



March 11, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

Passing Proposal 283 prioritizes a small group of commercial fishing as one third of the set netters would qualify under the proposal. A vote in support of 283 gives a small group fishing preference, further risking the king salmon run in the Kenai River.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous “over escapement” issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Destry Lind

Anchorage
99516



March 12, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

Vote NO! on 283, I would if I were in your shoes.

Most sportfishers know what needs to be done to protect the Kenai River king salmon. When the escapement numbers are not being achieved, there is zero scientifically valid reason to risk a single king salmon's opportunity to spawn.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Diana Kuest

Anchorage
99511

Don Bumpus
P.O. Box 167
Chignik Lagoon, AK 99565

Alaska Board of Fisheries
P.O. Box 115526
Juneau, Alaska 99811-5526



January 10, 2022

Subject: **ACR 7 (Proposal 282)**

Dear Members of Alaska Board of Fisheries,

As the author of ACR 7 now listed as Proposal 282, I ask that you recognize why its passage is essential for the sustainability of the Chignik early-sockeye salmon run.

There are multiple years now where the Chignik early-run has failed to reach the lower end of the escapement goal. The consequences to Chignik are not just commercial fishery and subsistence closures for the last four years, but more poor returns in the future from those past failures to meet minimum escapements.

By current regulations, the Shumagin and Dolgoi fisheries are under no obligation to reduce the interception of Chignik-bound sockeye salmon or any other non-local stock when a stock is in jeopardy of not meeting escapement. According to ADF&G's WASSIP study, these are leading harvest areas where Chignik-bound sockeye salmon migrate.

Integrating Chignik escapement requirements into the management plan for the Shumagin and Dolgoi fisheries is one reasonable way to address the problem. Proposal 282 offers a solution, and one that is fair to Chignik and Area M.

I strongly encourage the Board to pass Proposal 282.

My best, ***Don Bumpus***



March 07, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

Currently ADF&G cannot reduce fishing restrictions until the OEG is achieved. If passed, Proposal 283 would allow projected escapements to be utilized rather than actual fish in the river. It's literally putting the cart before the horse; commercial fishing will be permitted before sufficient king salmon have actually made it into the river, based on the OEG.

The economy of the Kenai Peninsula relies on its salmon fisheries. However, the economics point to the sport-caught fisheries being the economic powerhouse, NOT the commercial fishery. Regardless, we need to rebuild the king salmon runs to support both economic engines. Are you willing to risk an entire species' survival to pull a few sockeye out of the water? Where is the logic in that?

Most sportfishers know what needs to be done to protect the Kenai River king salmon. When the escapement numbers are not being achieved, there is zero scientifically valid reason to risk a single king salmon's opportunity to spawn.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Thank you,
Don Meilner

Don Meilner

Palmetto
34221



February 18, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

The iconic State fish of the great State of Alaska, the mighty king salmon, and in particular the unique Kenai kings, need all the protection they can receive, now more than ever.

Passing Proposal 283 prioritizes a small group of commercial fishing as one third of the set netters would qualify under the proposal. A vote in support of 283 gives a small group fishing preference, further risking the king salmon run in the Kenai River.

Most sportfishers know what needs to be done to protect the Kenai River king salmon. When the escapement numbers are not being achieved, there is zero scientifically valid reason to risk a single king salmon's opportunity to spawn.

The Optimal Escapement Goal (OEG) is a higher threshold intended to not only halt salmon decline but also allow the fishery to recover. The Sustainable Escapement Goal (SEG) is the absolute bare minimum number of fish needed for the species to survive and does nothing to improve the fishery. Ultimately, if Proposal 283 is passed, survival of the king salmon fishery in the Kenai River is further threatened.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Don Yagura

Gig Harbor
98332



February 19, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

Proposal 283 is completely illogical. Lowering the Kenai Rivers king salmon escapement goal just so commercial fisheries can catch more sockeye salmon is like asking to take Cook Inlet beluga whales off the endangered species list just so commercial fisheries can catch more sockeye.

