recent years with a dominant age class still leaves plenty of older fish. It is just a small percentage because the dominant year class is so big. The Brood Year 2016 is one of the largest on record.

Mo Johnson: Does the department have any data on whether years with a high percentage of older fish spawn in different places?

Kyle Hebert (in response): We didn't see any pattern except that older fish seemed to correlate with large shifts in location, not any specific location, just a change in location.

John Murray: (Question and response missed- Note taker lost Zoom connection.)

Kyle Rosendale: Some years the Harvest Rate on old fish was over 30%. That's what this proposal is intended to limit. Traditional ecological knowledge says that both the proportion and number of older fish matter. There have to be enough of them and they have to comprise a large enough proportion of the total to be effective leaders.

Eric Jordan: (Repeats earlier inquiry about discrepancy between ADFG claim that age-compositions of harvest and escapement are similar and STA claim that fishery selects for older fish.)

Sherri Dressel (Repeats earlier response; Words don't precisely capture the nuance. Age comps are "similar", not identical. the harvest age comps are consistently biased towards older fish, but same strong year classes are still easily recognizable)



Eric Jordan (Repeats frustration with delay of Department comments): **Move to postpone vote on this proposal until department comments are released or until Dec 15, whichever comes first; Motion dies for lack of second.** Discussion continues.

Heather Baucher: How much would this proposal help the subsistence users? How much would it affect the seiners?

Kyle Hebert (in response): The recent historical target harvest rate has been 19%. Under the formula of this proposal, and the same biomass estimates, the target harvest rate would have averaged ~16.5% over the same period. Escapement would have increased by about 2% of the population. Presumably that would have had some positive effect on the subsistence harvest, but beyond that, can't say.

Tad Fujioka: The 19% target harvest rate is often not achieved. The seiners didn't fish at all in 2019 and 2020. What was the actual harvest rate over that same period?

Kyle Hebert (in response): The actual harvest rate was only about 14%.

Tad Fujioka (follow up): So the actual harvest rate has been less than the 16.5% calculated target under this proposal. Thus, the effect of this proposal on the actual harvest might not be all that significant. Certainly it is less significant than the difference in target harvest rate. To the degree that the harvest actually is reduced, the subsequent years will see an increased GHL as those fish return in the future.

Kyle Hebert (in response): Yes, some years ADF&G has reduced the target harvest rate below what the current formula provides to be extra conservative.

John Murray: In this past year 86% of the fish were 5 year olds. How would this proposal have affected the harvest this year?

Jeff Feldpauch (in response): This year was unique. The 5 year olds were small for their age, so while they are counted as "old" fish under this proposal, they really weren't big enough to be desired by the fishery. This year, the proposal wouldn't have had much of an impact. It would have changed the harvest rate a lot in 2020 when the 4 year olds comprised a large proportion of the biomass. This year only 3% of the biomass forecast were young fish, so the Harvest Rate would have been barely affected.

Mo Johnson: I don't think that this proposal will do what it is supposed to do. Only 3 of the last 20 years have had an actual harvest rate of >20%. Subsistence effort is dropping. That's why subsistence harvest is dropping. It isn't because of the seine fishery. ADF&G already factors in the selectivity of the fishery. No proposal can control where the fish choose to spawn.



Adjournment: 8:49 PM

Minutes Recorded By: Tad Fujioka

Minutes Approved By: _____ Full AC _____

Date: __ Nov 10th, 2021 _____



**Sitka Fish and Game Advisory Committee
November 10, 2021
Zoom**

I. Call to Order: [6:04] Heather Bauscher

II. Roll Call

Members Present:

Jeff Feldpauch-subsistence

Kent Barkau-hunting

Moe Johnson-seine

Karen Johnson-at large

John Murray-power troll

Tad Fujioka-processor

Steve Ramp-sport fish

Eric Jordan-at large

Heather Bauscher-alternate-chair

Stacey Wayne-shellfish

Luke Bastain-guide

Dick Curran-longline

Spence Chute-charter

Andrew Thoms-conservation

Members Absent (Excused):Aaron Prussian-handtroll

Members Absent (Unexcused):

Woody Cyr-trapping

Joel Markis-alternative

Number Needed for Quorum on AC:7 Quorum established

List of User Groups Present:14

III. Fish and Game Staff Present:Kyle Hebert, Sherri Dressel, Jason Jones

IV. Guests Present:Anna Laffrey,Paulette Moreno,Peter Bradley,Steve Johnson,Alex Jenkins,David Kreiss -Tomkins,Matt Jackson,Devon Calvin,Kyle Rosendale (STA) and a number of others that did not speak. 36 total

V. Approval of Agenda



- VI. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes
Eric second Kent
- VII. Reports
- a. Chair's report: letters in progress for review. 1) bear group draft, will present at a later date 2) updated letter to NPFMC, will present later.
Chair updated format for public/staff comments, questions and input. AC deliberations
 - b. ADF&G
 - c. Others
- VIII. Public Comment
- IX. There were 8 public comments. For sense of purpose and streamlining minutes this is a synopsis: concerns about herring stock failure in other areas in SE AK., cultural aspects of the herring resource, distrust of process dealing with herring and distrust of data, voices not being heard by AC, ADFG and BOF. thoughts on studies related to "big fat fecund fish" and their need for healthy fish production, AC comments need to reflect the community, herring fishery isn't being managed for subsistence needs, ANS (amount needed for subsistence) concerns with the needs not being meant.
- X. Old Business
- XI. New Business
- XII. Steve made motion to discuss Proposal 158. Second by Eric
***Please note the minutes from November 8th AC meeting dealing with Proposal 157 as it is relevant to Proposal 158 discussion, deliberations, public comments and staff comments.
- XIII. Kyle Rosendale (Sitka Tribe of Alaska -proposer.)
COMMENTS: ADFG management exploitation rate higher on older fish. Traditional knowledge shows older fish show young fish where to spawn. This Proposal hopes to help subsistence herring harvesters meet their needs. The Proposal is like an on /off .Switch off when below 20% of older fish. On when above.
- XIV. QUESTION. How many seasons would this take place if this proposal was in place?
ANSWER a few The questioner mentioned it looked like 6 seasons. ANSWER that could be right.
- COMMENTS on Proposal 158 and questions from AC for ADFG staff.
Jason Jones. ADFG. Possible closure of fishery with large recruitment events. If this proposal passes the fishery would have closed once since 2009(looking back) perspective.



- XV. QUESTION:JOHN(AC) It looks like 6 seasons would have been closed since 2009 if this proposal had been in place?
ANSWER: 6 seasons
- XVI. QUESTION:.JOHN(AC) As proposal is written in underlined language in Proposal.Do pre-season bait fishery or test fishing take place before February 28th? ANSWER:NO .A survey would be needed .A mechanism would be needed to gather a survey. A large undertaking.
- QUESTION:ERIC (AC)Is there a subsistence ADFG staff here tonight? ANSWER : No
- XVII. QUESTION:ERIC(AC) Are staff comments available? ANSWER :No ,but some staff comments and tables/ graphs were made available for meetings.
- XVIII. QUESTION:JEFF(AC) Confidence dealing with 3 year old herring? ANSWER :It would be hard to do. Don't really have a good way to do that.
- QUESTION:STACI(AC) 5 year + herring numbers? ANSWER: Screen share by Sherri dealing with 5 up herring showing 2 graphs. 5 year up herring since 1976 show increase in numbers with some bumps down downward depending on year.
- QUESTION: KENT(AC) Degrees of availability in total bio-mass? ANSWER: Kyle.Observed data when Sherri does model .There is model based variability around them. Sherri .There are estimates around the model and observed data. This leads on to discussion about gathering weight at age / weight composition via survey cast net.Generally cast net samples are 500 to 1000 plus herring are sampled ,done 20 to 50 plus samples.
- QUESTION:ERIC(AC) Dealing with 3 year olds entering the fishery? ANSWER :Sherri. $\frac{1}{3}$ Of 3 year olds seem to spawn but that varies year to year.
- QUESTION :ERIC (AC) Are sample sets similar? ANSWER :Sherri.2020 there were more samples with the same pattern with cast nets.
- QUESTION: JEFF (AC)? Age of herring behavior account for interaction between age classes ? ANSWER: Sherri . Models are a simplification of reality.
- QUESTION:TAD(AC) 2020 graph on age structure showed most of the fish the same age?ANSWER: Sherri . 2020 was odd because of age structure. 2017 better shows fewer net samples (20) with more variation ,a general theme was a similar pattern between cast net and sac-roe fishery.
- QUESTION: STACI (AC) (Note I'm winging the question somewhat. JOHN(AC) secretary). Is it bad to fish on older fish ? ANSWER:Sherri .That depends. The key is to sample across the range of sizes. Can change harvest across ages but ADFG feels this fishery is conservative in it's management.



QUESTION:KENT(AC) Can you use that analysis to fish selectively? ANSWER: Sherri. Absolutely.

QUESTION:JEFF(AC) Do markets change selectivity on fishery? ANSWER: Sherri.Yes selectivity happens year to year

End of staff comment/ questions.

ERIC AC .Moved to reconsider 156,157 delay action on 158 till 1) till ADFG subsistence staff presence 2)and until ADFG staff comments come out and postpone herring proposals until this happens.

Second.

Discussion: doesn't give us enough time. Should consider separating 156,157 and delaying 158 till staff comments.

JEFF Deal with proposal 158.

ERIC withdrew his motion.

Motion to table 158 until staff comments are in hand and subsistence staff at meeting.

Vote -9 in support 5 opposed.

Motion to reconsider 156,157 till right time frame ,with subsistence staff and staff comments available or by DEC 15th.(One week before comments do)

Comments: Tad ,timetable issues and won't have time at the end.

Steve ,issues with Dec.15 th.

Karen,don't undo what we have done.

Mo,agrees with Tad and Karen unless there is a radical change with staff comments.

Vote-2 in support 1 abstention 10 opposed

Move to reconsider delay of proposal 158

Seconded

Question 11 support 3 opposed (back on table)

Back to proposal 158

Tad to amend proposal with language :... or the proportion of fish age 5 and older is less than or equal to 0.20 as determined by_[PRE-SEASON BAIT FISHERY OR TEST FISHING COMPLETED BY FEBRUARY 28TH IN DISTRICT 13-B] **age composition forecast.**

Seconded

Comments :age 3 year herring a wild card . Age 3 herring are a challenge to forecast.

QUESTION:JOHN(AC) When do age composition forecast come out? ANSWER:Sherri . mid December to mid January.

On amending Proposal.

Vote-14 in support.

Back to amended Proposal.

Comments.



Mo ,Certain years it would be detrimental. Spoke about the need for cost recovery or an industry assessment as a means to gather funding for better management.

Tad,analysis question. At what age does a cohort of herring have the greatest spawning biomass?

ANSWER;Sherri ,Pretty involved. Answer: Age 5

Tad(AC) Comment: If the individual growth of uncaught 4 yr. old herring will outpace the annual mortality, resulting in a greater biomass in subsequent years, and they will also be worth considerably more per pound as 5 year olds. why would we want them caught at 4 yr. olds?

Jeff in favor.

Eric ,Wants to let the public know we are listening .The AC supports conservation .

Jeff.Why do we do test fishing if all the fish are homogenous,if all the fish are the same.

ANSWER:Sherri,to know how much they can be selected.

QUESTION

Vote-7 support 1 abstain 6 opposed.

Wrap up discussion. Some conflict with doing herring next week (WEDS) .AC decided on starting doing King Salmon Proposals and misc.

- XIX. Select representative(s) for board meeting
- XX. Set next meeting date.
Next meeting November 17th King salmon proposals
- XXI. Other
- XXII.** Adjourn
8:50 pm



| Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals | | | |
|---|--|---------------|--|
| January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK | | | |
| Proposal Number | Proposal Description | | |
| Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/ No Action | Number Support | Number Oppose | Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments |
| <p><i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i></p> | | | |
| 158 | Incorporate forecasted age structure into Sitka Sound commercial sac roe herring fishery spawning biomass threshold, as follows: | | |
| SUPPORT | | | Vote-7 support 1 abstain 6 opposed |
| | | | |



Adjournment:

Minutes Recorded By: John Murray

Minutes Approved By: Full Sitka AC

Date: Nov 17th, 2021



Sitka Fish and Game Advisory Committee

Nov 17, 2021

Zoom

I. Call to Order: [6:04] by [Heather Bauscher]

II. Roll Call

Members Present: 11+1

ERIC JORDAN JOINED AT 8:03

| |
|---------------------|
| hand troll |
| Subsistence |
| Hunting |
| Seine |
| At Large |
| Longline |
| Power Troll |
| Conservation |
| Processor |
| Resident Sport Fish |
| Alternate |
| Shellfish |

Members Absent (Excused): 3

Members Absent (Unexcused):3

Number Needed for Quorum on AC:

List of User Groups Present:

III. Fish and Game Staff Present:

- a. Troy Tydingo Sport Fish
- b. Jake Wieliczkeivich Sport Fish
- c. Grant Hagerman Troll Biologist
- d.

IV. Guests Present:

- a. Tom Fisher Troller
- b. Forres Braden SE Guides Association
- c. Jeff Favour Commercial Fisherman
- d. Linda Behken- Alaska Longline Fisherman’s Association
- e. Henry Wurtz
- f. Anna
- g. Peter Bradley



XIV. Adjourn



| Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals | | | |
|---|---|---------------|---|
| January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK | | | |
| Proposal Number | Proposal Description | | |
| Support/Support as amended/Oppose/No Action | Number Support | Number Oppose | Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments |
| <p><i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i></p> | | | |
| | | | |
| 83 | Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to manage for an average sport harvest of 20% of the sport/troll allocation with commensurate regulations addressing sport fishery overages in the commercial troll fishery, as follows: | | |
| OPPOSE | 0 | 11 | <p>Move to approve, seconded</p> <p>Forrest Braden from SE AK guide association introduces the proposal and why it was put forward by their organization;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Stated that this proposal was mutually exclusive with Proposals 82 (by ADF&G) and 88 (by Steve Merritt). -SEAGO wants to go back to pre 1996 management -Would like to avoid in-season closures; need more fish in low quota years to do this under current limits -challenged by terms of the 2018 International Pacific Salmon Treaty which replaced the old soft cap on the SEAK catch with a hard cap -presented a table predicting that under the proposed sport limits, the sport catch would exceed 20% in Tiers 2-4 and be under 20% in Tiers 5-7. <p>Steve Ramp asked about if the proposal disregards the new treaty provisions</p> <p>Department Staff were given a chance to speak to the proposal</p> <p>Tad asked how the non-resident sport effort has trended.</p> |



| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>Troy Tydingco outlined the non-resident effort has trended up over the last 30 years. Resident effort has remained stable.</p> <p>John Murray asked if the department could lower sport limits earlier in the season to prevent a closure later in the season.</p> <p>Troy Tydingco answered that Yes, they could if directed to do so and that the new electronic logbooks for the charter guides allowed quicker analysis of the catch so inseason management is feasible.</p> <p>Public Testimony:</p> <p>Jeff Farvour-- believes that the AC has already taken action for times when king salmon are at low abundance. There is a reality that we could have long periods of time with low abundance and we have to share the burden-- he does not see that with this proposal.</p> <p>James Hughes-- troller with Seafood Producers Coop; concerned about explosive growth of charter sector and would like to see limited entry. does not see us being in high abundance and does not support this proposal. Mentioned the WFC lawsuit that would potentially further reduce Alaska's quota, thus making low quota years when sport harvest would exceed 20% even more likely.</p> <p>AC deliberation:</p> <p>Tad Fujioka-- This proposal is a big step back. It would erase a management structure that the BoF imposed in the 1990's and has been effective since.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-The effort of the charter fleet, particularly early in the season when limits are highest has been increasing for 30+ years. That means that the historical average catches that SEAGO is basing their numbers on, will underforecast the catch of the modern charter fleet.-This will lead to the sport harvest chronically exceeding their 20% share.-The new digital reporting allows in-season management. Catches can be projected far enough in advance that limits can be reduced in time to prevent the need for a full closure.- Does not want to see the 80/20 split go away. |
|--|--|---|



| | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>Steve Ramp: has a lot of confidence in the agency doing in-season management and has seen successful action to get to the 80/20 ratio and meet the treaty goals. feels that things are going well and doesn't want to see the changes in this proposal.</p> <p>John Murray: --would like to see sport (guided and resident) work with agency to find ways to make the fish last the season; -The last 2 rounds of Treaty negotiations have resulted in Alaska's all-gear quota dropping 22-24%. This has caused pain for all gear groups. All need to accept their share of the reduction. -Sport fishermen already catch a disproportional number of Alaskan hatchery kings, most of which are raised using funding from the commercial sector. Sports are getting 16,000 bonus fish per year on top of their share of the Treaty fish.</p> <p>Moe Johnson: against the proposal for many of the same reasons and also wants to point out the last sentence in why the proposal is pushed forward, "The result is insufficient harvest opportunity for the sport fishery during low abundance." and comments that this is part of the fishing business that some years things are good but also some seasons things are bad and it is part of it. That sentence really turned him off to the proposal.</p> |
| 84 | Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to ensure no closure of the resident king salmon fishery due to allocation concerns, as follows: | | |
| OPPOSE | 4 | 7 | <p>Steve Ramp moves to support, John Murray Seconds</p> <p>Question for Agency on electronic log-book data and how it is entered, how soon it comes into the agency, how soon it is analyzed, etc.</p> <p>Public Testimony</p> <p>James Hughes: asked how unguided lodges are recorded</p> |



| | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | <p>Agency staff-- referenced creel reported from the ADFG staff that take reports at the docks. also the state-wide harvest surveys</p> <p>Steve Ramp referred to Proposal 144 which would require logbooks for unguided boat rental and lodge operations.</p> <p>Committee Discussion:</p> <p>Steve Ramp-- opposed to this one because of the no-fishing days. believes it goes too far and that the department has enough tools to avoid no-fishing days.</p> <p>Tad- pointed out that the no-fishing days was one of a suite of suggestions in the proposal, not an inherent part of proposed regulation.</p> |
| 85 | Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to manage for a resident priority by implementing closed periods and reducing bag limits for nonresidents, as follows: | | |
| SUPPORT | 11 | 0 | <p>Tad Fujioka Moves to support 85 and 85, Stacey Seconds</p> <p>Tad spoke on 85 and 86 as being consistent with the Sitka AC's support of proposal 82 with our proposed changes and makes it fair; Since SEAK does not have any saltwater subsistence king salmon fisheries, local residents met their subsistence needs via the sport fishery. Thus it is appropriate to prioritize resident sport above other uses, specifically above non-resident sport and even commercial.</p> <p>Troy Tyingco (in response to question) said that it would be extremely unlikely that the resident sport catch would ever be large enough to consume the entire 20% sport allocation.</p> <p>Tad pointed out that the ADF&G-sponsored proposal 82 includes this same language for resident priority in the lowest quota years. If the department is comfortable implementing it in those years, there shouldn't be any difficulty in doing so in years with higher quotas.</p> <p>Forrest Braden: Supports year-round fishing for residents, but has some concerns about where that would leave charter fleet in low quota years.</p> |



