

For the Record, I'm Kevin Maier, representing the Juneau Douglas Advisory Committee.

Thank you, Madam Chair and members of the Board, for the opportunity to testify. I also want to thank board support staff for getting me here, and to all of you, staff and public, for your engagement with this important work of managing Alaska's fisheries.

I'm thankful for the opportunity to visit Dena'Ina land, just as I am thankful to live and work in Lingit Aani.

This is my first time attending a board meeting, and I'm unable to stay through the entirety of the committee of the whole, so please forgive me if my report on our deliberations is too detailed or too brief. I'll do my best to quickly encapsulate four separate 2-hour zoom meetings, dating back to fall of 2020, in a way that will clarify our intent and amplify our submitted minutes. I'll describe some of the proposals we discussed in four categories that track with the agenda.

- 1) KING SALMON—The theme here will be “caution”—that is, we urge the board to adopt proposals that help conserve king salmon stocks.

We discussed proposal 81 at length and narrowly voted to oppose. Nay voters repeatedly noted a desire to increase escapement rather than fully allocate a fishery.

After lengthy discussion, we voted to take no action on proposals 82 and 83. As written and explained to us, we didn't feel adequately prepared to understand the full ramifications of these proposals.

We narrowly voted to support proposal 89, but want to register our concerns about potential impacts of stacking power troll permits on king salmon stocks.

After lengthy discussion, we voted to support proposals 84, 85, and 86 by relatively healthy majorities. There were three general principles that emerged in our deliberations and votes: 1) protect charter and out-of-state opportunity, 2) prioritize resident king fishing opportunity, and 3) give the department tools to protect our imperiled king salmon stocks (our AC members are intimately aware of those red bars on Ed Jones's Taku River King salmon figure from yesterday; we know what it feels like to miss escapement goals several years running).

In short, we think the king salmon stock declines present an urgent need to modify our approach. Whether a function of marine survival or harvest, or some combination there-of, we think the declines are alarming, and we urge the board to help the department adopt aggressive conservation measures. Again, when it comes to king salmon, we urge caution.

- 2) COMMERCIAL SALMON

We unanimously support proposal 110. Reporting lost gillnet gear seems like a common-sense requirement.

We narrowly voted to oppose proposals 111, 112, and 114. And we unanimously voted to oppose 113, 115, and 116. Again, protecting king salmon stocks emerged as a guiding principle in all these discussions.

3) PERSONAL USE

We support an amended version of proposal 134, asking that that it be re-written to include both subsistence and personal use and to exclude terminal harvest areas.

We unanimously voted to oppose proposals 135 and 136, as well as proposals 138-141 (creating personal use fisheries). We considered the latter group of proposals together. It is our impression that the implications for the Pacific Salmon Treaty make these complicated, so we support the status quo management.

After lengthy discussion of proposal 137 on Sweetheart Creek proxy fishing we voted to oppose. It is worth noting that this popular personal use fishery might need some monitoring.

4) SPORT PROPOSALS

We unanimously opposed proposal 143, as ADFG indicated they don't have capacity to manage the volume of data from in-season reporting of non-resident sport fish harvest

However, we voted by healthy majority to support 144 to create a log-book program for rental vessels. We see this burgeoning sector of non-guided sport fishing to be an emergent concern, especially, again, for king salmon. (With potential changes in federally managed species, we see potential growth in this sector and want to make sure we are very accurately tracking this impact on salmon. We learned yesterday that 15% of king salmon sport harvest in Southeast Alaska already comes from this non-guided non-resident, and we expect this will increase).

We considered proposals 145-148 together, voting to oppose changing bag limits for non-residents, as we don't see a biological reason to do so at this time.

Finally, we support amending proposal 155, retaining the proposed requirement to keep salmon in the water before releasing but cutting the portion about multiple hooks.

Again, I want to thank you for the opportunity to participate in this process, and I will be here through this afternoon if you have any questions. I'll submit these summative comments as an RC as well.