These belugas need a minimum of about 50 pounds of sockeye's per day during July to gain enough fat to survive the winter. Commercial fisheries and belugas compete for the same resource and that threatens beluga whales survival. So should we remove belugas from the endangered species list to end the conflict?

Both Cook Inlet beluga whales and Kenai King salmon cannot be genetically replaced if destroyed by commercial fisheries. Both of these illogical attempts would be absolutely unbelievably self destructive. If we were going to make a resource mistake it should be one that over restricts users and gives the resource a break, NOT the other way around.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Donald Johnson

Soldotna
99669



February 19, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

As an Alaskan Master Guide, I have the privilege of both using Alaskan Wildlife resources while also managing sustainability of Wildlife resources. Alaskan Fisheries are in severe decline and in my opinion based on supporting Data, The Chinook Salmon natural run in Cook Inlet is Dire. We still may have time to reverse this trend of Decline However it will not be possible without the Opposition of Proposal 283..

As a current land owner and user of Alaskan fishery resources on the Kenai river, The decline is not a problem of one specific user but all users. As it will be painful for all who are affected.. We all must sacrifice today in order to have a chance at stronger resources tomorrow..

The Optimal Escapement Goal (OEG) is a higher threshold intended to not only halt salmon decline but also allow the fishery to recover. The Sustainable Escapement Goal (SEG) is the absolute bare minimum number of fish needed for the species to survive and does nothing to improve the fishery. Ultimately, if Proposal 283 is passed, survival of the king salmon fishery in the Kenai River is further threatened.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Donald Willis

Enumclaw
98022



February 15, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

Please vote NO on proposal 283. Save the famous late run king salmon. Stop the greed and save the Species. The early run of king salmon has already been destroyed all for \$\$\$\$\$. Be responsible.

The economy of the Kenai Peninsula relies on its salmon fisheries. However, the economics point to the sport-caught fisheries being the economic powerhouse, NOT the commercial fishery. Regardless, we need to rebuild the king salmon runs to support both economic engines. Are you willing to risk an entire species' survival to pull a few sockeye out of the water? Where is the logic in that?

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Donna Kessler

Anchorage
99516



March 09, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

Just stop!! Common sense. The precious King Salmon first before any kind of fishing. Escapement met before any fishing. Please let them survive. The mis-management of the king salmon is obvious. Keep it equal, sport and commercial to save our precious salmon. Commercial fisherman will survive and sports fisherman will survive with strict restrictions to save the salmon, if not the salmon WILL NOT survive.

The OEG is the OEG for a reason. The escapement threshold was set because that is the minimum number of salmon that need to enter the river so that the fishery can rebuild. I am not willing to give up on the Kenai River king salmon. Please vote no on Proposal 283.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous “over escapement” issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Donna Kessler

Anchorage
99516



February 17, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

We live in the Kenai Keys., on the river at mile 42. Since 1970's — We have seen a steady decline in King salmon- . Preserving King Salmon fishery for future generations is exceedingly important.,

Passing Proposal 283 prioritizes a small group of commercial fishing as one third of the set netters would qualify under the proposal. A vote in support of 283 gives a small group fishing preference, further risking the king salmon run in the Kenai River.

Most sportfishers know what needs to be done to protect the Kenai River king salmon. When the escapement numbers are not being achieved, there is zero scientifically valid reason to risk a single king salmon's opportunity to spawn.

The standard should remain that meeting the conservation needs of the weakest stocks is more important than avoiding the upper limit of another species. Passing 283 would indicate that the Board has abandoned weak-stock management principles.

The Optimal Escapement Goal (OEG) is a higher threshold intended to not only halt salmon decline but also allow the fishery to recover. The Sustainable Escapement Goal (SEG) is the absolute bare minimum number of fish needed for the species to survive and does nothing to improve the fishery. Ultimately, if Proposal 283 is passed, survival of the king salmon fishery in the Kenai River is further threatened.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Donna McLeod

Sterling
99672



February 17, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

Hi,

As an avid fisherman. This is not a management proposal it's production fish catch increase. Simply add a 1-2 extension to other fishing boundaries. Lest the Kenai Kings thrive.