| | | | |
|--------------------|---|----|---|
| | | | <p>Committee Discussion:</p> <p>Steve Ramp has heard the discussion from agency and feels this is a good proposal and will support.</p> |
| 86 | Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to manage for a resident priority by implementing closed periods and reducing bag limits for nonresidents, as follows: | | |
| SUPPORT | 11 | 0 | See discussion under proposal 85. |
| 87 | Make numerous changes to management of commercial troll and sport fisheries for king salmon in Southeast Alaska, as follows: | | |
| | | | AC didn't discuss because it is out of our area |
| 88 | Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to manage for a sliding sport allocation between 16 and 24 percent with commensurate commercial troll fishery allocation modification under commercial regulation, as follows: | | |
| OPPOSE | 0 | 11 | <p>Tom Fisher reported that the proposer has withdrawn his support but not the proposal.</p> <p>Committee Discussion:</p> <p>Steve Ramp-- I'm against this because it goes against the 80-20 allocation compromise</p> <p>John Murray- in future the high quota years are likely to be scarce, if they occur at all, so the 80/20 balance will not be achieved.</p> <p>Tad Fujioka-- we are on the record supporting proposal 82 as modified and this proposal goes against that.</p> |
| 89 | Allow the use of two additional fishing lines during periods of king salmon nonretention in all of the Southeast-Yakutat area if there is more than one CFEC power troll permit holder on board the vessel, as follows:. | | |
| OPPOSE | 0 | 12 | <p>Steve Ramp moves to support, Kent Barkau seconds</p> <p>Grant Hagerman from ADFG answered questions:</p> |



| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Concerned that with some boats running 6 lines and other only running 4, the historical CPUE data which is based on 4 lines would no longer provide accurate estimates of inseason abundance. This would cause problems for management. Furthermore, there are Treaty provisions which are also based on troll CPUE that wouldn't be valid either.</p> <p>Proposer Matt Lawrie spoke to the proposal: this is a proposal I put in to allow for more production for the troll fleet for people who want to purchase a 2nd permit or bring someone else on the boat. Over time, the troll fleet has had to move away from king salmon to coho and chum which are more of a volume oriented fishery and this proposal would make for increased catches and increased efficiency given the downward trend of decreased revenue for the fishermen in this fishery</p> <p>Public Comment:</p> <p>Tom Fisher: speaking as a small boat troller; believes we have too many permits but when we get to the 40 foot boat and lower this (operating 6 lines) becomes a very difficult process. This shuts small boats out from the benefits of this change and believes this will lead to the small boats disappearing. Small boats won't be able to compete with the larger boats. Does not support.</p> <p>Matt Donahoe: opposes the proposal because this is a big boat proposal and will harm the small boats and will require boats with at least 3 crew or more. extra lines would be more efficient when fishing is slow. When the fishing is good, you increase incidental catch and increased mortality from sealions and sharks getting those fish because the operator can't pull those lines as much as they need to because they are busy enough with just 4 lines.</p> <p>Jame Hughes: opposed because of low abundance issues prefers to stick with the status quo</p> <p>Committee discussion:</p> |
|--|--|--|



| | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>John Murray: this works on slow fishing but when it is busy and you have to shake kings it becomes too much gear to tend so doesn't support</p> <p>Tad Fujioka: this proposal combines 2 controversial ideas into 1 proposal: 6 lines and permit stacking... makes this very controversial and a lot of reasons to oppose</p> <p>Moe Johnson: Oppose for the mortality concerns on being able to work the lines and being able to get to the extra lines... this is going to increase the mortality of incidental king salmon catch</p> <p>Eric Jordan: opposed</p> |
| 90 | Change trigger to from an annual abundance index (AI) number to a District 13 early-winter power troll CPUE tier, as follows: | | |
| SUPPORT | 12 | 0 | <p>Tad Fujioka spoke to the proposal which he authored-- intention both as a housekeeping proposal incorporating the new CPUE standard and to maintain/increase the catch in the spring when the AK hatchery fish are the most abundant thus stretching our treaty quota. The springtime is when get the most value per Treaty fish.</p> <p>Grant Hagerman-- housekeeping proposal; currently the department can do this and the department has done it over the last 2 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Tiers have a range of AIs. This would slightly lower the abundance level (from 1.15 to 1.005) that would trigger the roll over of uncaught winter quota into the spring season. -There is the potential for the Pacific Salmon Commission to get rid of the CPUE-based quota at the five year review. <p>Committee Discussion:</p> <p>Tad: Having a slightly lower trigger for rolling over uncaught winter quota into spring is ok because the only reason that the trigger was put there in the first place was to ensure an adequate summer quota. Under Stock of Concern management, the spring fisheries are so much more restricted than they were, that even with the additional quota, the spring catch will stil lbe much lower than they would have been in the past.</p> |



| | | | |
|--------------------|--|----|--|
| | | | |
| 91 | Reallocate the annual troll harvest allocation between the winter, spring and summer troll fisheries, as follows: (Note that this is the official description, but is incorrect. The proposal actually only addresses the allocation between the summer July and summer August fisheries.) | | |
| OPPOSE | 0 | 11 | <p>john Murray moves to support, Steve Ramp seconds</p> <p>ADFG staff answered some questions: Grant:-Historically proposals to move quota from July to August have been supported because August fish are bigger and prices higher. -They were opposed due to concerns that the fleet might not be able to catch the entire remaining quota. -catching the entire summer quota during July is potentially concerning because the new treaty agreement has a limit on incidental Chinook mortality which is estimated by troll effort during the non-Chinook retention periods. The July catch rate is higher than August, so if the entire quota is caught in July that would mean more Chinook non-retention days.</p> <p>Public Testimony:</p> <p>Matt Donahoe: Haven't had problem catching fish in July and August. Department has the opportunity to do a mop-up fishery and have a trip limit fishery. They work. This is a solution looking for a problem that doesn't exist</p> <p>Committee Discussion:</p> <p>Tad: The proposer states that his objective is to ensure a August fishery of a given length. If that is the objective, why not just write the proposal to close the July fishery at the time that would provide for an August fishery of the desired length? It would be far easier to do this in July of a given year than to set a management plan years in advance.</p> <p>John Murray-- has some questions for processor rep if this strains the processor capacity. Processor rep reports that if the fleet has to ice up for a short opener and then head back out for Coho, that would require a lot of ice. For SPC, not a problem. for a smaller processor, maybe. They would have to plan ahead.</p> |



| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>-States that there were only 3 times in the past when the troll fleet finished the year under their quota and doesn't see this happening much now because of how efficient the fleet is.</p> <p>-Prefers more quota in August; fleet is more spread out then;</p> <p>Eric Jordan: this proposal increases mortality, decreases the value of the summer kings, and increases potential conflict</p> |
|--|--|--|---|



Adjournment:

Minutes Recorded By: _____ Andrew Thoms _____

Minutes Approved By: _____ Full AC _____

Date: ___ 12/1/21 _____



**Sitka Fish and Game Advisory Committee
December 1, 2021
Zoom**

I. Call to Order: [6:03
] by Heather Bauscher

II. Roll Call
Members Present: 15

| Last | First | User Group |
|-----------|---------|--------------|
| Prussian | Aaron | hand troll |
| Feldpauch | Jeff | Subsistence |
| Barkau | Kent | hunting |
| Johnson | Moe | Seine |
| Johnson | Karen | At Large |
| Curran | Dick | Longline |
| Murray | John | Power Troll |
| Thoms | Andrew | Conservation |
| Fujioka | Tad | Processor |
| Chute | Spencer | Charter |
| | | |
| Jordan | Eric | At Large |
| Cyr | Woody | Trapping |
| Bastain | Luke | Guide |
| | | |
| Bauscher | Heather | Alternate |
| Wayne | Stacey | Shellfish |

Members Absent (Excused):1
Members Absent (Unexcused):2
Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 7

III. Fish and Game Staff Present:
a. Grant Hagerman
b. Troy Tydingco
c. Mike Vaughn

IV. Guests Present:
a. Matt Donahoe, Alaska Trollers Association



- b. Adam Olson
 - c. Taylor White
 - d. Ben Adams (NSRAA)
 - e. James Hughes
 - f. Tim McDonough
 - g. Justin Peeler (SEAS)
 - h. (James) Carter Hughes
- V. Approval of Agenda
- a. John Murray Moved, Eric Jordan seconded all in favor
- VI. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes
- a. John Murray moved to approved, Tad Fujioka seconded, all in favor
- VII. Reports
- a. Chair's report
 - i. Chair is looking into publication of meeting times
 - ii. Chair went on Problem Corner radio show to advertise our meetings and described the issues that we address. Many callers concerned about trawl fleet bycatch
 - b. ADF&G
 - c. Others
- VIII. Public Comment
- a. Matt Donahoe-- Lack of ADFG comments on proposals is unacceptable. Department has had an additional year to get out comments and three weeks before deadline no one has seen them.
 - i. Jeff Feldpausch moves to write a letter to BOF and Commissioner on lack of department comment and concerns on COVID outbreak in Ketchikan; Eric Jordan seconds and asks to include Gov and legislature; John Murray wants it to be separate letters, all agree. AC approves this
 - b. Taylor White joined to thank the AC for their letter of support for research on Sitka Sound that looks at historical data, traditional ecological knowledge, and current surveys. Invites current AC members to be available for interviews if they have knowledge on abalone and otters. twhite1@ucsc.edu
- IX. Old Business
- a. Trawl Fleet Bycatch-- Chair reported that our letter on bycatch was submitted



- b. Bear Working Group Letter-- Eric Jordan moves to approve letter and send to City of Sitka, John Murray seconded; AC approves with 1 member opposing
 - c. Bear Population Survey Letter; John Murray Moves to Support, Eric Jordan Seconds, Tad will edit and clean up. Full AC supports
 - d. Herring letter-- still needs more work
-
- X. New Business
 - XI. Select representative(s) for board meeting
 - XII. Set next meeting date; monday December 6
 - XIII. Other
 - XIV.** Adjourn 8:39pm



| Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals | | | |
|---|----------------------|---------------|---|
| January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK | | | |
| Proposal Number | Proposal Description | | |
| Support/Support as amended/Oppose/No Action | Number Support | Number Oppose | Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments |
| <p><i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i></p> | | | |
| 80 | | | Amend regulation to address payback provisions when the State of Alaska king salmon fisheries exceed Alaska’s annual king salmon all-gear harvest ceiling, as follows: |
| 81 | | | Allocate any Alaska all gear-allocation king salmon remaining after September 1 to the commercial troll fishery, as follows: |
| 82 | | | Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to align with the provisions of the 2019–2028 Pacific Salmon Treaty annex, as follows: |
| 83 | | | Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to manage for an average sport harvest of 20% of the sport/troll allocation with commensurate regulations addressing sport fishery overages in the commercial troll fishery, as follows: |
| 84 | | | Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to ensure no closure of the resident king salmon fishery due to allocation concerns, as follows: |
| 85 | | | Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to manage for a resident priority by implementing closed periods and reducing bag limits for nonresidents, as follows: |
| 86 | | | Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to manage for a resident priority by implementing closed periods and reducing bag limits for nonresidents, as follows: |
| 87 | | | Make numerous changes to management of commercial troll and sport fisheries for king salmon in Southeast Alaska, as follows: |
| 88 | | | Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to manage for a sliding sport allocation between 16 and 24 percent with commensurate commercial troll fishery allocation modification under commercial regulation, as follows: |



| | | | |
|------------------------|--|----------------------|--|
| 89 | Allow the use of two additional fishing lines during periods of king salmon nonretention in all of the Southeast-Yakutat area if there is more than one CFEC power troll permit holder on board the vessel, as follows:. | | |
| | | | |
| 90 | Change trigger to from an annual abundance index (AI) number to a District 13 early-winter power troll CPUE tier, as follows: | | |
| | | | |
| 91 | Reallocate the annual troll harvest allocation between the winter, spring and summer troll fisheries, as follows: | | |
| | | | |
| 92 | Allow retention of king salmon greater than 26 inches in hatchery terminal harvest areas by commercial trollers, as follows: | | |
| Support with amendment | 12 | 1 1 abstention | <p>John Murray moves to support, Stacey Wayne seconds</p> <p>member of public had question on current regs. ADFG says they can do this if needed, but only after that year's THA harvest has been shown to be predominantly AK hatchery fish.</p> <p>While the spring troll season opens May 1, THAs don't open until June 1, and catch data isn't available until enough fish have been caught and the CWTs processed to verify the stock composition. So the spring troll season is mostly over before the size limit can be changed.</p> <p>Tad Fujioka points out that in the Sitka spring troll fishery, trollers routinely fish in THAs and non-THAs in the same day. Having a different size limit just in THAs would require offloading their catch when they wanted to fish outside the THAs. This would be a big inconvenience. It is better to have the same size limit apply to THAs and other spring areas. Tad moves to amend proposal to <i>change the minimum size limit for all of the spring troll fisheries from 28" overall to 26-1/2" from snout to fork of tail.</i></p> <p>Eric Seconds. Tad explains the rationale for this and outlines that immature fish have deeply forked tail but mature fish have a square tail. Shows photo that demonstrates.</p> |



Mature King salmon on left, immature king salmon on right

Additionally, Tad points out that:

- The only fish that would be shorter than 28" are 2-ocean fish. These are either immatures or jacks. The immature fish will have forked tails and thus an immature fish with a fork length of 26-½" will be at least 28" long, so the amendment wouldn't result in any additional immature fish being caught. The mature jacks are virtually all males, and thus not directly contributing to hatchery broodstock needs.
- In 2018 the BoF directed the department to limit spring trolling to areas with very low prevalence of SE wild stocks. Thus very few Stocks of Concern will be encountered, but even if they are, the amendment only affects spawners that are less than 28". The wild escapement counts only include "large" Chinook so the fish that are affected by this amendment aren't ones that would be counted towards escapement goals, and as previously mentioned are surplus males, so they aren't contributing to reproduction either.
- NSRAA, like stocks all over the West Coast and Alaska is seeing an increased proportion of their male spawners returning as 2-ocean jacks. So while forgoing a small proportion of the jack return wasn't a significant issue in the past, it is a much larger loss than it used to be. With the troll catch of hatchery



| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>fish trailing well being their designated share under 5 AAC 33.364, every additional king would help.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The fork length is a more repeatable measurement since it doesn't vary with the positioning of the tail. An overall length measurement can vary by up to an inch depending upon whether the tail is flared or squeezed. This has caused some fishermen to get citations when their fish pointed its tail when first measured, but went into rigor mortis with a flared tail. <p>ADFG staff confirmed the last point and said that ADFG measures fish to the fork of the tail because it is more consistent.</p> <p>Woody Cyr-- all for the proposal; he states that he shakes a lot of 3 year old returning mature fish that are bigger in weight that immature fish;</p> <p>Luke Bastian likes the proposal with amendment, but not without it.</p> <p>ADFG Grant Hagerman: concern over some of the mixed stock fisheries and lack of data on smaller fish and their origin. Proposal assumes the smaller fish are from the hatcheries but there isn't necessarily data to fully demonstrate this.</p> <p>Tad explains that the 26-½" fork length is the equivalent to 28" overall for immature kings. In the Sitka area the spring spawners are virtually all local hatchery fish as there are no wild king salmon rivers nearby. Thus, the amendment wouldn't result in any additional wild fish being retained that wouldn't already be legal under the existing regulation. The only additional fish that the amendment would allow to be kept are mature fish since they have squarer tails.</p> <p>Moe Johnson: generally in favor but perhaps moving away from proposal. He definitely favors the reduction to 26.5 in terminal areas but not in the entire spring troll fisheries. Moves to limit this to just the Sitka areas. Amendment accepted as friendly. So Amendment becomes: <i>Change the minimum size limit for all of the Sitka spring troll fisheries from 28" overall to 26-1/2" from snout to fork of tail.</i></p> |
|--|--|--|---|



| | | | |
|---|---|----|---|
| | | | <p>Eric Jordan: the value of the catch will be greatly increased because of this amendment change.</p> <p>Amendment passes</p> |
| 93 | Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan by reducing the maximum nonresident annual limit to three king salmon, as follows: | | |
| Oppose | 1 | 13 | <p>Tad moves to support, Jeff Seconds</p> <p>Agency Staff-- this may make it hard for the agency to manage to meet its allocation if this amendment were to pass.</p> <p>Luke Bastian-- hard to see why it is appropriate to make a blanket restriction in high-quota years for the sector that is the most restricted in low quota years</p> <p>John Murray-- agreed that there is a need to manage to catch the sport quota as closely as possible.</p> |
| 94 | Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to manage for a resident priority by implementing specific closed periods and reducing annual limits for nonresidents, as follows: | | |
| Comment- We support Proposal 82 as amended, which is mutually exclusive to 94. | | | <p>John Murray moves to make no comment on the grounds that we have already endorsed Proposal 82 as Amended which set a management plan; Tad Fujioka seconds. no objections</p> |
| 95 | Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to provide for inseason liberalization of management measures when the sport fish allocation will not be met, as follows: | | |
| Support | 13 | 1 | <p>Tad Fujioka moves to support, Eric Jordan Seconds</p> <p>Public Testimony: James Hughes: this is a good proposal. In season management is appropriate.</p> |



| | | | |
|---------------------|---|--------------------|--|
| | | | <p>Tad asks ADFG Sportfish staff how current their in-season harvest projections are now that they are getting charter logbooks electronically.</p> <p>Troy responds that they update their projections every two weeks.</p> |
| 99 | Establish a gear rotation between purse seine and troll gear in the Southeast Cove Terminal Harvest area, as follows: | | |
| Support | 10 | 2 2 abstain | <p>Eric Jordan moves to support, John Murray 2nds</p> <p>Justin Peeler, on behalf of SEAS spoke on proposal. Described it as just continuing what has been working.</p> <p>Committee Discussion:</p> <p>Tad: Troll fleet is behind in their share of hatchery fish. Under BoF directive, the appropriate remedy is to adjust the THAs fisheries. As such, the trollers, not the seiners should have the right to set the schedule-subject to the 2:5 time ratio that the BoF has previously established.</p> <p>Moe: support the proposal.</p> <p>Eric Jordan: not a great place to troll and fishery happens when the King opener is going on.</p> |
| 100 | Remove drift gillnet gear from allowed gear to participate in the Southeast Cove THA common property fisheries, as follows: | | |
| Oppose | 2 | 12 | <p>Tad moves to Support, John seconds</p> <p>Committee discussion</p> <p>discussion on how allowing gillnetters is there just in case more fish need to be caught and option is needed.</p> <p>Tad: Gillnet fleet does not currently, and has not historically fished in SE Cove. This proposal is only about theoretically allowing them to do so in the future. The gillnetters are already catching well more than their share of hatchery fish and have been for decades. Under BoF directive, they would only deserve this THA opportunity at the expense of other gear groups if they were below their allocation. It is inconceivable that they would be below their allocation</p> |



| | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|---|
| | | | <p>before the next BoF cycle, so they should not be on the list of possible gear groups in SE Cove at this time.</p> <p>Eric: As an NSRAA board member, he prefers that the BoF delegate NSRAA as much freedom of authority as possible.</p> |
| 101 | Modify management plan to further consider potential effect of hatchery-produced salmon on wild-stock salmon, as follows: | | |
| Oppose | 1 | 10 3 abstain | <p>John Murray moves to support, Moe Johnson seconds</p> <p>Public testimony</p> <p>Matt Donahoe: oppose this Carter Hughes: Why is someone from Cook Inlet proposing on local hatcheries here in SE? This is primarily over chum salmon. He opposes the proposal.</p> <p>Justin Peeler: opposes this proposal</p> <p>Committee Discussion:</p> <p>John Murray: I don't support. Brings up interesting points, but better done through NSRAA board.</p> |
| 102 | Change the ratio of drift gillnet to purse seine openings from 2:1 to 1:2 in the Deep Inlet Terminal Harvest Area, as follows: | | |
| Support with Amendment; Ratio of 1 Seine: 1 gillnet | 13 | 1 | <p>Proposer spoke to the proposal</p> <p>Public Testimony</p> <p>Justin Peeler: (speaking as representative of SEAS the proposer): This proposal was intended to retain status quo of 2018.</p> <p>Justin Peeler, speaking as a sitka seiner: would like to see it 1:1</p> <p>Committee:</p> <p>Woody Cyr moves to amend to make it a 1:1 ratio of seine days and gill net days; Tad Fujioka seconded</p> |



| | | | |
|---------------------|---|-----------------|--|
| | | | <p>Moe Johnson adamantly agrees with Justin Peeler on making it 1:1; not sure how local gill netters can make it on just 1 or 2 days per week. Acknowledges that gillnetters are above their allocation, but says that Deep Inlet is different for gillnetters since the local gillnetters have no traditional fisheries in this area. They either fish Deep Inlet or they have to leave town. The 1:1 also helps get the fish when they have the highest price</p> <p>Tad: Recalled that SEAS rep introduced the proposal saying that it was based on “status quo” of the 2018 ratio of 2 seine:1 gillnet, but didn’t say what the ratio has been since then. Asks NSRAA rep what the ratio was in 2019-2021</p> <p>Answer: it has been 1:1</p> <p>Woody Cyr: appreciates Moe’s perspective and pointed out that Deep Inlet is the only gillnet fishery that NSRAA supports</p> <p>Amendment passes unanimously; as does proposal as amended.</p> |
| 103 | Modify net gear allocation guidelines to further consider potential effect of hatchery-produced salmon on wild-stock salmon and wild-stock salmon management, as follows: | | |
| Oppose | 1 | 11 2 abstain | <p>Public Testimony:</p> <p>Justin Peeler: not a good proposal James Carter Hughes: not in support Matt Donahoe: proposal trying to shut down all hatcheries but NSRAA has done a good job managing</p> <p>Committee Discussion: Eric Jordan: as a founder of NSRAA I oppose this proposal. NSRAA has done a good job Jeff Feldpausch : Have talked to the proposer and does feel there are concerns about hatchery impacts and that there are limits being pushed and are impacts on wild stocks. speaking on a former hatchery manager.</p> |



| | | | |
|---------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | |
| 104 | | | Create a management plan for hatchery returns to Burnett Inlet, as follows: |
| | | | |
| 105 | | | Create a management plan for hatchery returns to Port Saint Nicholas, as follows: |
| | | | |
| 106 | | | Modify boundaries of the Port Saint Nicholas Special Harvest Area and allow use of drift gillnet gear for cost recovery operations, as follows: |
| | | | |
| 107 | | | Create a management plan for hatchery returns to Port Asumcion, as follows: |
| | | | |
| 108 | | | Create a special harvest area for Port Asumcion, as follows: |
| | | | |
| 109 | | | Establish a hatchery special harvest area in Carroll Inlet, as follows: |
| | | | |
| 110 | | | Require reporting and recovery of lost drift gillnet gear, as follows: |
| | | | |
| 111 | | | Change the maximum drift gillnet mesh size during periods established by emergency order from 6 inches to 6 and one-eighth inches, as follows: |
| | | | |
| 112 | | | Provide the department authority to allow drift gillnets of up to 90 meshes in depth to be used in the District 11 drift gillnet fishery beginning in SW 34, as follows: |
| | | | |
| 113 | | | Change the maximum mesh size during periods established by emergency order from 6 inches to a range of five and one-quarter to 6 inches and define dates in Districts 6, 8 and 11 when the mesh size will be implemented, as follows: |
| | | | |
| 114 | | | Allow the use of fishing rods in conjunction with downriggers by hand trollers, as follows: |
| | | | |
| 115 | | | Modify the start date of the winter troll fishery, as follows: |
| | | | |
| 116 | | | Require retention of king salmon caught during periods of nonretention to be retained if they are deemed too injured to be released and set price at one dollar for selling retained fish, as follows: |
| | | | |
| 117 | | | Allow trollers the use of two additional fishing lines in designated chum troll fishing areas in August and September, as follows: |
| | | | |



| | |
|---------------------|--|
| 118 | Modify the boundaries of Districts 6 and 8 in Sumner Strait, as follows: |
| | |
| 119 | Create a new section in District 6 and reimplement the Section 6-D Pink Salmon Management Plan, as follows: |
| | |
| 120 | Remove Section 6-D closure to fishing with drift gillnet gear during the month of August, as follows: |
| | |
| 121 | Establish waters closed to commercial drift gillnet fishing in and around Coffman Cove, as follows: |
| | |
| 122 | Northern Southeast seine salmon fishery management plans -- Remove sunset date so regulation remains in effect, as follows: |
| | |
| 123 | Remove the sunset date so regulation remains in effect and change effective end date of the plan from July 22 to July 15, as follows: |
| | |
| 124 | Establish additional guidelines for the department to manage the District 12 purse seine fishery north of Point Marsden, as follows: |
| | |
| 276 | Allow for the retention of salmon during periods of commercial nonretention when the sport fishery in the area is open for that species, as follows: |
| | |
| 125 | Clarify language for subsistence take of coho and king salmon, as follows: |
| | |
| | |



Adjournment:

Minutes Recorded By: Andrew Thoms

Minutes Approved By: Full AC

Date: 12/6/21



**Sitka Fish and Game Advisory Committee
December 6, 2021
Zoom**

- I. Call to Order: 6:08 by Heather Bauscher
- II. Roll Call
Members Present: up to 15 (not all present for entire meeting)

| Last | First | User Group |
|------------|---------|---------------------------------|
| Prussian | Aaron | hand troll |
| Feldpausch | Jeff | Subsistence |
| Barkau | Kent | hunting |
| Johnson | Moe | Seine |
| Johnson | Karen | At Large |
| Curran | Dick | Longline |
| Murray | John | Power Troll |
| Thoms | Andrew | Conservation (left mtg early) |
| Fujioka | Tad | Processor |
| | | |
| Ramp | Steve | Res.Sportfish (joined mtg late) |
| Jordan | Eric | At Large |
| Cyr | Woody | Trapping |
| Bastain | Luke | Guide |
| | | |
| Bauscher | Heather | Alternate |
| Wayne | Stacey | Shellfish |

Members Absent (Excused):2
 Members Absent (Unexcused):1
 Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 7

- III. Fish and Game Staff Present:
 - a. Grant Hagerman
 - b. Troy Tydingco
 - c. Mike Vaughn
 - d. Jason Jones
 - e. Jake Wielieczkiewicz
 - f. Aaron Dupuis
 - g. Lauren Sill



- IV. Guests Present:
 - a. Justin Peeler (SEAS)
 - b. Officer Tim Hall (AWT)
 - c. Mike Martello
 - d. Jud Kirkness
 - e. Chris Combs
 - f. Tony Byrd

- V. Approval of Agenda
 - a. Moved/2nd; Stacy Wayne/ John Murray; Carried w/o objection

- VI. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes
 - a. Moved/2nd; John Murray; Stacy Wayne; Carried w/o objection

- VII. New Business- proposals

- VIII.** Adjourn 9:15 pm



| Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals | | | |
|---|----------------------|---------------|---|
| January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK | | | |
| Proposal Number | Proposal Description | | |
| Support/Support as amended/Oppose/No Action | Number Support | Number Oppose | Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments |
| <p><i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i></p> | | | |
| 80 | | | Amend regulation to address payback provisions when the State of Alaska king salmon fisheries exceed Alaska’s annual king salmon all-gear harvest ceiling, as follows: |
| 81 | | | Allocate any Alaska all gear-allocation king salmon remaining after September 1 to the commercial troll fishery, as follows: |
| 82 | | | Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to align with the provisions of the 2019–2028 Pacific Salmon Treaty annex, as follows: |
| 83 | | | Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to manage for an average sport harvest of 20% of the sport/troll allocation with commensurate regulations addressing sport fishery overages in the commercial troll fishery, as follows: |
| 84 | | | Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to ensure no closure of the resident king salmon fishery due to allocation concerns, as follows: |
| 85 | | | Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to manage for a resident priority by implementing closed periods and reducing bag limits for nonresidents, as follows: |
| 86 | | | Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to manage for a resident priority by implementing closed periods and reducing bag limits for nonresidents, as follows: |
| 87 | | | Make numerous changes to management of commercial troll and sport fisheries for king salmon in Southeast Alaska, as follows: |
| 88 | | | Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to manage for a sliding sport allocation between 16 and 24 percent with commensurate commercial troll fishery allocation modification under commercial regulation, as follows: |



| | |
|---------------------|---|
| 89 | Allow the use of two additional fishing lines during periods of king salmon nonretention in all of the Southeast-Yakutat area if there is more than one CFEC power troll permit holder on board the vessel, as follows: |
| | |
| 90 | Change trigger to from an annual abundance index (AI) number to a District 13 early-winter power troll CPUE tier, as follows: |
| | |
| 91 | Reallocate the annual troll harvest allocation between the winter, spring and summer troll fisheries, as follows: |
| | |
| 92 | Allow retention of king salmon greater than 26 inches in hatchery terminal harvest areas by commercial trollers, as follows: |
| | |
| 93 | Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan by reducing the maximum nonresident annual limit to three king salmon, as follows: |
| | |
| 94 | Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to manage for a resident priority by implementing specific closed periods and reducing annual limits for nonresidents, as follows: |
| | |
| 95 | Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to provide for inseason liberalization of management measures when the sport fish allocation will not be met, as follows: |
| | |
| 99 | Establish a gear rotation between purse seine and troll gear in the Southeast Cove Terminal Harvest area, as follows: |
| | |
| 100 | Remove drift gillnet gear from allowed gear to participate in the Southeast Cove THA common property fisheries, as follows: |
| | |
| 101 | Modify management plan to further consider potential effect of hatchery-produced salmon on wild-stock salmon, as follows: |
| | |
| 102 | Change the ratio of drift gillnet to purse seine openings from 2:1 to 1:2 in the Deep Inlet Terminal Harvest Area, as follows: |
| | |
| 103 | Modify net gear allocation guidelines to further consider potential effect of hatchery-produced salmon on wild-stock salmon and wild-stock salmon management, as follows: |
| | |
| 104 | Create a management plan for hatchery returns to Burnett Inlet, as follows: |
| | |
| 105 | Create a management plan for hatchery returns to Port Saint Nicholas, as follows: |
| | |



| | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|--|
| 106 | Modify boundaries of the Port Saint Nicholas Special Harvest Area and allow use of drift gillnet gear for cost recovery operations, as follows: | | |
| | | | |
| 107 | Create a management plan for hatchery returns to Port Asumcion, as follows: | | |
| | | | |
| 108 | Create a special harvest area for Port Asumcion, as follows: | | |
| | | | |
| 109 | Establish a hatchery special harvest area in Carroll Inlet, as follows: | | |
| | | | |
| 110 | Require reporting and recovery of lost drift gillnet gear, as follows: | | |
| 11 | 1 | 2 | <p>Justin Peeler: This was sponsored by the East POW AC. They have a lot of proposals. Many people on this AC are also on the Craig AC. There were a lot of changes to the East POW AC roster recently.</p> <p>Woody: I have a lot of experience gillnetting, and I am very surprised by this proposal. You would always try to recover your net. They cost \$10,000! That's enough incentive that I can hardly think of a scenario where somebody wouldn't continue to make the effort to ultimately get their net back. It would take an inconceivable string of cascading failures to end up in such a situation.</p> <p>Tad: This proposal sounds like a solution in search of a problem.</p> <p>Stacy: I've found abandoned nets while beachcombing. I don't know what they were used for. What would be the harm in requiring the gear to be marked?</p> <p>Woody: Losing a net is such a rare occurrence, there wouldn't be any real benefit. The problem with requiring nets to be marked is that sometimes we have to repair nets mid-opening if we get web in the prop or something. In a situation like that, you cut away the damaged portion of your net and tie what's left back together to be able to keep fishing for the rest of the opener. If the damaged portion included the marked section, then you would accidentally be in violation. It would be adding insult to injury.</p> <p>Stacy: I've fished in the Bristol Bay set net fishery. they have to be marked.</p> <p>Moved/2nd by Eric/Luke : To table and take No Action Fails 6-8 so motion proceeds to a vote.</p> |
| 111 | Change the maximum drift gillnet mesh size during periods established by emergency order from 6 inches to 6 and one-eighth inches, as follows: | | |
| | | | |



| | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|---|
| 112 | Provide the department authority to allow drift gillnets of up to 90 meshes in depth to be used in the District 11 drift gillnet fishery beginning in SW 34, as follows: | | |
| | | | |
| 113 | Change the maximum mesh size during periods established by emergency order from 6 inches to a range of five and one-quarter to 6 inches and define dates in Districts 6, 8 and 11 when the mesh size will be implemented, as follows: | | |
| 0 | 9 | 4 | <p>John: This is out of our area, but it is relevant to the Chinook Stocks of Concern, so it affects Sitka fishermen. Why are they using a 6" mesh to target sockeye anyway?</p> <p>Tad: At least around Juneau, the early gillnet fishery used to be a sockeye fishery and is still managed on wild sockeye escapement, but the gillnetters are targeting DIPAC chum. If they catch too many sockeye they get closed. If the sockeye escapements are good, they get longer openings. So, they want to catch the chum without catching too many sockeye. That's why they use a large mesh, so the sockeye can go through. It's goofy in that it is officially a sockeye fishery, but they are trying to not catch sockeye.</p> <p>Justin Peeler (SEAS): This would have significant implications for gillnetters. Can't tell how many king salmon it might save. Districts 6 & 8 don't draw much effort that time of year, but districts 11 and 15 are big fisheries. This is outside of Sitka, your AC shouldn't weigh in. At least in some of these areas, they are trying to catch sockeye.</p> <p>Woody: Fish are smaller now than they used to be. Guys are already fishing 4-7/8" nets for sockeye and chum. So this proposal is unnecessary. I'm in favor of not adding additional restrictions. I especially don't want an upper and a lower limit in effect at the same time. It gets messy when there are too many different restrictions in nearby areas. Guys aren't able to shift from one area to the next one if they have a net that is only legal in one area. This wouldn't provide much benefit since the gillnetters already don't catch very many kings in districts 11 & 15 with a 6" mesh.</p> |
| 114 | Allow the use of fishing rods in conjunction with downriggers by hand trollers, as follows: | | |
| 12 | 1 | 1 | Office Hall (AWT): Concern due to lots of trollers fishing during the spring and summer compared to winter when using downriggers is already allowed; Spring has lots of water closed to commercial troll; If downriggers are allowed for both sport and commercial there is no way to tell from a distance if a fisherman is sportfishing or commercial trolling; |



| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>Allowing downriggers would provide the chance for more participation by charter boats; The proposal doesn't limit the number of downriggers- would 4 be allowed, or just 2?; However, overall the previously mentioned enforcement concerns are fairly minor.</p> <p>Tad: Hand trollers are already allowed to use rod & reel, so there is already gear overlap. Hence from an enforcement perspective, this proposal wouldn't introduce any fundamentally new complication to the fishery. Actually, since manual downriggers are quite uncommon on sportboats now that most of them have electric models, this would help to reduce the amount of gear overlap.</p> <p>Eric: When one goes sportfishing on a commercial boat, you are required to remove the dorsal fin of any salmon you catch to identify it as a sport-caught fish. In many years of operating a derby weight station, I have very rarely seen anybody forget to do this. (To Trooper Hall) How often have you seen this?</p> <p>Troller Hall (in response): It happens occasionally; can't really say how often.</p> <p>Aaron: Would this allow all downriggers, or just manual downriggers?</p> <p>Trooper Hall: It would have to be manual downriggers only, or else it isn't considered handtroll gear.</p> <p>Tad: Proposals like this have come up many times in the past. ATA supported one like this last cycle. Enforcement opposed it for instinctive reasons that weren't really all that well grounded- they didn't like the gear overlap issue, but since rod and reel is already allowed, that is a false argument. Furthermore, if the area that the boat is fishing in is closed to trolling, then they can't be legally trolling anyway, regardless of what kind of gear they are using. And if the water is open to trolling, then why does it matter if it is hard to tell whether they are trolling or sportfishing?</p> <p>Eric: I strongly support this proposal. Both hand troll and power trollers ought be able to use rods if they want to.</p> |
|--|--|---|



| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>115</p> | <p>Modify the start date of the winter troll fishery, as follows: Amended to apply only in years when the winter fishery is scheduled to close March 15 instead of April 30.</p> | |
| <p>14 (Proposal amended to apply only in years when the winter fishery is scheduled to close March 15 instead of April 30.)</p> | <p>0</p> <p>0</p> | <p>Tad: I was on the ATA board when they submitted this proposal. This proposal was intended to provide partial mitigation to the winter fishermen for the loss of the best 6 weeks of winter. It isn't much, but it is something. The CPUE index for district 13 that is part of the new Pacific Salmon Treaty Agreement starts with week 41, so opening any earlier would contaminate that index. That's why ATA didn't ask to start any earlier. By moving the opening date from the 11th to the beginning of week 41, it would make the length of the assessment period uniform every year. As it is now, the length varies. So this proposal would make it a better index. The winter fishery used to start on Oct 1. Summer trollers wanted to restrict the winter harvest, so they would get more of the quota and pushed to get the opening date moved to Oct 11. Back then, the winter season always ran through at least mid April. But, in 2018, the BoF shortened the winter season due to Stock of Concern issues and as long as we continue to be in SOC management, it will close March 15. Thus, there is no longer any need to further restrict harvest on the front end of the season.</p> <p>Grant (ADF&G Troll biologist): The fishery opening date has been Oct 11th since 1992. Sometimes the 11th is in stat week 41 , sometimes in week 42. This would change the length of the CPUE assessment compared to the 2001-2015 base period which might change the relationship between CPUE and abundance. This might cause a change in the quota. Hard to say whether it would go up or down, but the Alaskan treaty team is nervous, because they would have to explain this change to their negotiation counterparts.</p> <p>Mo: What is the earlier possible opening date under this proposal?</p> <p>Grant: It would add 3-9 days.</p> <p>Kent: So, it would be 6 more days on average.</p> <p>Steve: This is an opportunity to gain more data. We don't know what the catch rates will be until we fish. The more</p> |



| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>data that we have the better we should be at predicting abundance.</p> <p>John: (To Grant) So currently, the CPUE assessment period isn't a fixed number of days?</p> <p>Grant (in response): No, it runs from Oct 11 through the end of Week 48. The number of days changes from year to year.</p> <p>Tad: This would stop it from changing every year and make it a fixed length. That should make the index more reliable, not less. A desire to remain consistent with how something was done in the past is not a good enough reason to keep doing it poorly.</p> <p>Eric: Many years ago, our AC proposed moving the winter line in front of town further out. When that change was made, there happened to be big runs of Robertson Creek hatchery kings coming by those years and we caught lots of them. The winter catch got up around 72,000. It was a substantial fraction of the annual quota. That was good for the resident trollers since winter prices are much higher than summer prices, but the summer guys didn't like it and they wanted the winter season capped at 40,000. We convened a task force to address this. They settled at a winter cap of 45,000. The winter prices are so much higher than the summer prices, it is much better for the year round residents if we catch them in the winter. But now with the season closing March 15, the winter catches are very small. This would help a bit.</p> <p>John (Power troll rep): We've lost the best part of our winter season to the SoC management plan. Spring fishing in most areas is shutdown completely. If we can get a few more winter days it would help. There aren't SoC concerns this time of year, so this is the best opportunity to make up a little bit of lost ground.</p> <p>Luke: So does this change the CPUE assessment period?</p> <p>Tad: Not technically. The CPUE assessment period was set by the 2019 Treaty Agreement as Week 41-48. However, since the agreement went into effect, we haven't started fishing until Oct 11. The assessment period has been open for 3-9</p> |
|--|--|---|



| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>days before there has been any fishing to assess. This would let us fish the entire assessment period.</p> <p>Woody: This is a good proposal. Don't worry about the CPUE effects. They will be minor.</p> <p>Mo: I am concerned about the CPUE changes, but I'm more worried about the potential for bycatch. I used to start winter fishing on Oct 1 back when it was allowed. That was a long time ago and the ocean has changed alot since, but back then we used to get a lot of shakers and a lot of juvenile outmigrant coho. I could support this proposal for years when the SoC Plan has the winter fishery closing on March 15, but not in the event that we go back to April 30. If we can fish until April 30, we'll catch our fish in April, so we don't need to start early and have the potential for bycatch. Better to catch them in April if we are allowed to.</p> <p>Also, one of the reasons for changing from Oct 1 to Oct 11 was to make the inside winter guys take some of the burden of the reduction instead of it just coming from moving the winter line in front of Sitka in. The first ten days of fishing in Frederick Sound used to be very good. Giving that up was Petersburg's contribution to reducing winter catch.</p> <p>Move/2nd; Mo/Eric to Amend proposal to only apply to years when the winter season will close on March 15</p> <p>Kent: Will we know at the beginning of winter season whether it will end on March 15?</p> <p>Grant (in response): Yes, winter season will continue to end on March 15 until the BoF lifts the Unuk River SoC management. The Department would have to make a recommendation to do that well in advance of the beginning of winter season.</p> <p>Amendment passes 14-0</p> <p>Tad: The amendment is consistent with the intent of the ATA board when they made the proposal. This was a compromise proposal between various factions of the troll fleet, but the reason for making the proposal was to provide partial mitigation for the loss of the most lucrative 6 weeks of the winter season.</p> |
|--|--|--|



| | | | |
|---------------------|--|---|--|
| 116 | Require retention of king salmon caught during periods of nonretention to be retained if they are deemed too injured to be released and set price at one dollar for selling retained fish, as follows: | | |
| 0 | 14 | 0 | <p>Juston Peeler (SEAS): Opposed to this. It would lead to too much mishandling</p> <p>Grant (Troll biologist): ADFG has many issues with this. It appears unenforceable</p> <p>AWT Officer Hall: On its face, it is unenforceable. It would allow the sale of fish that can't be legally possessed. Fishermen that are catcher/sellers and have private markets could sell the fish to themselves, then resell the fish to a customer under their processor license.</p> <p>Tad: Under the new Pacific Salmon Treaty Agreement, Alaska has a limit on the number of king salmon that fishermen keep and a separate limit on the incidental mortality. The way that the agreement is written, reducing the latter doesn't allow us to keep any additional fish. We've greatly reduced our incidental mortality over the years, and haven't gotten any additional quota in exchange.</p> |
| 117 | Allow trollers the use of two additional fishing lines in designated chum troll fishing areas in August and September, as follows: | | |
| 1 | 13 | 0 | <p>Justin Peeler (SEAS): As a seiner and SEAS board member, I support this proposal to make the troll fleet more efficient and make it easier to catch the troll allocation.</p> <p>AWT Officer Hall: This would become an enforcement issue if boats fishing 6 lines were required to release king and cohos but boats fishing 4 lines in the same area were allowed to keep them. Is that the department's understanding of the proposal?</p> <p>Grant (ADFG troll biologist): Yes, those running 6 lines would have to release kings and cohos.</p> <p>AWT Officer Hall: The proposal includes August and September- so the August king opener would be included.</p> <p>Eric: I'm strongly opposed to this proposal. I pioneered the chum troll fishery. It is a good one for small boats since it takes place in mostly protected waters. Many small boats don't have 6 gurdies, and even if they did they couldn't run six wires without getting tangled up. Six wires makes boats</p> |



| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>less maneuverable. Maneuverability is a big part of success in the chum troll fishery. Running too many flashers will spook the fish and put them off bite for everybody else. Between reduced turning radius, more boats getting in each other's way, extra tangles and spooked fish this isn't likely to lead to higher catches. Probably will result in lower catches if too many guys try this. Furthermore, it is highly allocative since only the biggest boats could run 6 lines successfully anyway.</p> <p>AWT Officer Hall: The proposal doesn't specifically say that it is limited to power trollers. Would handtrollers be allowed to run 6 wires too? They aren't even allowed to have 6 gurdies on the boat now.</p> <p>Eric: (To Hall) How would you enforce this?</p> <p>AWT Officer Hall: It would be very difficult. I would have to go aboard and look at the catch of each boat running 6 wires. That would be very time consuming. I'm not interested in doing this. It wouldn't be a good use of my time.</p> <p>John: Would this require a change to 5AAC 29.120 also? That section limits power trollers to 4 lines except west of Cape Spencer.</p> <p>Stacy: When we talked about the other 6 line proposal, there were bycatch concerns. When fishing is good, the fish on the 5th and 6th wires get drug around longer so they aren't in as good of shape, if they get released. Would this lead to a 50% increase in bycatch encounters and more than 50% increase in bycatch mortality?</p> <p>Eric: There are plenty of reasons to oppose this proposal, but bycatch isn't one of them. The chum troll fishery has very little bycatch- especially when things are busy and the chum are biting well. I once had made an arrangement with an ADFG observer to come along with me on a coho trip because they wanted to get Chinook bycatch data. I got a tip that the chum were in, so I told the observer that I was going chum fishing instead. The observer cancelled because even back then, ADFG knew that bycatch in the chum fishery was so low that it wasn't going to be worth the observer's time to be on board.</p> |
|--|--|--|



| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | | <p>Mike Vaughn (ADFG assistant troll biologist): In response to a previous question by AWT Hall, it is ADFG’s interpretation that handrollers would be allowed 4 wires under this proposal.</p> |
| <p>132</p> | <p>Prohibit diving (spear fishing) in Redoubt subsistence area:</p> | |
| <p>No position on this proposal, but inform BoF that there is fishing activity at redoubt that is apparently illegal.</p> | | <p>Tony Byrd: I spearfish at Redoubt. I oppose this proposal. It is unwarranted. No other type of subsistence gear group is being singled out. The safety concern is being overblown. There are plenty of dangers inherent to dipnetting too. The spear is tethered to the spear gun. It isn’t like it is going to go flying off and hit somebody.</p> <p>Eric (to Tony): I have flyfished, dipnetted and snagged at Redoubt. Can you spearfish outside of the snagging line instead of right at the base of the falls?</p> <p>Tony (in response) : Maybe you could, but it would be much more difficult. You would have to hold your breath much longer. Also, there are lots of boats on the line. It is safer near the falls where there aren’t a bunch of boats and snagging hooks.</p> <p>Tad (to Tony): The proposer says that spearfishing is inefficient. Can you speak to that?</p> <p>Tony (in response): My son and I do well. We get our limits. Spearing allows us to be selective and take the specific fish that we want. Dipnetting is difficult for me. I have a bad back. I do better spearing than dipnetting for sure.</p> <p>Ben Adams: I’ve fished Redoubt for ten years with a dipnet and with spear. The root cause of this problem isn’t spearfishing, but rude behavior. I try to be considerate of all other users. Mostly other people are too. I question why the proposal is in effect June 21- August 1. Early in that time period there usually are few if any other people there. Dipnetter spook fish too. It isn't just spearfishermen. You learn how to swim so that you don’t spook so many fish. We don’t want to spook the fish. It makes it harder for us too. But you have to learn. If you are in the water though, it is easier to see how the fish are reacting. There are many dangers at Redoubt- bears, people with guns, slippery rocks, etc. Spearfishing isn’t any more of a danger than those</p> |



| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>things. Why should we be singled out. We already are restricted to the side with less current. The current is too strong at the main falls to be able to swim, so that side is always going to be free of spear fishermen.</p> <p>Jud Kirkness: I oppose this proposal. I've been dipnetting at Redoubt for 16 years. I catch about 100 sockeye most years and have never had a problem with spear fishermen. The run is as strong as it is because the Forest Service fertilizes the lake. That's to say that all of us, including the spear fishermen, as federal taxpayers are paying for those fish, so they ought to be allowed to continue to harvest them. The mention in the proposal statement about spearfishing being dangerous isn't a legitimate one. Fishing at Redoubt is dangerous for many reasons. Spearfishermen are the least of my safety concerns.</p> <p>Mike Martello: I oppose this proposal. I've been spearfishing at Redoubt for 12-15 years. Sure the fish scatter when you go after them, but only for a few minutes. I get my limit, and so do the dipnetters fishing around me. If this proposal were to pass, the snorkelers would have to be out past the snagging line. This would be more dangerous. Fishing at Redoubt can be dangerous for many reasons. I've seen boats flip in the falls, I've seen dipnetters fall in. There are plenty of dangers, but spearfishermen aren't a major source.</p> <p>Eric: Is there a possible compromise? The Sitka AC won a major award for developing this management plan. We spent a lot of time on it, and during that time, spearfishing wasn't anticipated. Could there be some time slots when spearfishing wouldn't be allowed? There is a real potential for conflict here. For instance, if there is a spear fisherman in the pool below the falls, I would imagine that it would be pointless to try to fly fish there.</p> <p>Mike: I don't think it is appropriate to regulate one gear type over all others. It wouldn't be fair. The fishery is timed around the tides, so a fixed time of day wouldn't work- or at least there would be days when the time you were allowed to fish would be a time when the fish weren't there. People fish after work, so their schedules are limited. I've speared there a lot and rarely does my presence affect any other users. The fish move around. We don't want to spook them unnecessarily. The fish come back within</p> |
|--|--|--|



| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>minutes. It doesn't take any longer for the fish to recover than if you swept a dipnet through the pool.</p> <p>I speared 40 fish last year. Many times when I went there weren't any dipnetters. Why should I be restricted to certain times of day if there isn't anybody else there?</p> <p>Maybe a line closer to the fall could work, but if you are the only one there you ought to be able to go anywhere you want to go. The currents change with the tide. At low tide you can't get close to the falls anyway. As I see it, the user groups already break themselves into separate zones. The snaggers get the outer area. The dipnetters get the falls and the spearfishermen get the middle.</p> <p>John: The Redoubt management plan allows the use of a spear, but does it allow the use of a spear gun? The proposal says that it doesn't.</p> <p>Lauren Sill (ADFG Subsistence): 5 AAC 01.010 defines spear to be hand operated. Don't know if a spear gun counts.</p> <p>AWT officer Hall: I don't know either.</p> <p>Steve: Snorkeling might be legal sport gear, but I don't think that it is legal subsistence gear.</p> <p>AWT officer Hall: I think you (Steve) might be right.</p> <p>Troy (ADFG Sportfish) The snagging boundary is the fresh/salt water line. Sport spearfishing isn't allowed in fresh water where the current spearfishery is taking place.</p> <p>Aaron Dupuis (ADFG comfish): The subsistence regs at Redoubt allow dip nets, gaffs, spears, and hook and line, but dive gear- including snorkeling is not allowed.</p> <p>Andrew: So what does that mean?</p> <p>Aaron Dupuis: It means that you aren't allowed to use dive gear for subsistence fishing at Redoubt.</p> <p>Andrew: I dipnet there all the time, but I've never had a problem with a spearfisherman. I'm fine with them there. I would be willing to make a proposal to change the regs so that they could legally be there.</p> |
|--|--|--|



| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Luke: I've dipnetted, snorkeled and snagged at Redoubt. I've never had any inter-gear conflicts, just intra-gear ones. I would support making spearfishing legal.</p> <p>Steve: If snorkeling is illegal, we should support the proposal.</p> <p>Jud Kirkness: As written, this proposal would prohibit anybody being in the water whether they were spearfishing or not. That's overkill.</p> <p>Jeff: Dipnetting spots are limited. if snorkelers are spooking fish, that makes things even more difficult. The limited access is the reason for the low harvest. I'm in favor of this proposal.</p> <p>Stacy: It is clear that diving isn't legal, and using a spear gun probably isn't legal either. Maybe the best solution for tonight is to table the proposal. The divers need to get together and come up with a proposal that is acceptable to the dipnetters before it is likely to pass. Mostly they need to define ways that would enforce courtesy.</p> <p>Andrew: I agree</p> <p>AWT officer Hall: The Redoubt Management Plan would have to change. Might have to change sport and Personal Use too.</p> <p>Aaron Dupuis: Perhaps one of the other proposals for Redoubt could be amended. That way it could be addressed this cycle. I don't think that it would be appropriate to amend this proposal since it would be the opposite of the proposal's intent.</p> <p>Luke: There is a lot more perceived conflict at Redoubt than actual conflict. If the fish aren't running it is easy to blame some other user group. When you are actually in the water, you can see how the fish are really reacting.</p> <p>John: Where is the Redoubt Management line? Could they snorkel outside of that line?</p> <p>Aaron Dupuis (in response to John's question):The line is out north of Kidney Cove. I.e. The entire fishable water is within the Redoubt Management area, so no, I don't think that is a solution.</p> |
|--|--|--|



| | | | |
|---------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>Eric (to AWT Hall): Did you know that there is a popular illegal activity going on at Redoubt?</p> <p>AWT officer Hall (in response): No. This just came to light researching for this proposal. We didn't realize that it wasn't legal.</p> <p>Eric: Because we have had people participating in illegal fisheries, I suggest that users get together to define areas/times when/where spearing can be made legal.</p> <p>Heather: This would need a SE RAC proposal too.</p> <p>Woody: This proposal says that no person shall remain submerged. What if somebody just wants to go for a swim? What if a dipnetter falls in and gets immersed? they would be in violation. That's overkill.</p> <p>Jeff: I don't see another proposal that we could amend to include spearfishing. Proposal 133 is about net gear and 131 is about community harvesting.</p> <p>Heather: In that case, we probably can't solve this in time for this BoF cycle.</p> <p>Moved/2nded; Steve/Kent to Take No Action on this proposal and inform the BoF that there is an apparently illegal activities taking place</p> |
| 119 | | | Create a new section in District 6 and reimplement the Section 6-D Pink Salmon Management Plan, as follows: |
| | | | |
| 120 | | | Remove Section 6-D closure to fishing with drift gillnet gear during the month of August, as follows: |
| | | | |
| 121 | | | Establish waters closed to commercial drift gillnet fishing in and around Coffman Cove, as follows: |
| | | | |
| 122 | | | Northern Southeast seine salmon fishery management plans -- Remove sunset date so regulation remains in effect, as follows: |
| | | | |
| 123 | | | Remove the sunset date so regulation remains in effect and change effective end date of the plan from July 22 to July 15, as follows: |
| | | | |



| | | | |
|---------------------|--|--|--|
| 124 | Establish additional guidelines for the department to manage the District 12 purse seine fishery north of Point Marsden, as follows: | | |
| | | | |
| 276 | Allow for the retention of salmon during periods of commercial nonretention when the sport fishery in the area is open for that species, as follows: | | |
| | | | |
| 125 | Clarify language for subsistence take of coho and king salmon, as follows: | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |



Adjournment: 9:15

Minutes Recorded By: Tad Fujioka

Minutes Approved By: Full AC

Date: 12/6/21



**Sitka Fish and Game Advisory Committee
December 9 ,2021
Zoom**

I. Call to Order: [Time] by Heather Bauscher, Chair

II. Roll Call

Members Present:

| | | |
|-----------|---------|---------------------|
| Prussian | Aaron | hand troll |
| Feldpauch | Jeff | Subsistence |
| Barkau | Kent | Hunting |
| Johnson | Moe | Seine |
| Johnson | Karen | At Large |
| Curran | Dick | Longline |
| Murray | John | Power Troll |
| Thoms | Andrew | Conservation |
| Ramp | Steve | Resident Sport Fish |
| Jordan | Eric | At Large |
| Cyr | Woody | Trapping |
| Bastain | Luke | Guide |
| Bauscher | Heather | Alternate |

| | | |
|---------|-------|----------|
| Johnson | Karen | At Large |
|---------|-------|----------|

| | | |
|---------|-----|-----------|
| Fujioka | Tad | Processor |
|---------|-----|-----------|

Members Absent (Excused):1

Members Absent (Unexcused):2

Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 7

III. Fish and Game Staff Present:

- a. Aaron Dupoius
- b. Jason Jones
- c.