The standard should remain that meeting the conservation needs of the weakest stocks is more important than avoiding the upper limit of another species. Passing 283 would indicate that the Board has abandoned weak-stock management principles.

Most sportfishers know what needs to be done to protect the Kenai River king salmon. When the escapement numbers are not being achieved, there is zero scientifically valid reason to risk a single king salmon's opportunity to spawn.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Doug Razzano

Phoenix
85028



March 07, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

Currently ADF&G cannot reduce fishing restrictions until the OEG is achieved. If passed, Proposal 283 would allow projected escapements to be utilized rather than actual fish in the river. It's literally putting the cart before the horse; commercial fishing will be permitted before sufficient king salmon have actually made it into the river, based on the OEG.

Kenai River king salmon have not been meeting spawning objectives for years, and Proposal 283 potentially allows the commercial harvest of kings when we haven't clearly met the lower escapement goals.

The Optimal Escapement Goal (OEG) is a higher threshold intended to not only halt salmon decline but also allow the fishery to recover. The Sustainable Escapement Goal (SEG) is the absolute bare minimum number of fish needed for the species to survive and does nothing to improve the fishery. Ultimately, if Proposal 283 is passed, survival of the king salmon fishery in the Kenai River is further threatened.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Douglas Hath
Rancho Palos Verdes
90275



February 25, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

I live in Kenai on the bluff about five miles south of the mouth of the Kenai river , Fishing the Kenai for Kings was one of the things I used to enjoy every summer, the King run has been devastated to the point that I no longer fish for them and if drastic restrictions are not put in place to save the remaining fish it won't matter in a few years there will be nothing left for anyone to fight over . The Trawl fleet kills and dumps thousands of fish a year overboard as bycatch , and nothing is done , if the commercial set netter and guides are allowed to fish before escapement into the river is meet the fishery is doomed , you might as well kill them all and get it over with .

Passing Proposal 283 prioritizes a small group of commercial fishing as one third of the set netters would qualify under the proposal. A vote in support of 283 gives a small group fishing preference, further risking the king salmon run in the Kenai River.

Most sportfishers know what needs to be done to protect the Kenai River king salmon. When the escapement numbers are not being achieved, there is zero scientifically valid reason to risk a single king salmon's opportunity to spawn.

The OEG is the OEG for a reason. The escapement threshold was set because that is the minimum number of salmon that need to enter the river so that the fishery can rebuild. I am not willing to give up on the Kenai River king salmon. Please vote no on Proposal 283.

Currently ADF&G cannot reduce fishing restrictions until the OEG is achieved. If passed, Proposal 283 would allow projected escapements to be utilized rather than actual fish in the river. It's literally putting the cart before the horse; commercial fishing will be permitted before sufficient king salmon have actually made it into the river, based on the OEG.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Duane Hahn

Kenai
99611



February 16, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

I was born in Alaska, and I've lived on the Kenai Peninsula for about 7 years now. I have still never caught a Kenai King. Why? Because I believe it is irresponsible to fish for them in the current state that they are in. The decisions being made the past few years blow my mind. People used to throw 60 pound fish back because they knew they would get a bigger one. Now a 60 pounder is a really lucky day. Lowering escapement goals will only lead to the complete destruction of the trophy kings we still have. Shut the king fishing down, at least for a few years! At least try to bring back our kings!!!!

Passing Proposal 283 prioritizes a small group of commercial fishing as one third of the set netters would qualify under the proposal. A vote in support of 283 gives a small group fishing preference, further risking the king salmon run in the Kenai River.

The economy of the Kenai Peninsula relies on its salmon fisheries. However, the economics point to the sport-caught fisheries being the economic powerhouse, NOT the commercial fishery. Regardless, we need to rebuild the king salmon runs to support both economic engines. Are you willing to risk an entire species' survival to pull a few sockeye out of the water? Where is the logic in that?