IV. Guests Present:



Chuck Olson
Peter Bradley
Devon Calvin
Daphyne Albee-- Alaska Native Sisterhood
Kyle Rosendale Sitka Tribe of Alaska
Tom Gamble
Lauren Sill
Anna
Katherine Rose-- Raven Radio
Justin Peeler
Louis Brady
Paulette Moreno
Mark Browning

- V. Approval of Agenda
- VI. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes
- VII. Public Comment
- VIII. Old Business
 - 1) Bear letter on population survey-- held until next meeting
 - 2) Covid Letter-- Held until next meeting
 - 3) Jeff Feldpausch gave an update on tribal lawsuit on herring fishery. Will email out updates and rulings.
 - 4)
- IX. New Business
- X. Select representative(s) for board meeting
- XI. Set next meeting date
- XII. Other
- XIII.** Adjourn



| Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals | | | |
|---|--|---------------|---|
| January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK | | | |
| Proposal Number | Proposal Description | | |
| Support/Support as amended/Oppose/No Action | Number Support | Number Oppose | Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments |
| <p><i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i></p> | | | |
| | | | |
| 159 | Repeal this regulation related to management of the commercial sac roe herring fishery in Sitka Sound, as follows: | | |
| UNANIMOUSLY OPPOSE | 0 | 13 | <p>John Murray moves to adopt Tad seconds.</p> <p>Representative of Herring Conservation Alliance (seiners) spoke to the proposal on how this regulation of allowing for subsistence use could threaten the fishery and close it down.</p> <p>Eric Jordan asked about if this was the concern, how it is that we have had a fishery over the years since the regulation was adopted?</p> <p>John Murry: If this is passed, wouldn't the agency have to rewrite the entire management plan?</p> <p>ADFG: if this did happen, adfg would use time and area to ensure that subsistence needs were met.</p> <p>Public Testimony:</p> <p>Kyle Rosendale: STA-- this regulation is part of the lawsuit that STA had in motion. This regulation is one of the core ways that ADFG and regulations meets its obligation to meet subsistence needs. if this was repealed, the Board and State would likely be afoul of meeting subsistence needs. STA is against this regulation</p> |



| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>Justin Peeler--- This regulation was taken to court and maybe it is time to revise it. it is time to get out the misinterpretation of it. bringing it to the floor of the board of fish will allow us to do that.</p> <p>Devon Calvin-- member of public-- oppose this proposal.</p> <p>Paulette Moreno--oppose proposal 159 on behalf of Alaska Native Sisterhood; this is a matter of respect and having a proposal coming forward like this contrary to previous work done by all parties is disrespectful</p> <p>Tommy Gamble-- Opposes this proposal</p> <p>Board Discussion: STA and ADF&G had an MOU that required them to work together address reasonable opportunity and address subsistence concerns. In 2009 the State back out of the MOU citing concerns by another user group that STA had access to information that others didn't.</p> <p>John Murray: Stocks are robust and the biomass is large so there is enough for subsistence harvest and commercial harvest and all the other critters</p> <p>Eric Jordan: Do we need to repeal this to have a sacroe fishery or can the department manage for subsistence and sac roe with this regulation? (to ADFG) Answer from ADFG area Biologist: YES</p> <p>Tad: feels like there is an inconsistency from the proposer</p> <p>Moe: request we take no action and recommend the BOF revisit the regulation in place and meet with all parties involved to go over regulations and make sure all needs are met. As a seine fisherman, concerned when a regulation ends up in court. BOF should sit down with user groups and come up with better wording</p> <p>Moe: move to take action and request BOF revisit the regulation in place with all user groups involved and come up with better wording so that it will not end up in court again. Luke Bastian 2nds</p> <p>John-- not in favor of that</p> |
|--|--|--|--|



| | | | |
|-----------------------|---|----|--|
| | | | <p>Jeff-- not in favor of amendment nor proposal Aaron-- likes the motion and agrees that maybe there is a need to change up the language in the regulation Jeff- would not support rewriting this at this date Steve-- oppose amendment. herring fishery has been run fine with this regulation over the years since adoption motion 11 oppose, 2 support FAILS</p> <p>Eric Jordan calls question</p> |
| 160 | Reduce closed waters in the Sitka Sound commercial sac roe herring fishery, as follows: | | |
| OPPOSE UNANIMOUSLY | 0 | 14 | <p>John Murray moves to discuss Kent Barkhau seconds</p> <p>Proposer: we don't want to divide anyone or cause conflict. we just want everyone to get some of the biomass</p> <p>Department Comment: if these areas went away, department could have a fishery here. these areas have been fished in the past. this is allocative proposal and department is neutral</p> <p>Questions about areas closed. ADFG biologist shows maps of herring spawning protected area and proposal changes Public Testimony:</p> <p>Kyle Rosendale: STA opposes this. Long-time subsistence harvesters and elders cite this area that would be taken out of the protected area as the most important spawn area. This is an area set up for the people in the 14 foot open skiffs who are accessing areas for eggs. These areas are set up for those people who can't go out in more unprotected waters and these areas are very important</p> |



| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>Justin Peeler-- This proposal is to bring it to the floor and see if we can design it better-- give access to seiners for the deeper water</p> <p>Louis Brady-- I oppose this and urge people to respect the opinions and considerations of the first people of this place and the thousands of stakeholders the use these eggs to oppose this proposal</p> <p>Paulette Moreno-- strongly oppose this proposal and asks the Sitka AC to do the same.</p> <p>Tom Gamble-- spoke on his history of being involved with mapping this area and working with commercial sector in figuring out a proposal, original proposal was bigger and was reduced to this current area.</p> <p>DElbert Kadake-- Called in from Kake- Goes to Sitka to harvest eggs. the area this proposal considers is the hot spot for egg harvest. the only time i have noticed a disturbance is when there is a fishery close by that disturbs fish coming into the protected area. we come to kake to harvest eggs.</p> <p>Peter Bradley: Opposed to this proposal and talked about history</p> <p>Comments from Committee</p> <p>Jeff Feldpautch-- showed maps of spawn frequency and that this area that would be opened up has a high spawn frequency which makes it an important harvest area. A lot of other areas in the sound are bad for herring egg gathering... beaches on kruzof fill the eggs with sand and the conditions out there are not conducive (too much swell and weather)</p> <p>Eric: when the protected areas were proposed by the tribe, it was larger than the actual current protected area. The Sitka AC proposed this area which was adopted by the BOF</p> <p>Woody-- This protected area has only existed since 2018. It is too early to roll this bad. Let it work for more time</p> |
|--|--|--|---|



| | | | |
|-----------------------|--|----|---|
| | | | <p>Tad: I find the language on “artificially inflated amount needed for subsistence (ANS)”” is offensive and shame on proposer for including that. The BOF will look down on that.</p> <p>Steve: will oppose because there is nothing to replace it, but would like to make comment in notes to direct agency to do in-season management to identify areas of spawn where areas are set aside for subsistence harvesters</p> <p>Andrew--disagree with Steve and dont’ think it is possible to set aside areas in-season to set aside for subsistence harvest</p> |
| 161 | Require a subsistence fishing permit to harvest herring roe on branches in the Sitka Sound area, as follows: | | |
| OPPOSE UNANIMOUSLY | 0 | 14 | <p>Steve Ramp moves to consider Tad seconds</p> <p>Justin Peeler, proposer-- with the increasing number of people engaged in subsistence, feel that this could help track it. Also, apologize on any language that may be offensive. i am here as an individual and did not’ necessarily write these proposals that have language that is offensive.</p> <p>Department Staff: Department has no position on this proposal</p> <p>Woody-- is the department getting the information it needs from the current survey information? Department staff: YES</p> <p>Moe: do we have a percentage of harvesters surveyed? Department: we have a percentage of the households we believe participates in the survey based on STA’s list of known harvesters. we use chain referral and get pretty good response rates.</p> <p>Public Testimony:</p> <p>Kyle Rosendale: STA is opposed and we dont’ think this gets the reporting in the best way. we would like to see more resources for subsistence staff. The surveys give</p> |



| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>opportunities for questions and feedback and reporting in ways that permits would not.</p> <p>Anna Lafree-- oppose this proposal</p> <p>Peter Bradley-- shared a link and opposed the proposal</p> <p>Paulette Moreno-- opposes proposal and has noted changes in fish behavior</p> <p>Louise Brady-- Opposes proposal</p> <p>Delbert Kadake-- oppose proposal. hard to say how the permit will work when the eggs I collect I share out with everyone. do the people I share with need permits?</p> <p>Tom Gamble: Opposes this proposal</p> <p>Committee Discussion:</p> <p>Jeff Feldpausch-- took offense to some of the language in the proposal-- assures that data collected on subsistence harvest by his office is accurate</p> <p>Harvest surveys put managers "in the boat" with the harvesters. Permits will not give this level of data</p> |
| | | | |



Adjournment:

Minutes Recorded By: Andrew Thoms

Minutes Approved By: Full AC

Date: December 13, 2021



**Sitka Fish and Game Advisory Committee
December 13th, 2021
Location of Meeting**

I. Call to Order: [Time] by [name of chair/acting chair]

II. Roll Call

Members Present:

| | | |
|-----------|---------|---------------------|
| Prussian | Aaron | hand troll |
| Feldpauch | Jeff | Subsistence |
| | | |
| Johnson | Moe | Seine |
| Johnson | Karen | At Large |
| Curran | Dick | Longline |
| Murray | John | Power Troll |
| Thoms | Andrew | Conservation |
| Fujioka | Tad | Processor |
| | | |
| Ramp | Steve | Resident Sport Fish |
| Jordan | Eric | At Large |
| Cyr | Woody | Trapping |
| Bastain | Luke | Guide |
| | | |
| Bauscher | Heather | Alternate |
| Wayne | Stacey | Shellfish |

Members Absent (Excused):

Members Absent (Unexcused):3

Number Needed for Quorum on AC:7

List of User Groups Present:

III. Fish and Game Staff Present:

- a. Aaron Dupoius
- b. Jason Jones
- c. Jake Wieliczkievicz
- d.

IV. Guests Present:

- a. Katherine Rose, Raven Radio
- b. Paulette Moreno



- c. Chuck Olson
 - d. Anna Calvin
 - e. Kyle Rosendale
 - f.

- V. Approval of Agenda
 - Agenda Approval by unanimous consent

- VI. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes
 - Minutes of December 9th meeting approved
- VII. Reports
 - a. Chair's report
 - i. Report on correspondence
 - b. ADF&G
 - c. Others
 - i. Member of AC reported on the lateness of the ADFG comments on proposals

- VIII. Public Comment

- IX. Old Business
 - a. Update on Bycatch meeting and AC actions

- X. New Business

- XI. Select representative(s) for board meeting

- XII. Set next meeting date

- XIII. Other

- XIV.** Adjourn



| Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals | | | |
|---|--|---------------|---|
| January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK | | | |
| Proposal Number | Proposal Description | | |
| Support/Support as amended/Oppose/No Action | Number Support | Number Oppose | Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments |
| <p><i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i></p> | | | |
| 162 | Increase the possession limit for subsistence spawn-on-kelp harvest, as follows: | | |
| SUPPORT UNANIMOUSLY | 12 | 0 | <p>Tad moves to adopt, Jeff seconds</p> <p>Proposer Tad Fujioka: I see this as a minor proposal. I tried to make it as non-controversial as possible. The current regulations require the harvester to return to ADFG after harvesting ½ of their annual limit to renew their paperwork. This is onerous and wasteful of staff and harvesters time and limited minus tide opportunities for harvest. This proposal would allow the harvester to harvest their full allotment on one trip. The current limits appear to be random and are difficult to measure in the field. So the proposal rounds the limits up to the next 25 pounds which is half of a standard wetlock box. The proposer considered increasing the limit much more, but decided not to do so in order to avoid introducing potentially controversial allocative aspects.</p> <p>Department Staff: went through current regulations-- Department is neutral on proposal and doesn't see conservation concerns on the abundance of resource (kelp or herring); annual harvest is around 2500 lbs</p> <p>Public Comment:</p> <p>Kyle Rosendale-- Sitka Tribe: totally support this proposal</p> <p>Paulette Moreno-- Totally support this proposal</p> |



| | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | <p>Committee Discussion:</p> <p>John Murray: support this proposal. total catch is down compared to total biomass and there is a lot of macrocystic kelp around</p> <p>Tad Fujioka-- Have friends in other parts of the state who I share the resource with; last year was about 100 households</p> <p>Jeff Feldpausch-- I believe this will improve reporting accuracy of harvest</p> |
| 163 | Establish equal share quotas for the Sitka sac roe purse seine fishery, as follows: | | |
| SUPPORT | 11 | 1 | <p>John Murray moves to support, Tad seconds</p> <p>Proposer: this proposal is beneficial to everyone who is a stakeholder in the herring fishery I am a permit holder in the sac-roe fishery I have seen improvements every year in this fishery. My concern is that the fishery can be dangerous and costly. 3 concerns: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Conservation 2) Cost of monitoring and prosecuting fishery 3) Safety--- I have seen vessels hit each other and run over nets. All these concerns can be solved by all permit holders having an equal share in the fishery. The reason we had statehood was to stop fish traps and distribute fishery benefits to fishermen and not just processors. This proposal would make the fishery safer, better, less costly and better for the resource.</p> <p>Q: Eric Jordan: This sounds great.</p> <p>Jeff: Would the permit holder have to be on the grounds? Chuck: yes</p> |



| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>Karen: Have you talked to other permit holders on how they feel?</p> <p>Proposer: there is a poll going around amongst permit holders and the vast majority are in favor. There are only 3 or 4 who are against this. We have a super majority on this amongst permit holders.</p> <p>Moe Johnson: when the black cod chatham fishery was shifted to equal share, was it unanimous amongst permit holders?</p> <p>Answer from Proposer: NO, it was not unanimous but the BOF did it anyway. I don't think we would ever get 100% from the SACROE fishery.</p> <p>Department Staff: This proposal will not have an impact on ADFG to manage the fishery or meet the harvest quota</p> <p>Department is neutral</p> <p>Question on meeting GHF?</p> <p>Department: we can meet GHF and manage fishery accordingly. it would more likely be on the processor's capacity to meet GHF rather than us managing.</p> <p>John Murray: Appreciate all the points made in the proposal</p> <p>Public Testimony:</p> <p>Kyle Rosendale, Sitka Tribe: STA supports measures that reduce disturbance to herring spawning, but this proposal doesn't outline how the fishery would be managed and we are very concerned about high grading. It is STA's concern that previous cooperating fisheries that were managed for higher market quality and was essentially highgrading which had an impact on herring populations</p> <p>Committee Discussion:</p> <p>Eric Jordan: I strongly support this. I have been on boats participating in the fishery when boats run over nets and captains are fighting with each other. very unsafe.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|



| | | | |
|---------------------|---|----|---|
| | | | <p>Tad: The BoF should consider other stakeholders besides the permit holders. Equal shares would mean negative economic impacts for many other stakeholders-- less crew, less spending in Sitka restaurants/bars/gear stores, less sales tax for the city; less revenue for the harbor department--other vessel owners will see their rates raised to make up for this shortfall.</p> <p>Andrew Thoms: also less reality show crew</p> |
| 164 | Establish equal share quotas for the Sitka Sound sac roe herring purse seine fishery, as follows: | | |
| OPPOSE | 3 | 10 | <p>Jeff Feldpauch moves to adopt John seconds</p> <p>Chair: Any further information anyone wants to add to the robust discussion on 163?</p> <p>Steve Ramp: question for Department: how would this proposal deal with quota different from 163?</p> <p>Answer: For 163, if a permit holder didn't catch their quota, it would be left in the ocean. For 164, there is an overage/underage that would allow others to catch that share.</p> <p>Jeff FEldpausch: I see this proposal as putting the onus on the department and 163 as putting the onus on the fishery participants to distribute</p> <p>PUBLIC Testimony</p> <p>Kyle Rosendale: Sitka Tribe opposes 164 and the 10% overage/underage clause</p> <p>Chuck : the processors would give the totals on product harvested. Overage would be paid to ADFG</p> <p>Paulette Moreno: I oppose proposal. We need a solution but it is not this proposal.</p> <p>Committee:</p> |



| | | | |
|---------------------|--|----|---|
| | | | <p>John Murray: I support this proposal more. feel like this proposal gives move chance to get more crew members and more dollars out into the community.</p> <p>Jeff-- I am going to oppose proposal. it puts too much on department</p> |
| 165 | Allow unharvested Sitka sac roe quota to be harvested for food and bait by herring sac roe purse seine permit holders, as follows: | | |
| OPPOSE | 2 | 11 | <p>Jeff feldpauch move to adopt John Murray second</p> <p>Proposer: intent of proposal is to meet guideline harvest level which has not been obtained in quite some time. market for herring roe is getting smaller</p> <p>Would like to see the bait fishery be a winter fishery</p> <p>Not my intention that these fish are used for fish meal at all</p> <p>Department: Currently nearly all of the GHM is allocated to Sac-Roe with only 100 tons allowed for bait fishery Department is neutral on this proposal</p> <p>Question: wouldn't passing this create a whole new fishery that needs a whole new management plan?</p> <p>Moe: question for Chuck. if this proposal just allowed for bait fishing in just the Sitka Sound sac roe fishery area would that work? Chuck answer: intention was to open Sitka Sound to food and bait and never to harvest south of Aspid Cape.</p> <p>Jeff: question for Aaron: where does the majority of the Sitka Sound population go when they are not spawning in the sound? Answer: don't' really know</p> <p>Moe: Are the Craig bait fishery sampled? aaron: not totally aware but believe all are from Craig</p> <p>Pubic testimony:</p> |



| | | | |
|---------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | <p>Kyle Rosendale: Sitka Tribe of Alaska strongly opposes this proposal. Concerned about a fish meal fishery. also we don't have reliable stock distribution data for winter. Also, the fish left in the ocean not caught in the sac roe fishery are going to feed other fish that have a higher economic value.</p> <p>Anna Laugherty-- oppose this proposal</p> <p>Steve Johnson: don't support this proposal and this it needs a whole new management plan</p> <p>Paulette Moreno: strong opposition to this proposal</p> <p>Peter Bradley: opposes this proposal</p> <p>Committee Discussion:</p> <p>Steve Ramp-- Move to amend that the area of the harvest is between Point Kakul and Aspid Cape Moe Johnson seconds</p> <p>amendment passed 11 in support 2 oppose</p> <p>Eric Jordan: I supported the amendment but I don't think this is the time for this proposal</p> <p>Tad: We import bait from Craig at my processor and I would like to source locally. it wouldn't be a big harvest. I think this proposal would be better if this was the first fishery that could take place and sac roe was second, but I can support it this way.</p> <p>Jeff-- if it was just fish and bait, I could maybe support, but with the concerns about herring being converted to fish meal, I have serious concerns.</p> |
| 166 | Create an open pound herring spawn on kelp fishery in Sitka Sound, as follows: | | |
| SUPPORT | 8 | 5 | Tad moves to discuss, steve seconds |



| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>Department: has come up frequently in the past. Department is neutral</p> <p>public testimony:</p> <p>Steve Johnson: I don't think this is the right mechanism. this needs to be studied separately rather than just sliding a few pounds in using a sac roe permit</p> <p>Kyle Rosendale: Sitka Tribe of Alaska opposes the proposal because we don't want a sacroe and roe-on-kelp fishery</p> <p>Sitka Tribe would support an open pound fishery as a replacement for roe-on-kelp</p> <p>Paulette Moreno: oppose</p> <p>Committee Discussion</p> <p>Jeff Feldpausch-- in favor of the fishery because it doesn't kill herring... but concerned that this won't' go anywhere.</p> <p>Woody: I don't think this proposal is perfect but it is a good step to use roe without killing all the fish to cut their eggs out of them.</p> <p>Steve Ramp: I want to support the tribe but I think we need to offer alternatives to harvesting all fish and mortality</p> <p>Luke Bastian: concerning spawn in Hoonah Sound-- I have not observed spawn in Hoonah Sound in 5 years and I spend a lot of time there in the fall. On this proposal, if we can add value and reduce mortality, I am in favor and support this.</p> <p>Moe: wasn't there already a spawn on kelp fishery in Sitka sound years ago? Department: recently, only the test fishery in the late 90s.</p> <p>Eric: There are a lot more jobs and value with open pound fishery. I am in favor of asking the BOF to direct the department to do a study on this. There was a spawn-on-kelp fishery decades ago. The access to that resource was reallocated to the sac roe fishery.</p> |
|--|--|---|



| | | | |
|-----------------------|--|----|---|
| | | | |
| 167 | Redefine the boundaries of the Hoonah Sound spawn-on-kelp fishery (13-C) and the Sitka sac roe fishery (13-A/B), as follows: | | |
| OPPOSE UNANIMOUSLY | 0 | 13 | <p>Tad moves to discuss Woody Seconds</p> <p>Department: opposes this proposal</p> <p>Jeff: clarifies that the department doesn't consider the Sitka Sound Stock and Hoonah Sound stock the same</p> <p>Public Testimony:</p> <p>CHuck Olson: opposes this proposal. I am permit holder in Hoonah Sound fishery and I don't' believe they are the same stock of fish.</p> <p>Paulette Moreno: Oppose this proposal because they are different stocks of fish; they spawn at different times</p> <p>Committee Discussion: Eric Jordan: Ralph Guthrie and I opposed eliminating the Salisbury Sound area from the Sitka Sound sac roe fishery years ago. Seiners and department testified that herring move back and forth up Olga and Neva Straits to Salisbury. These are the same stocks (Salisbury and Sitka Sound) but Hoonah Sound is a different stock.</p> <p>Tad: Wasn't there a proposal 10-12 years ago to break Salisbury off - maybe the proposal that Eric referenced. And didn't' the tribe do a study that showed they are different stocks? Answer (Jeff): some microchemistry was done at the tribe by Heather Woody at the nursery areas and could identify nursery areas that identified differentiation in stocks. Don't recall the results.</p> |
| | | | |



Adjournment:

Minutes Recorded By: Andrew Thoms

Minutes Approved By: Full AC

Date: 12/15/21



**Sitka Fish and Game Advisory Committee
December 15th, 2021
Zoom**

I. Call to Order: [Time] by [name of chair/acting chair]

II. Roll Call

Members Present:

| | | |
|----------|---------|---------------------|
| Prussian | Aaron | hand troll |
| Johnson | Moe | Seine |
| Johnson | Karen | At Large |
| Curran | Dick | Longline |
| Murray | John | Power Troll |
| Thoms | Andrew | Conservation |
| Fujioka | Tad | Processor |
| Ramp | Steve | Resident Sport Fish |
| Jordan | Eric | At Large |
| Cyr | Woody | Trapping |
| Bastain | Luke | Guide |
| Bauscher | Heather | Alternate |
| Wayne | Stacey | Shellfish |

Members Absent (Excused):1

Members Absent (Unexcused):2

Number Needed for Quorum on AC:

List of User Groups Present:

III. Fish and Game Staff Present:

- a. Aaron Dupois
- b. Jason Jones
- c. Jake Wieliczkievicz
- d. Troy Tydingco
- e.

IV. Guests Present:

- a. Mike Martello
- b. Katherine Rose, KCAW
- c.

V. Approval of Agenda

Consent of AC



- VI. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes
 - a. Luke moves to approve, Woody seconds; all in favor

- VII. Reports
 - a. Chair's report
 - b. ADF&G
 - c. Others

- VIII. Public Comment

- IX. Old Business
 - a. Bear Population letters: Luke Bastian talks about edits made to the letter.
 - i. Eric Moves to use that letter with Luke's edits, all in favor.
 - b. Herring letter: many in favor; john murray didn't review. Eric wants to read it out loud. will wait on this letter.
 - c. Delay in Staff Comments letter- Stacey motions to send, Tad seconds. Full AC approves letter. will be sent
 - d. Stocks of Concern Letter: John Murray drafted letter to everyone.

- X. New Business

- XI. Select representative(s) for board meeting

- XII. Set next meeting date

- XIII. Other

- XIV.** Adjourn



| Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals | | | |
|---|---|---------------|--|
| January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK | | | |
| Proposal Number | Proposal Description | | |
| Support/Support as amended/Oppose/No Action | Number Support | Number Oppose | Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments |
| <p><i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i></p> | | | |
| | | | |
| 131 | Modify fishing area and add hand purse seine as legal gear for the Redoubt Bay and Lake subsistence salmon fishery, as follows: | | |
| | | | <p>Andrews moves to consider, Stacey seconds</p> <p>Department: proposal would expand the waters where hand purse seine may be used under a community harvest permit</p> <p>Tad: how close is this to the snagging line Answer: very close Tad: there is potential for gear conflict; snagging hooks in a seine would be a problem.</p> <p>Eric: on the community harvest permit, doesn't ADFG give permits and set quota and days? Answer from Department: community harvester comes to department with # of households and names and permit is given for catching those fish, Limit is number of households x the household limie, up to a max of 500 fish in possession. We don't issue many of these permits.</p> <p>Luke: with the current boundary in place, how productive is it with the current boundary? Answer: would be better closer to the falls. In current area allowed, it is deep and hard to catch fish.</p> <p>Stacey: how often does the threshold of over 40,000 get met? Answer: the last several years it has been a regular occurrence.</p> |



| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>Steve Ramp-- I see in the proposal that 3 harvest attempts in 2 years has resulted in 3 fish, so the current allowed area isn't that productive.</p> <p>In terms of conflict, do you think that if it was moved to 200 yards out, would it reduce potential conflict? Answer: your decision, but likely. this is an allocative issue</p> <p>Aaron Prussian: in the proposal it says when the projected total escapement is over 40,000 fish. how will that be established if the model can project that very early in the run. should it say, "when 40,000 fish escape?" Answer: the regulations say projected and that is usually how we manage. We like to wait until the ¼ point of the run when we have a good amount of data to be able to make those calls.</p> <p>John: Do community harvest permits get issued often? Answer: the average number of permits given annually is an average of 2</p> <p>Tad: how many households need to be represented? Answer: it doesn't say, it needs to be more than 1 Tad: if this became reg hand seining could become more popular? Answer: yes, most people don't know about this provision.</p> <p>Public Testimony: None</p> <p>Committee Discussion:</p> <p>Steve: I use Redoubt a lot. I see a lot of conflict around that snag line. I see problems there and that is why I asked about that 200 yard distance.</p> <p>Stacey: amendment idea-- how would that be enforced? Aaron: we could put markers up wherever we want to in the beginning stages it would be confusing.</p> <p>Stacey: I would second Steve's amendment, if he had made one.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|



| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>Tad: Move to amend the boundary to 50 yards North of Existing Snagging Line Steve Seconds Amendment Passes Unanimously</p> <p>Andrew Thoms: Moves a 2nd amendment to include dive gear: John Murray Seconds:</p> <p>Modify fishing area and add hand purse seine, spearfishing gear, including speargun or Hawaiian sling, when immersed in saltwater utilizing skin diving equipment including snorkel, as legal gear for the Redoubt Bay and Lake subsistence salmon fishery, as follows:</p> <p>5 AAC 01.760</p> <p>(C) by spearfishing gear, including speargun or Hawaiian sling, when immersed in saltwater utilizing skin diving equipment including snorkel.</p> <p>(C.1) spearfishing is prohibited within 20 feet of falls</p> <p>(C.1) spearfishing while using a compressed air system, such as scuba or hookah, is prohibited.</p> <p>5 AAC 01.760 (e)(6) for the purposes of this section, the legal gear for harvest under a community harvest permit are a beach seine, hand purse seine, dip net, gaff, spear, spearfishing gear, including speargun or Hawaiian sling, when immersed in saltwater utilizing skin diving equipment including snorkel, and a hook and line attached to a rod or pole</p> <p>Tad: 20' seems inadequate. People currently flyfish at the base of the falls. 20' isn't enough room for that. maybe 20 yards would be enough room- barely. Steve Ramp: I don't think this motion fits with the proposal.</p> |
|--|--|--|---|



| | | | |
|---------------------|--|----|--|
| | | | <p>Woody: I agree with the motion, I'm not sure of the setback. 20 feet is fine, 20 yards is excessive</p> <p>Tad: I just want to remind everyone that at the last meeting when this was discussed, the proposer specifically said that he didn't think it was appropriate to amend this proposal to add dive gear.</p> <p>Luke: not sure if we tie it on here or not, but it is important to deal with this because it is a common process. I don't know if there is another way to get it considered. This proposal does deal with legal means in this area. I agree with Woody that 20 feet is adequate.</p> <p>Andrew: this is the best vehicle for considering this method of fish</p> <p>Steve: Based on what we learned last meeting about spear fishing being illegal in fresh waters and that the snagging line was the department's line between fresh and salt water, I can't vote for an amendment that supports illegal activities.</p> <p>John: I'm not sure that this is right in the community use proposal. Maybe we table it and deal with it Monday. I would vote against this as-is. I move we table. Eric seconds. Motion to table until Monday passes.</p> |
| 132 | Prohibit the use of spears in Redoubt Bay and Lake subsistence fishery from June 21 to August 1, as follows: | | |
| | | | |
| 133 | Allow the use of seine and gillnet gear in the waters of Redoubt Bay that are open to commercial salmon fishing, as follows: | | |
| OPPOSE | 0 | 11 | John Muray moves to support |



| | | | |
|---|--|------------------|--|
| <p>w/ motion to the board to deal with the issues raised by the department by prohibiting seines and gillnets in Redoubt Bay.</p> | | <p>2 abstain</p> | <p>Aaron Prussian seconds</p> <p>Department: this proposal would allow harvesters to use seine and gillnet in the commercial fishing area</p> <p>Question: would this be allowed close to the falls? Answer: no, just in the commercial use area</p> <p>Question: is gill net gear allowed in the commercial fishery? Answer: No, this would allow it for subsistence only.</p> <p>Question: with this, could we have a community gill net permit? Answer: no, community harvest does not include gill-net, it only adds hand purse seine. This is just for individual household permits.</p> <p>Tad: Is the department aware of any abuse of the potential conflict you are working to fix? Answer: No, generally not a problem but could happen. They could say they are fishing for chum and catch sockeye.</p> <p>Stacey: So you could use gillnet for your household harvest with this change? Answer: yes</p> <p>Moe: do you have specs on seine or gillnet gear? Answer: in the regs for subsistence</p> <p>Committee Discussion:</p> <p>Eric: I'm opposed to this proposal. we didn't include this gear in the Redoubt Lake sockeye plan back when the AC set up the plan- which we won a national award for. And there is a reason we didn't include seine and gill net because this is a dipnet fishery and snagging fishery. In opposing this, we should have this regulation cleared up so that it is clear that you cannot fish seine or gill net for any type of salmon in the Redoubt management area.</p> <p>John: I see this as a courtesy thing. Aaron showed us the problems in the regs. I'm voting for.</p> |
|---|--|------------------|--|



| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>Steve: I'm in support of this. It is pretty clear that it says you can't go past the commercial regulatory markers. It allows another method to gather sockeye and it doesn't create any conflict.</p> <p>Stacey: i'm in support for the same reason. I would rather use a gillnet than a dipnet. Dipnets require too much strength.</p> <p>Woody: It is a mess out there with all these regulations. This is supposed to be something you are supposed to enjoy without having to hire a lawyer. For this proposal, I'm in support to clear up lots of regulations out there.</p> <p>Moe: I was part of the Redoubt task force when we came up with this plan and there was no intention to allow seine or gill net out in the outer area. I'm in favor of hand seine under the community use permit, but not for household use. There is no business for gillnet here with the amount of king salmon and coho salmon going through there. There will be conflicts with the commercial seine openings. Bycatch on gillnets will be a big issue... every species of salmon goes through here.</p> <p>Tad: I am going to support the senior members of this AC who developed the Redoubt management plan and oppose this proposal.</p> <p>Eric: Move to amend to eliminate GillNet ; Steve Seconds</p> <p>Tad: I don't think that the amendment deals with the problem that the proposer addresses. There would still be the potential ambiguity in the regulations that could be interpreted as allowing somebody to use a gillnet to target chum and catch sockeye. Furthermore, the author of proposal states clearly that hand purse seining is not effective in the waters that this amendment would allow them. So this amendment doesn't solve the problem that the proposal was trying to address and it doesn't help anybody catch any fish.</p> <p>Motion Fails</p> |
|--|--|--|---|



| | | | |
|---------------------|---|--|---|
| | | | <p>Moe talked about history of Redoubt management plan and commercial fishery</p> <p>Tad: Upon hearing the history, I think we should oppose this and let the board know that we would like them to change 5 aac 01.720 (a)(1) to say that gillnets and seines may not be used in Redoubt Bay except under the terms of a community harvest permit</p> <p>Steve: I am changing my position from support to opposition based on the history I have heard on the development of the Redoubt Lake management plan that this AC has done.</p> <p>Vote</p> <p>Abstentions: one abstention is because he works in the Forest Service on Redoubt Lake, one is because he is confused about proposal.</p> <p>NOTE TO BOF: this proposal seeks to make changes to eliminate potentially conflicting regulations. Rather than support the proposal, the Sitka AC made the following motion that would make the changes to deal with the issues the department is concerned about in this proposal with the following language:</p> <p>Move that we ask the BoF to modify 5aac01.720(a)(1) such that seine and gillnet gear not be allowed for subsistence salmon fishing in Redoubt Bay except as allowed under a community harvest permit</p> <p>Full Sitka AC in support of motion</p> |
| 134 | Prohibit obstructing more than half of the stream, creek, or river when personal use fishing, as follows: | | |
| | | | <p>Stacey Wayne moves to discuss Andrew seconds</p> <p>Department: currently regs do not regulation how much nets can cover streams in this area. in Yakutat, we do regulate and in other areas we do regulate. Department is currently neutral on this proposal.</p> |



| | | | |
|---------------------|---|----|---|
| | | | <p>Tad: I think we should skip since we don't have personal use fishing in Sitka. John seconds.</p> <p>all in favor</p> |
| 135 | Allow permits to be issued for the personal use taking of king and coho salmon, as follows: | | |
| | | | |
| 136 | Include commercial harvested salmon to fish that may not be possessed on the same day sport or personal use salmon are taken, as follows: | | |
| OPPOSE ANIMOUSLY | 0 | 13 | <p>Department: confusing language *dealt with personal use salmon which we do not have in the Sitka area. *lots of potential for confusion between Personal Use fishing that is the urban alternative to subsistence versus withholding fish out a commercial fisherman's catch for their personal use, also known as homepack.</p> <p>Question</p> |
| 137 | Prohibit personal use proxy permits at Sweetheart Creek, as follows: | | |
| | | | |
| 138 | Create salmon personal use fisheries in marine waters of the Juneau Management Area, as follows: | | |
| | | | |
| 139 | Modify where personal use fishing can occur in the Taku River to include all of Section 11-B and remove dates when the fishery can occur, as follows: | | |
| | | | |
| 140 | Add section 11-B as a personal use salmon fishing area when the area is closed to the commercial drift gillnet fishery, as follows: | | |
| | | | |
| 141 | Add section 11-B as a personal use salmon fishing area when the area is closed to the commercial drift gillnet fishery, as follows: | | |
| | | | |
| 142 | Establish bag and possession limits and lawful gear for smelt fishing in the Ketchikan area, as follows: | | |
| | | | |
| 143 | Require inseason reporting of nonresident sport fish harvest, as follows: | | |