Kenai River king salmon have not been meeting spawning objectives for years, and Proposal 283 potentially allows the commercial harvest of kings when we haven't clearly met the lower escapement goals.

Currently ADF&G cannot reduce fishing restrictions until the OEG is achieved. If passed, Proposal 283 would allow projected escapements to be utilized rather than actual fish in the river. It's literally putting the cart before the horse; commercial fishing will be permitted before sufficient king salmon have actually made it into the river, based on the OEG.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Dusten Kirker
Kenai
99611



Submitted By
Dwain Foster Sr.
Submitted On
3/11/2022 1:43:38 PM
Affiliation

Phone
9072273619
Email
captcod3091@aol.com

Address
P.O. Box 162
Sand Point, Alaska 99661

Members of the Alaska Board of Fish

My name is Dwain Foster Sr. I am a lifelong resident of Sand Point. I own both salmon seine and setnet permits for Area M and have actively fished here for over 50 years.

I am writing in opposition of Proposal 282. Proposal 282 is looking to severely restrict Area M fishing times in both June and July. This action would be crippling to our communities.

In October 2021, the Department clearly stated that ACR 7 (now Proposal 282) was an allocation issue, NOT a conservation issue. In years past when Chignik has not met escapement goals, the Department has used its emergency order authority. In 2021, Chignik met its late run and total escapement and neither one is listed as a stock of concern. With this being said, there is no conservation need to change the Area M management plan out of cycle when we are to be brought before the board in 2023. ADF&G forecasts that Chignik will meet its escapement goal in 2022, which clearly proves that Chignik fishermen are once again advocating restrictions on us that have no real benefit to them.

I urge you to not support Proposal 282. This clearly is allocative and not conservative and if the Board were to adopt these changes, it would go against Board and Department policy.

Thank you,

Dwain Foster, Sr.



Submitted By
Dwight Kramer
Submitted On
2/1/2022 2:19:52 PM
Affiliation
self

Comments on Proposal 283

While I sympathize with the anguish and financial hardship the commercial set net community feels as they watch hundreds of thousands of sockeye salmon swim by, I also understand the importance of protecting the Kenai River LR Kings in their present state of continuing extreme low abundance. Anytime we have species that is in decline and failing to sustain itself at even the lowest measurements of established escapement goals it becomes incumbent on all user groups to accept restrictions necessary to protect that species and give it an opportunity to rebound. Fish first, always.

As users, both sport and commercial, we have to face the reality that until the LR kings are once again at healthy numbers, near the mid-range of the OEG or higher, none of us will ever enjoy full fisheries without restrictions of some sort. We cannot keep treating the lower bound of either the SEG or OEG as thresholds where we expect to have harvest opportunities on all fish over the bare minimums if we ever expect this run to become vibrant once again.

For these reasons I am **OPPOSED** to this proposal.

I also don't understand the premise in bringing this proposal forward at this time. It makes no sense on many levels;

It is out of cycle and most people interested in UCI and Kenai River fishery issues won't expect something like this or ever know it is on the agenda for the March meeting. This is unfair to other user groups that would have certainly wanted to be involved in the BOF testimony and discussion portions of the process.

This proposal does not consider the ramifications it would have on other user groups who's harvest restrictions would be based on the OEG at a higher threshold for opportunity. Would the sport fishery want equal opportunity based on the same SEG parameters as commercial? If so, would the harvest in both fisheries jeopardize the OEG standards for spawner recruitment and further harm all efforts to further rehabilitate the Kenai river LR king stocks?

It is especially puzzling, why it is so important to bring this proposal forward at this time when the king escapement levels over the past 3 years have been well below either escapement goal and the forecast for this upcoming season is the most dismal in history. It seems counter productive and inconceivable to even consider going back to a lower spawner escapement level just for the sake of killing more of these fish, needed for recruitment, all for an opportunity to harvest another species at the same time.

I believe this proposal is short sided and lacks full consideration for how it could ultimately affect other user groups and further jeopardize any recovery efforts regarding our LR King stocks. All regulations presently in place are in reference to the established OEG and any further allocation discussions regarding LR Kings should center around the OEG for it is the highest standard necessary to help rebuild this run.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this proposal.