| | | | |
|------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| 144 | Establish a logbook program for rental vessels used in Southeast Alaska sport fisheries, as follows: | | |
| SUPPORT UNANIMOUSLY | 13 | 0 | <p>john murray moves to approve Stacey wayne seconds</p> <p>Proposer (Steve Ramp wrote, Sitka AC submitted) this is to deal with non-residents who rent boats to target halibut</p> <p>Department Comments: outlined department's comments on proposal</p> <p>Question: does the state have the ability to institute a non-resident log-book: Department Answer: Yes</p> <p>Tad: how can the state do creel surveys on rental boats that operate out of a private dock? Department: we dont' have a current program on rental boats.</p> <p>Department: the department would oppose developing a new logbook system unless there is a conservation concern and department also doesn't have the budget for it. department feels that what we have is adequate</p> <p>Tad: With boat rental clients not being included in charter logbooks, and with many boat rental businesses operating from private docks, including the main Sitka rental fleet, and with the statewide harvest survey not specifically identifying boat rental clients, the department doesn't have a way to estimate the catch by rental clients. So of course they haven't identified any concerns with this user group. It is circular reasoning to cite the lack of data as the reason to not gather data.</p> <p>Question: what percentage of license purchasers get a creel survey and what percentage send it back? Department: I don't have the answer to that.</p> <p>Question: we made the LAMP to provide for subsistence opportunities for Sitka residents. what is the percentage of halibut caught in the sound by rental boats? Department: we dont' know.</p> |



| | | | |
|---------------------|---|--------------------|---|
| | | | <p>Question: does the department know how many rental boats are operating? Department: we dont' know how many rental boats their are</p> <p>Question: these boats seem to be a trend with 20 or 30 of these boats operating out of some of these communities. If this were happening in the Sitka Sound, it would have a big impact on the sound. Did the creel census do any work at lodges at remote locations? Answer: depends on what you mean by remote.. we have done them in some communities but not in pelican, or port alexander or angoon and other remote places</p> <p>Public Testimony:</p> <p>Matt Donahoe: No creel survey in Yakutat, Gustavus, and Elfin Cove and many other SE AK communities so there is no data from those areas.</p> <p>Committee Discussion: Steve: this is a region wide issue and we hope the BOF starts the discussion on these issues with rental vessels</p> <p>Andrew: proposal 143 will deal with some of this as well.</p> |
| 233 | Remove districts 13-A and 13-B from Northern Southeast herring spawn on kelp pound fishery administrative area, as follows: | | |
| OPPOSE | 3 | 7 3 abstain | <p>John moves to consider, Tad Seconds</p> <p>Department staff gives an overview of the proposal and some items of regulation it would govern. Board of Fish doesn't have the authority to do what this proposal asks for. it would require CFEC action.</p> <p>Tad asks if a pound fishery could be allowed in Sitka Sound if CFEC were to make the change that this requests; Answer, if this passes, NO, not until they made another change to re-allow it.</p> |



| | | | |
|-----|----|---|--|
| | | | <p>Committee Discussion:</p> <p>John Murray: I would rather not make a comment on this.</p> <p>Tad: I oppose the concept of this proposal because it would create an additional barrier to the Sitka Sound seine fishery transitioning to a spawn on kelp fishery</p> <p>Andrew and Woody agree with Tad</p> <p>Eric asks Aaron Dupois how many roe on kelp closed pound permits are in the hoonah sound fishery: Answer: 111</p> <p>Moe: I support making this area separate from other pound fishery areas. If there is ever a roe on kelp fishery in Sitka Sound again, the harvesters shouldn't necessarily be the folks that hold L21A permits. They should be the folks that used to harvest roe on kelp before the seine fishery usurped them.</p> <p>Abstainers commented that they didn't know enough about this to have an opinion and that they needed more information and background.</p> |
| 277 | 13 | 0 | <p>john murray moves to approve Stacey wayne seconds</p> <p>Proposer (Steve Ramp wrote, Sitka AC submitted) this is to deal with non-residents who rent boats to target halibut</p> <p>Department Comments: outlined department's comments on proposal</p> <p>Question: does the state have the ability to institute a non-resident log-book: Department Answer: Yes</p> <p>Tad: how can the state do creel surveys on rental boats that operate out of a private dock? Department: We don't. Tad: How do you collect catch data on rental boat clients? Department: Statewide harvest survey</p> |



| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>Tad: Are the rental boat clients specifically identified in the SWHS or just lumped in with everybody else? Department: No, we don't differentiate.</p> <p>Department: the department would oppose developing a new logbook system unless there is a conservation concern and the department also doesn't have the budget for it. department feels that what we have is adequate</p> <p>Question: what percentage of license purchasers get a creel survey and what percentage send it back? Department: I don't have the answer to that.</p> <p>Question: we made the LAMP to provide for subsistence opportunities for Sitka residents. what is the percentage of halibut caught in the sound by rental boats? Department: we dont' know.</p> <p>Question: does the department know how many rental boats are operating? Department: we dont' know how many rental boats their are. We don't even define rental boats.</p> <p>Question: these boats seem to be a trend with 20 or 30 of these boats operating out of some of these communities. If this were happening in the Sitka Sound, it would have a big impact on the sound. Did the creel census do any work at lodges at remote locations? Answer: depends on what you mean by remote.. we have done them in some communities but not in pelican, or port alexander or angoon and other remote places</p> <p>Public Testimony:</p> <p>Matt Donahoe: No creel survey in Yakutat, Gustavus, and Elfin Cove and many other SE AK communities so there is no data from those areas.</p> <p>Committee Discussion: Steve: this is a region wide issue and we hope the BOF starts the discussion on these issues with rental vessels</p> <p>Andrew: proposal 143 will deal with some of this as well.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|



| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>John: move to take out option 2 Woody Seconds</p> <p>Tad: Regarding the option of deleting option 2-- one of the BOF members has a boat rental operation operating out of Petersburg. He might have a problem with the regulation on his business across the board but he might be okay with us just taking action on Sitka. Let's leave the proposal as written.</p> <p>Stacey: I don't think we need to take it out. Let's have the conversation</p> <p>Eric: i agree with Stacey</p> <p>Tad: I support leaving option 2 in the proposal, but I agree that the problem is much bigger than just the LAMP. Even in Sitka, the boats do go outside of the LAMP regularly. I have seen these rental boats anchored fishing on the pinnacles-- a protected area where no bottom fishing is allowed. As they were unguided, maybe they didn't realize that they weren't supposed to be fishing for halibut there.</p> <p>Motion on amendment to remove option 2 fails 3-10</p> <p>Eric: the state can't do this alone. we need help from NOAA to manage this for halibut With these proposals, we are bringing attention to this issue and flagging that this needs attention. 143 is taking on a similar issue and noticing similar concerns and we need to address this issue</p> |
| | | | |



Adjournment:

Minutes Recorded By: _____Andrew Thoms_____

Minutes Approved By: _____full AC_____

Date: ___December 20th, 2021_____



The Sitka AC finds the Department Comments (RC2) regarding our Proposal 144 to be inadequate at best, and misleading or obfuscating at worst. The following is a rebuttal to the portion of RC2 dealing with our proposal.

PROPOSAL 144 – 5 AAC 47.XXX. New Section.

PROPOSED BY: Sitka Fish & Game Advisory Committee.

WHAT WOULD THIS PROPOSALS DO? This would specifically require a “sport fishing rental vessel angler and/or operator” to obtain and complete a department logbook and would require the rental vessel operator to register rental vessels used for saltwater sport fishing in the SEAK Area. The information recorded in the logbook would be the name, address, telephone number, and residency of each rental vessel angler, as well as the angler’s saltwater sport fishing effort, location, catch, and harvest. The sport fishing rental vessel operator would be required to submit logbook information to the department.

WHAT ARE THE CURRENT REGULATIONS? ~~There is no definition of a sport fishing rental vessel, rental vessel angler, or rental vessel operator. Anglers are required to record harvest information for finfish with annual limits on a nontransferable harvest record. Participants in the sport, personal use, and subsistence SEAK shrimp and king crab fisheries are required to record and report harvest and effort information on a harvest reporting form (permit) issued by the department. Logbooks are only required in the guided marine sport fishery.~~

WHAT WOULD BE THE EFFECT IF THE PROPOSAL WERE ADOPTED? This would require implementation of a new logbook system that would collect information currently collected by other department programs. The implementation of an additional system to monitor the rental vessel fishery would have a ~~unbudgeted impact on the department~~ due to the costs associated with producing logbooks, collection of the logbooks, and entering and analyzing the data.

Businesses that rent vessels used for saltwater sport fishing would be responsible for distributing logbooks to angler clients and for returning completed logbooks to the department by timelines yet to be defined. This would have little effect on the state sport fisheries management since management prescriptions set by the board are specific to residents and nonresidents or sport anglers as a whole, not guided or unguided anglers as in the federal management of halibut.

BACKGROUND: All Alaska businesses that provide guided sport fishing services in salt water are required to complete a logbook page for each trip with angler residency, effort, location, catch, and harvest data, and completed logbook pages must be submitted to the department weekly. The department uses the guided saltwater logbook data to monitor fishery impacts on fish stocks, including stocks with conservation concerns, such as king salmon and nonpelagic rockfish in recent years. ~~A electronic logbook system that was fully implemented for SEAK in 2021 will make the logbook data available in a more timely manner than was possible through 2020 using mail-in returns and manual data entry methods.~~

This is indicative of the department’s lack of adequate concern over growth of this sector into fully allocated fisheries.

This statement is irrelevant to the objective of quantifying the harvest of rental boat clients. This record is solely for enforcement purposes and doesn’t get submitted to the department.

Additionally, this record does not identify whether or not a fish is caught on rented boat.

Our concerns are broader than king crab and shrimp. And again, this record does not identify whether the catch was made from a rented boat.

The same logbook program currently used by the guided boats could be used for unguided rental boats. As this is an electronic system, the additional costs of expanding the program would be minimal.

Our point is that unguided boat rental businesses are financially similar enough to guided boat operations that they should be included in the logbook requirements.



The collection of this data would allow the NPFMC to make informed choices about future regulations

The department provides halibut catch and harvest data from guided saltwater logbooks to federal halibut fishery managers. The IPHC, in consultation with the NPFMC, adopts halibut bag, possession, and length limits for guided and unguided anglers under the Catch Sharing Plan, and NOAA/NMFS administers those regulations. State of Alaska representatives on the NPFMC have a meaningful voice in regulation of federal fisheries in Alaska waters. At its December 2019 meeting, the NPFMC discussed an unguided halibut rental vessel registration system but took no action the agenda item.

that could treat rental boat clients separately from other fishermen.

Actually, only anglers returning to certain public docks at certain times of day are subject to sampling. Many of these boat rental businesses operate from private facilities not subject to the marine harvest survey program. Furthermore, rental clients set their own schedule so are much more likely than guided anglers to return to port outside of the creel sampler's shift.

During peak sport fishing months in SEAK, the department operates a marine harvest survey program that interviews all marine anglers, guided and unguided, resident and nonresident, as they return to dock facilities and samples their harvest by species. The department provides marine harvest survey data on halibut size and harvest to federal halibut fishery managers.

The SWHS does not identify whether fish were caught from a rented vessel. Even if this were changed, the SWHS only captures a fraction of the angling effort. As a result, the expanded results have a very wide range of uncertainty, particularly when seeking information about a subset of the respondents or about a specific geographic location

The department's Statewide Harvest Survey is an annual end of season survey mailed to a sample of all anglers with an Alaska sport fishing license. From the survey responses, the department estimates total sport fish catch and harvest in all salt and fresh waters of the state by all anglers, including guided/unguided and resident/nonresident categories. The department provides SWHS halibut harvest data to federal fishery managers. The stated intent of this proposal is to "quantify the harvest of sport fish by nonresident anglers fishing from resident vessels". The department believes the SWHS provides the data necessary to quantify the harvest of sport fish by nonresident anglers, including those fishing from rented vessels.

The department has a long history of utilizing emergency order authority in salt waters in response to indications of decreasing fish stocks, or where there are high levels of effort or harvest relative to stock abundance. The department has no authority over inseason regulations regarding the halibut sport fishery.

DEPARTMENT COMMENTS: The department **OPPOSES** the establishment of a new rental vessel registration and logbook system in the absence of a specific conservation concern or a management need. Also, the department does not have funding budgeted to cover this cost and would need new funding to implement it.

Without data that is specific to rental boats, how would ADF&G know if rental boat catch was causing a specific conservation concern? This is a circular argument.

This statement does not address the purpose of the proposal which seeks to identify the amount of harvest from rented boats specifically, not as an aggregated total of non-resident catch as is currently done. The department does not currently make any attempt to quantify harvest specifically from rented boats, even though the BoF suggested this as far back as 1992, as shown on this excerpt from page 5 of Board of Fisheries Finding 93-142-FB:

In order to improve catch reporting and assist in management of the recreational fishery, the department may:

- Establish a mandatory log book program to monitor the harvest and effort of guided sport anglers (charter boats and fishing lodges), outfitters and dry skiff rentals.

The department's restatement of the purpose of our proposal is incorrect. We seek to quantify the harvest of sport fish by nonresident anglers fishing from rented vessels, not from resident vessels.



**Sitka Fish and Game Advisory Committee
December 20, 2021
Zoom**

I. Call to Order: 6:11 by Heather Bauscher

II. Roll Call

Members Present:

| | | | |
|------------|---------|---------------------|------------------|
| Prussian | Aaron | hand troll | p |
| Feldpausch | Jeff | Subsistence | p |
| Barkau | Kent | Hunting | p |
| Johnson | Moe | Seine | p |
| Johnson | Karen | At Large | p |
| Curran | Dick | Longline | p |
| Murray | John | Power Troll | p |
| Thoms | Andrew | Conservation | p |
| Fujioka | Tad | Processor | p |
| Chute | Spencer | Charter | p |
| Ramp | Steve | Resident Sport Fish | p |
| Jordan | Eric | At Large | p |
| Cyr | Woody | Trapping | p |
| Bastain | Luke | Guide | p |
| Markis | Joel | Alternate | absent unexcused |
| Bauscher | Heather | Alternate | p |
| Wayne | Stacey | Shellfish | p |

Members Absent (Excused):0

Members Absent (Unexcused):1

Number Needed for Quorum on AC:7

List of User Groups Present:

III. Fish and Game Staff Present:

- a. Jake Wieliczkiwicz-Sportfish
- b. Rhea Ehresmann-Groundfish
- c. Troy Tydingco-Sportfish
- d. Aaron Dupois- Comfish
- e. Jason Jones-Comfish



- IV. Guests Present:
 - a. Matt Donahoe-- ATA
 - b. Katherine Rose KCAW
 - c. Tory Curran
 - d. Snyders
 - e. Jeff Wolfe Commercial Crabber
 - f. Greg Wallace- local dungie crabber
 - g. Linda Behnken- ALFA
 - h. Justin Peeler
 - i. Richard Yamada- Alaska Charter Assoc

- V. Approval of Agenda
 - a. steve ramp motions to approve, tad seconds, all in favor

- VI. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes
 - a. Steve moves, john seconds, all present at that meeting in favor

- VII. Reports
 - a. Chair's report
 - b. ADF&G
 - c. Others

- VIII. Public Comment
 - a. 2 guests present want to reconsider 225

- IX. Old Business
 - a. Herring Letter-- moved by Eric to sent to department, John Murray seconds. Steve Ramp asked for the letter to be also shared more broadly.
 - b. Stocks of concern letter-- Eric motions to approve, Steve 2nds. Andrew comments that more language on conservation concerns of resource
 - c.

- X. New Business

- XI. Select representative(s) for board meeting

- XII. Set next meeting date

- XIII. Other

- XIV. Adjourn**



| Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK | | | |
| Proposal Number | Proposal Description | | |
| Support/Support as amended/Oppose/No Action | Number Support | Number Oppose | Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments |
| <p><i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i></p> | | | |
| | | | |
| 122 | Northern Southeast seine salmon fishery management plans -- Remove sunset date so regulation remains in effect, as follows: | | |
| SUPPORT | 13 | 0 2 abstain (feel it is not in our area) | <p>Steve Ramp moves to discuss, John Murray seconds</p> <p>Department-- Outlines department comments</p> <p>Tad: we've seen this proposal come up in the past-- I think that it used to encompass all seining north of Pt Marsden. Now the proposals before us only refer to district 12. That would exclude the Amalga fishery in district 11. Even though it is a THA, they are catching some wild sockeye there- the same stocks that are the focus of this 15,000 cap. Why is that area no longer included?</p> <p>Department: i don't have a good answer on that.</p> <p>Committee: Moe: I am in favor of status quo so i am in favor of this proposal</p> |
| 123 | Remove the sunset date so regulation remains in effect and change effective end date of the plan from July 22 to July 15, as follows: | | |
| | | | No action due to support of 122 |
| 124 | Establish additional guidelines for the department to manage the District 12 purse seine fishery north of Point Marsden, as follows: | | |
| | | | No action due to support of 122 |



| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| 276 | Allow for the retention of salmon during periods of commercial nonretention when the sport fishery in the area is open for that species, as follows: | | |
| 125 | Clarify language for subsistence take of coho and king salmon, as follows: | | |
| 126 | Repeal net tending requirement in Yakutat Bay, as follows: | | |
| 127 | Repeal net tending requirement in Yakutat Bay, as follows: | | |
| 128 | Allow use of set gillnets in all Southeast Alaska area subsistence salmon fisheries, as follows: | | |
| 129 | Modify closed waters and remove coho salmon annual limit for the Klawock River, as follows: | | |
| 130 | Modify fishing times and locations for subsistence salmon fishery in the Klawock River and Lake, as follows: | | |
| 131 | Modify fishing area and add hand purse seine as legal gear for the Redoubt Bay and Lake subsistence salmon fishery, as follows: | | |
| SUPPORT W Amendment (to adjust boundary of seine line to be 50 yards beyond the snagging line) | 14 | 0 1 abstain (works in that fishery manage ment) | <p>Brought up to finish</p> <p>On the Amendment by Andrew Thoms:</p> <p>Andrew Thoms: Moves a 2nd amendment to include dive gear: John Murray Seconds:</p> <p>Modify fishing area and add hand purse seine, spearfishing gear, including speargun or Hawaiian sling, when immersed in saltwater utilizing skin diving equipment including snorkel, as legal gear for the Redoubt Bay and Lake subsistence salmon fishery, as follows:</p> <p>5 AAC 01.760</p> |



| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>(C) by spearfishing gear, including speargun or Hawaiian sling, when immersed in saltwater utilizing skin diving equipment including snorkel.</p> <p>(C.1) spearfishing is prohibited within 20 feet of falls</p> <p>(C.1) spearfishing while using a compressed air system, such as scuba or hookah, is prohibited.</p> <p>5 AAC 01.760 (e)(6) for the purposes of this section, the legal gear for harvest under a community harvest permit are a beach seine, hand purse seine, dip net, gaff, spear, spearfishing gear, including speargun or Hawaiian sling, when immersed in saltwater utilizing skin diving equipment including snorkel, and a hook and line attached to a rod or pole</p> <p>Jeff Feldpausch: one concern is that the proposal was written to deal with community use fishery. This amendment adds a gear type for individual subsistence use. It distracts from the original intent.</p> <p>Eric Jordan: I would like to see 20 yards as the distance from falls</p> <p>Stacey: Both Tad and I would like to see 20 yards</p> <p>Luke Bastian: concerned about adding it to the community use permit</p> <p>Steve: I don't think this motion fits here and after hearing from Jeff I am also opposed to it</p> <p>John Murray-- I thought that we heard that spearfishing isn't a legal gear</p> <p>Steve-- spearfishermen need to introduce their own proposal not piggyback on the community harvest proposal</p> <p>Stacey: it is clear that the spear-fishing that is currently practiced with wetsuit and snorkel gear is not allowed by the regs. those practices should go through the process</p> |
|--|--|---|



| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | <p>Jeff Feldpausch: This amendment is inappropriate. I would rather that the AC take no action on this proposal, or even vote it down than to recommend to the BoF that it be amended in this way.</p> <p>Motion to amend to include dive gear fails, 2-12</p> <p>Tad (question to Jeff): Is STA ok with pulling back the proposed seine line to allow a 50 yard buffer between the water that would be open to seining and the water that the snaggers operate in?</p> <p>Jeff: Yes. I understand the potential for gear conflict. We'll gain a mile, so we don't need to quibble over 50 yards.</p> <p>Question on Proposal with Amendment from last week (move the seine line to 50 yards north of the snagging line) PASSES</p> |
| | | | |
| 143 | Require inseason reporting of nonresident sport fish harvest, as follows: | | |
| <p>SUPPORT UNANIMOUS</p> <p>with AMENDMENT that the log include whether or not the fish was caught from a rented vessel</p> | 15 | 0 | <p>John moves to discuss, Jeff Feldpausch 2nds</p> <p>Department: Jake- this mandates that all non-residents would have to submit a log-book Department feels like their surveys gather good information and that they can't do anything more because they don't have a budget for figuring out more precisely how many fish non-residents catch</p> <p>Question: how many non-residents are we talking about: department: 42% are guided and catches are reported on in the charter captain electronic monitoring. 58% of non-resident fishers are un-guided.</p> <p>Public Comment: Matt Donahoe: I support this if it requires accountability on unguided sportfish harvest</p> |



| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>Committee Discussion:</p> <p>Steve: we are gathering data--- with dock creel survey and with the harvest survey mailers that are sent out.</p> <p>John Murray: I overall like the idea of collecting data and i support ADFG developing electronic ways of collecting data</p> <p>Tad: our proposal 144 does a more surgical job of taking on the issue of what rental boat clients are catching</p> <p>Woody: anyone that i have had come visit would have had no issue with filling out a log for taking care of management concerns</p> <p>Andrew: i support to help reiterate the need for ADFG to develop app/ electronic reporting</p> <p>Eric: we have a huge problem with the sport fish survey taking place way after the season and it is voluntary. it is not an accurate way of collecting data. you exaggerate your catch when you want to or you hide what you catch-- it is how fishing is. you can't get accurate data from an after-the-season mail-out form to fill out. we need something better. we fill out stuff all the time so let's get something going and get better information. I have served on the SE RAC and it is a good body and they put thought into this proposal.</p> <p>Steve: I don't think this proposal is well written... hard to fill in log book for each fishing area... you move around all day looking for fish. charter guides are doing this for a living and outcatch fish 2-3 times. This proposal isn't mature enough.</p> <p>Tad: Now that all sport fish licenses are sold over the internet, the dept could use email to collect information sooner than mailing out surveys. They have email addresses for everybody who bought a license. Furthermore, with so many non-resident licenses in SE being short-term licenses, the department knows when the person stopped fishing. They could email the fisherman right after their fishing trip. The form would naturally be electronic, and the data would be easy to compile in-0season.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|



| | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | <p>Woody: deer harvest for non residents requires logging harvest and success rate and king salmon is a much more at-concern resource</p> <p>Steve: I would motion to amend the proposal that this survey would require that the fisherman document if fish were caught on a rental or non-rental vessel. Dick Curran seconds.</p> <p>Motion to amend passes 14-1</p> <p>Question on main motion</p> |
| 144 | Establish a logbook program for rental vessels used in Southeast Alaska sport fisheries, as follows: | | |
| | | | |
| 145 | Establish nonresident bag, possession, and annual limits for coho and sockeye salmon in the fresh and salt waters of the Southeast Alaska Area, as follows: | | |
| SUPPORT | 9 | 6 | <p>John moves to discuss, Steve seconds</p> <p>Department: outlines opposition</p> <p>Q: does the department see a conservation concern for Coho and Sockeye? A: No</p> <p>Committee Discussion:</p> <p>Steve: absent a conservation concern, i am not in favor of cutting back</p> <p>Luke: agree with Steve. not many people are going to exceed that number and if there is not a conservation concern, no need to put limits on it.</p> |



| | | | |
|---------------------|--|----|---|
| | | | <p>Jeff: I see this as an allocation issue, not a conservation issue. I don't understand why the department is taking a stand on an allocation issue.</p> |
| 146 | <p>Establish nonresident bag and possession limits for coho, sockeye, chum, and pink salmon in salt waters of the Southeast Alaska Area, as follows:</p> | | |
| OPPOSE | 3 | 12 | <p>Steve Ramp moves to consider, John Murray 2nds.</p> <p>Department: Jake outlines comments that these are opposed based on no management or conservation concerns.</p> <p>Question: are there any conservation concerns that would warrant this limit? Answer: Only McDonald Lake and Hugh Smith Lake sockeye.</p> <p>Question: do you have the growth in sport take of Coho? Answer: outlined numbers but doesn't have a growth rate. but there is a notable upward trend.</p> <p>Question: how much would this reduce harvest: Answer: it would reduce harvest</p> <p>Committee:</p> <p>Steve: I hope we dont' support this since we just voted to support a 6 fish/day proposal</p> <p>john: I oppose this, i think we took care of this with 145</p> <p>Jeff: I support this because of the sockeye salmon systems that are in decline</p> <p>Luke: i don't see a whole lot of non-resident sockeye harvest. I dont' know why we should lower the limit when there is no conservation concern</p> <p>Eric: isn't it a fact that people can't catch sockeye? they don't know how to catch with lures? Department: that is a good point. there are some people who have it dialed but most people can't do it well.</p> |



| | | | |
|---------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | <p>Eric: oppose proposal</p> <p>Question on viability of sockeye runs on other areas: Jeff Feldpausch outlines that many sockeye systems are in concern, including Gut Bay, Falls Lake, Sitkoh, Klag and harvest in these areas could impact subsistence harvesters.</p> |
| 147 | Establish nonresident bag and possession limits for coho salmon in the fresh waters east of the longitude of Cape Fairweather, as follows: | | |
| OPPOSE | 7 | 8 | <p>Steve Ramp moves to discuss, Jeff seconds</p> <p>Department: outlines department's opposition</p> <p>questions on total numbers for harvest. department gives answers with 10year average numbers</p> <p>Public Testimony:</p> <p>Matt Donahoe: The numbers show that commercial fishermen have had decreasing success with Coho while the sportfish harvest of cohos is increasing</p> <p>Committee Discussion:</p> <p>Steve: without a conservation measure, i can't support harvest limits</p> <p>Tad: freshwater sport pressure on coho is very localized. While there isn't a concern in the great majority of the coho systems in SE that rarely get fished, some of the systems near communities get hit pretty hard. The entire Juneau road system has a 2-coho freshwater bag limit and residents and non-residents because of the extra pressure. Other communities' populations are not as large as Juneau's, but with a 6 fish limit, there could be localized problems too. A reduction from 6 fish to 5 fish would be an acknowledgement of that issue and an acknowledgement of resident-priority without being a major burden.</p> |



| | | | |
|---------------------|--|---|--|
| 148 | Establish nonresident bag and possession limits for sockeye, chum, and pink salmon in fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area, as follows: | | |
| OPPOSE | 6 | 9 | <p>Steve Ramp moves to discuss Tad seconds</p> <p>Department: similar comments to 146, department opposes</p> <p>Tad: how many sockeye systems have specific bag limits? Answer: I am not sure region-wide</p> <p>Committee Discussion:</p> <p>Steve: same as others, for no conservation concern, why reduce bag limits.</p> <p>Tad: I am not concerned about pink and chum. But, sockeye are a concern and there are some systems near communities that have big concerns. I am in favor of lower limits on specific systems where there are concerns-- especially on road systems and close to communities where there is high pressure. I don't want to get to a situation like Juneau, where 2 of the three road-accessible sockeye systems have been closed for years, and the third, which requires a 6 mile round trip hike is only open 10 days/year- and the fish don't even show up until around the third day.</p> |
| 149 | Reduce saltwater coho salmon bag and possession limit in Puget Cove to two fish, as follows: | | |
| | | | |
| 150 | Repeal rainbow trout size limits in Crystal, Glacier, and Moraine lakes, as follows: | | |
| | | | |
| 151 | Prohibit guided sport fishing on the Salmon River near Gustavus, as follows: | | |
| | | | |
| 152 | Close sport fishing in a section of 108 Creek, as follows: | | |
| | | | |



| | | | |
|-----------------------|--|----|---|
| 153 | Close sport fishing in a section of Log Jam Creek, as follows: | | |
| | | | |
| 154 | Allow the use of bow and arrow in Southeast Alaska sport fisheries, as follows: | | |
| OPPOSE unanimously | 0 | 15 | Steve moves to support, John seconds Department: has only been allowed for species like pike. Department opposes |
| 155 | Prohibit the removal of salmon from the water when nonretention regulations apply and prohibit the use of a multiple hook in Southeast Alaska sport fisheries, as follows: | | |
| SUPPORT | 13 | 2 | Steve moves to discuss; Andrew seconds Department Comments: Department opposes Committee Discussion: Tad: move to remove 2nd portion on treble hooks but leave first section and change wording so that it is prohibited to remove from either freshwater or saltwater a salmon for unhooking, if it is unlawful for the fisherman to retain a salmon of that species. Kent Seconded Luke: what about measuring the fish? Steve: I have no problem releasing a king in the water, but I have to take them out of the water to measure them Tad: That's why I changed the wording in the original language. If you need to measure it, because it might be legal, then sure, do what you need to do. But if you know you have to release it, don't harm it any more than necessary. Stacey: It would be hard for me to remove a hook from a boat unless someone held me by the ankles into the water Spencer: I feel the same way. I'm not sure how I can take the hook out from in the water |



| | | | |
|---------------------|--|----|--|
| | | | <p>Luke-- Trying to train deckhands to identify fish until they get out of the water... we use fish friendly nets but even people trying to be legal are going to be in violation sometimes</p> <p>Woody--- it is pretty common for other places to require fish to be left in the water. there are devices and ways to release. the other option is to use hooks that are not stainless and cut leader. save small king salmon.</p> <p>Eric: I proposed to ban use of treble hooks in troll fishery and that passed BOF. Then there was a study that showed that highline treble hook fishermen saw no change in mortality but there was a lot higher catch rate using single hooks. The treble hook ban was repealed because the obvious thing to do was to convert to single hooks because of catch rates.</p> <p>John: talked about methods</p> <p>Luke: charter guide talked through his techniques and as a captain he has techniques that can keep the fish alive. for fresh water, people are picking them up and taking photos. for saltwater fishing, if we aren't going to keep a fish, we release it ASAP and don't mess around with it</p> <p>Motion passes 14-1</p> <p>Tad: glad to hear from charter rep that it is not common in the Sitka sport fishery to hold up a fish for photos then later release it. but i think it is more common in other places where king salmon aren't as common. In particular in the waters closed for SOC management</p> |
| | | | |
| 201 | Expand closed water boundary lines for the Dungeness crab commercial fishery in the Sitka Sound Special Use Area during the summer season, as follows: | | |
| OPPOSE | 3 | 12 | Stacey moves to reconsider Eric Seconds |



| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>Proposer: John Murray: Move to amend back to original proposal; Steve Ramp seconds</p> <p>Department Comment: Aaron Dupuis: opposes closing areas where there are no conservation concerns</p> <p>Public Comment:</p> <p>matt Donahoe: outlined that maps are in the proposal</p> <p>Jeff Wolf: this proposal is an allocation grab. commercial crabbers have been fishing here alongside subsistence and sport crabbers for years. These places that are proposed for closure are good for people getting into the fishery and this will make it harder for the fall fishery.</p> <p>Greg Wallace: echo jeff's statements. no reason for an exclusive use area. all open for 12 months for personal use.</p> <p>Justin Peeler: By closing the areas close to town, you are shutting down the little guy. I got my start in the commercial fishing industry by fishing crab near town in a boat that I made in shop class. That was in Petersburg where we were allowed to fish crab commercially right in front of town. With this proposal, a Sitka high school kid wouldn't be able to do that.</p> <p>Committee:</p> <p>Woody: not good to take this area away</p> <p>Jeff: a big issue that people are missing--- we would go up and rent Piper Island cabin and set out pots. one year it was incredible. we got our limit. The next year we went up and set pots for three days but the crab were all females and small males-- only one that was keepable. When the commercial fishery goes through and takes all the legal crab, it isn't possible for sport or subsistence to get any--- especially in the fall. I would be more comfortable with this closure being moved back to the fall. Maybe just leave Deep Bay closed to commercial use.</p> <p>there is conflict between commercial and sport/subsistence when you get a pot and it is full of females and small males because the commercial fishermen have gotten everything legal.</p> |
|--|--|---|



| | | | |
|---------------------|---|----|--|
| | | | <p>Motion to Amend Fails-- 5 to 10</p> <p>Moe: I think that we should pull the whole proposal from the books</p> <p>Tad: When we submitted this proposal, I was unaware that this area would remain open to sport fishing by non-residents. I thought that the reason for the proposal was that local residents felt that they needed more area for subsistence. I'm willing to prioritize local residents use over commercial, but if this proposal would continue to allow non-resident sport harvest I am against pushing the commercial crabbers out in favor of sport.</p> <p>Luke: I fish in there a lot and the area is good until commercial fishery opens and then it gets hammered and slim really fast. I don't want to take anyone's livelihood away. I like moving the line back to deep bay</p> <p>Eric: I hear what Tad is saying and with all kinds of growth in rental boat unguided sport fishery they would hammer that area too. There is currently good crabbing in the LAMP, we don't need to close more area to commercial use.</p> <p>Steve: When we first considered it, I opposed it. I opposed the amendment to further expand the area, and I still oppose the proposal.</p> |
| 225 | Modify sablefish bag, possession, and nonresident annual limits based on sablefish abundance in NSEI and SSEI sections, as follows: | | |
| OPPOSE | 2 | 13 | <p>MOVE to support on reconsideration of the original proposal, Tad, Steve seconds</p> <p>Department-- I am here if anybody has questions What is the GHF for the upcoming season? Dept answer- don't know</p> <p>Public Testimony:</p> <p>Tory: I don't understand the language of the amendment that the AC made previously. I submitted comments to the AC, did folk get them?</p> |



| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>Linda: For Alaska Longline Fishermans' Association--- this proposal makes it seem to be abundance based but is really just a bag-limit increase. The baseline is wrong. The bag limits were put in place based on the 2008 GHL of 1.5M lbs. So 1M is far too low to be considering an increase. Furthermore, the sport fishery has expanded to the outer coast now, so it isn't appropriate to just use Chatham to set the limit for all of SE. There are alot of things fundamentally wrong with this proposal. The proposal as written is disingenuous.</p> <p>Richard Yamata- AK Charter Assoc: The percentage of the Chatham catch that sport sector took was 7% of the poundage, but because size of fish has decreased with the influx of smaller fish, the result is that in recent years sport fish has only caught 3%. The commercial fishermen's limit is in pounds, ours is in number of fish, so as the fish get smaller our proportion of the catch decreases. This proposal only tries to increase the number of fish to reach the level when we started the fishery in 2009. Even if we got all the fish in this proposal, we would only hit 7% which is much lower than any other species for sport vs. commercial catch.</p> <p>Eric Jordan: I don't consider electric reels as sportfishing Committee:</p> <p>Tad: We identified several mistakes in the proposal the first time we discussed this and tried to amend the proposal to correct them. We recognized that an abundance-based catch needs to be able to go down as well as up, and we addressed that. We recognized that the catch should move proportionally with the abundance, and we addressed that. We recognized that the baseline of the original proposal was wrong, and we tried to fix that, but we goofed. We knew that the original limits were imposed in 2009, so we used the 2009 GHL, but we should have used the 2008 GHL since those were the only numbers available to the BoF early in 2009 when they set the limit. That error could be easily addressed tonight, but what we didn't recognize or try to address was that with the expansion of the sport blackcod fishery to outside waters, it is no longer appropriate to base the entire region's limits on the abundance in Chatham Strait alone. Unlike 15 years ago, that's now just one small portion of where the fishery occurs nowadays. I don't think that we</p> |
|--|--|---|



| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>have time now, after 10 PM and just two days until comments are due to address that and fix this proposal.</p> <p>Jeff: i am going to oppose</p> <p>Spencer: I think that the increased catch and effort is a function of sablefish in shallower waters. common to have a daily bag limit inside of 100 fathoms without electric reels while we are catching halibut. lots more blackcod but smaller.</p> <p>Luke: I move an amendment to change the baseline from 1.0M lbs to the 1.5M lbs that was the 2008 GHl.</p> <p>Dies for lack of second</p> <p>Dick Curren: There has been a lot of growth in sport blackcod catch since electric reels. The catch in chatham is up 400% and the outside catch up 500%. There is no limit to the number of participants. While there is limited entry on charter halibut boats, there is not a limit on the number of charter blackcod boats.</p> |
| | | | |

DRAFT



Adjournment:

Minutes Recorded By: Andrew Thoms _____

Minutes Approved By: Heather Bauscher _____

Heather Bauscher

Date: _____ 12/22/2021

DRAFT