February 16, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

The economy of the Kenai Peninsula relies on its salmon fisheries. However, the economics point to the sport-caught fisheries being the economic powerhouse, NOT the commercial fishery. Regardless, we need to rebuild the king salmon runs to support both economic engines. Are you willing to risk an entire species' survival to pull a few sockeye out of the water? Where is the logic in that?

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Dylan Chamberlin



Submitted By
Earl Cuzzort
Submitted On
1/31/2022 4:09:22 PM
Affiliation

Phone
9072235210

Email
egcuzzort@gmail.com

Address
17623 Rachel Circle
Eagle River , Alaska 99577

I'm unable to understand why personal use shrimpers in PWS have had the number of pots reduced last year to two pots per vessel, down from five pots in years past, under the guise that shrimp are beinh over fished, while commercial shrimpers had an increase to the number of pots allowed. Makes no sense.



February 16, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

I've caught salmon to feed my family from the Kenai River for the past 43 years so I witnessed the destruction of the world's greatest king salmon run. I know commercial fisherman who fish the Kenai River red salmon run and they have lied all along about their catch of king salmon, and they have significantly contributed to the destruction of the king fishery. Don't help them completely destroy this run of kings. Vote No on Proposal 283.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Ed Tompkins

Palmer
99645



February 16, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

I visited the Alagnek river last year. What a tremendous experience. I would love my children and anyone else to experience the same or better.

Please think of the little guy that pays a lot of money for the way nature should be. Alaska is truly the last frontier. Commercial fishing is just to make as much money as possible. Outdoorsmen enjoy it so much more. Don't ruin a good thing.

Thank you, and planning another trip with the kids next time.

The OEG is the OEG for a reason. The escapement threshold was set because that is the minimum number of salmon that need to enter the river so that the fishery can rebuild. I am not willing to give up on the Kenai River king salmon. Please vote no on Proposal 283.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Ed Wetzel

Cochranton
16314



March 07, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

The economy of the Kenai Peninsula relies on its salmon fisheries. However, the economics point to the sport-caught fisheries being the economic powerhouse, NOT the commercial fishery. Regardless, we need to rebuild the king salmon runs to support both economic engines. Are you willing to risk an entire species' survival to pull a few sockeye out of the water? Where is the logic in that?

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

edward parra

Kansas City
64119



February 16, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

Please, please, please, NO on Fisheries Proposal 283. To me, these late run Kenai King salmon are the heart and soul of the Kenai Peninsula and could very well be ranked among the most special fish on Earth deserving of their world famous reputation. These fish have placed the Kenai Peninsula on the map as a "must see" fishing destination for many, many people. Over the years, the human factor has arguably taken its toll on these special fish, and we have the collective responsibility of faithful stewardship not for ourselves but for generations yet to come. Shall the destruction of these fish be our legacy? Over the last 20 years, it certainly is looking that way. I fish, and let me be the first to give it up what I love doing to save what I love even more, the precious Kenai King Salmon. Certainly, the biggest takers will feel the most pain, but that burden is the price of saving this fishery for us all, and these fish deserve nothing less. The fisheries board must act with courage and conviction to reverse the massive decline of this run over so many years. I urge the BoF to save these fish AND do everything possible to bring their numbers back for posterity. Do this and restore our collective confidence in the ability of the Board of Fish to manage our most precious PUBLIC resource. Everybody knows we are simply taking too many fish. Everybody knows that lowering the escapement bar for success on paper is not the answer. I would venture to say that such a solution is shortsighted, lacks historical perspective, and is not the path for successful fisheries management. More egregiously, Proposal 283 lacks empathy for those generations yet to come. Previous generations delivered on their promise to us, and we must not fail in our solemn responsibility to those yet to come, for they deserve nothing less and it is not too late.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Edward Vey

Palmer
99645



February 16, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

I have owned property on the Kenai River for over 30 years and have a vested concern about the health of the river. I believe lowering the escapement of the fish will be detrimental to the river.

The Optimal Escapement Goal (OEG) is a higher threshold intended to not only halt salmon decline but also allow the fishery to recover. The Sustainable Escapement Goal (SEG) is the absolute bare minimum number of fish needed for the species to survive and does nothing to improve the fishery. Ultimately, if Proposal 283 is passed, survival of the king salmon fishery in the Kenai River is further threatened.

Most sportfishers know what needs to be done to protect the Kenai River king salmon. When the escapement numbers are not being achieved, there is zero scientifically valid reason to risk a single king salmon's opportunity to spawn.

The OEG is the OEG for a reason. The escapement threshold was set because that is the minimum number of salmon that need to enter the river so that the fishery can rebuild. I am not willing to give up on the Kenai River king salmon. Please vote no on Proposal 283.

Kenai River king salmon have not been meeting spawning objectives for years, and Proposal 283 potentially allows the commercial harvest of kings when we haven't clearly met the lower escapement goals.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Edwin Tripp

Yuma
85367



March 10, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

Dear members of the Board of Fish. First, I'd like to thank you for your commitment to public service. Your work on this Board is often a thankless task, but please know your time and efforts are greatly appreciated.

Second, I'd like to provide some comments in opposition to Prop 283. While it may be well intentioned, this proposition is contrary to what should be a goal for you, me and ALL Alaskans: the preservation of our cherished king salmon. Kenai River king salmon runs are dangerously low and either you believe in preserving them or you don't--it's as simple as that. This proposition would add setnet fishing time even when the department recognizes that king runs are low in the Kenai. Setnets are indiscriminate killers and if given more time, MORE KINGS WILL DIE in these nets. That should NOT be an acceptable option for the Board.

Additionally, the burden of conservation should be shouldered by all of the user groups. No one likes fishing restrictions, but paired restrictions spreads the pain of conserving Kenai River king salmon to both commercial and sport fishers. They also serve to reduce the rancor or anger that develops when one user group is singled-out to bear the brunt of conservation. Paired restrictions are a matter of equity. This proposition threatens decoupling those paired restrictions.

Last, I oppose this proposition because simply hearing this board generated proposal--out of cycle--destabilizes the whole Board of Fish process. Why have 3 year cycles when you're going to continually re-hash the difficult decisions from each meeting? There is NO biological reason with this proposition. It has to be exhausting to Board members to face the same difficult decisions, year after year--it certainly is to user groups. It also adds so-called "fish wars" to every legislative agenda and even the Governor's office. Honestly, why would you want to create such instability?!?

In closing, I strongly encourage Board members to REJECT prop 283. It's anti-conservation, it's unfair and its destabilizing. Many thanks for your kind consideration of my thoughts and comments.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Eldon Mulder

Anchorage
99504



February 18, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

The economy of the Kenai Peninsula relies on its salmon fisheries. However, the economics point to the sport-caught fisheries being the economic powerhouse, NOT the commercial fishery. Regardless, we need to rebuild the king salmon runs to support both economic engines. Are you willing to risk an entire species' survival to pull a few sockeye out of the water? Where is the logic in that?

Most sportfishers know what needs to be done to protect the Kenai River king salmon. When the escapement numbers are not being achieved, there is zero scientifically valid reason to risk a single king salmon's opportunity to spawn.

Passing Proposal 283 prioritizes a small group of commercial fishing as one third of the set netters would qualify under the proposal. A vote in support of 283 gives a small group fishing preference, further risking the king salmon run in the Kenai River.

The Optimal Escapement Goal (OEG) is a higher threshold intended to not only halt salmon decline but also allow the fishery to recover. The Sustainable Escapement Goal (SEG) is the absolute bare minimum number of fish needed for the species to survive and does nothing to improve the fishery. Ultimately, if Proposal 283 is passed, survival of the king salmon fishery in the Kenai River is further threatened.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Ellen Elaine Rainey

Kenai
99661



February 15, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

You need to vote NO on 283. The king salmon run is for more important than putting fish on tables for the rich! Save the Kenai salmon, nothing less!

The OEG is the OEG for a reason. The escapement threshold was set because that is the minimum number of salmon that need to enter the river so that the fishery can rebuild. I am not willing to give up on the Kenai River king salmon. Please vote no on Proposal 283.

Currently ADF&G cannot reduce fishing restrictions until the OEG is achieved. If passed, Proposal 283 would allow projected escapements to be utilized rather than actual fish in the river. It's literally putting the cart before the horse; commercial fishing will be permitted before sufficient king salmon have actually made it into the river, based on the OEG.

The economy of the Kenai Peninsula relies on its salmon fisheries. However, the economics point to the sport-caught fisheries being the economic powerhouse, NOT the commercial fishery.

Regardless, we need to rebuild the king salmon runs to support both economic engines. Are you willing to risk an entire species' survival to pull a few sockeye out of the water? Where is the logic in that?

Kenai River king salmon have not been meeting spawning objectives for years, and Proposal 283 potentially allows the commercial harvest of kings when we haven't clearly met the lower escapement goals.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Eric Eckard

WASILLA
99623



February 18, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

The economy of the Kenai Peninsula relies on its salmon fisheries. However, the economics point to the sport-caught fisheries being the economic powerhouse, NOT the commercial fishery. Regardless, we need to rebuild the king salmon runs to support both economic engines. Are you willing to risk an entire species' survival to pull a few sockeye out of the water? Where is the logic in that?

Currently ADF&G cannot reduce fishing restrictions until the OEG is achieved. If passed, Proposal 283 would allow projected escapements to be utilized rather than actual fish in the river. It's literally putting the cart before the horse; commercial fishing will be permitted before sufficient king salmon have actually made it into the river, based on the OEG.

Most sportfishers know what needs to be done to protect the Kenai River king salmon. When the escapement numbers are not being achieved, there is zero scientifically valid reason to risk a single king salmon's opportunity to spawn.

The standard should remain that meeting the conservation needs of the weakest stocks is more important than avoiding the upper limit of another species. Passing 283 would indicate that the Board has abandoned weak-stock management principles.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Eric Jean
Soldotna
99669



February 15, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

I have been sport fishing the Kenai river for 33 years. It's very important to me to protect the Kenai so future generations (including my children) will have the opportunity's that were available to me.

Kenai River king salmon have not been meeting spawning objectives for years, and Proposal 283 potentially allows the commercial harvest of kings when we haven't clearly met the lower escapement goals.

Currently ADF&G cannot reduce fishing restrictions until the OEG is achieved. If passed, Proposal 283 would allow projected escapements to be utilized rather than actual fish in the river. It's literally putting the cart before the horse; commercial fishing will be permitted before sufficient king salmon have actually made it into the river, based on the OEG.

The economy of the Kenai Peninsula relies on its salmon fisheries. However, the economics point to the sport-caught fisheries being the economic powerhouse, NOT the commercial fishery.

Regardless, we need to rebuild the king salmon runs to support both economic engines. Are you willing to risk an entire species' survival to pull a few sockeye out of the water? Where is the logic in that?

The standard should remain that meeting the conservation needs of the weakest stocks is more important than avoiding the upper limit of another species. Passing 283 would indicate that the Board has abandoned weak-stock management principles.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

eric mauro

Eagle River
99577



March 02, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

My name is Eric Spade and I live in Eagle River, AK. I have been fishing on the Kenai Peninsula since 1996 and am embarrassed and disappointed by the lack of competent management of the fisheries there. No place and no species is this more relevant than the Kenai River King salmon population. I am not anti-commercial fishing, but it is high time that Cook Inlet commercial interests be put on the back burner due to the decreased population/escapement of Kings on the peninsula and in the Mat-Su streams (Mat-Su silvers are another fish population of concern due to commercial quotas). I urge the Board not to lower King escapement on the Kenai. If anything increase the escapement. Users (sport and commercial) will have to live restrictions until this fishery is restored. My family dip nets on the Kenai and we have gone years without harvesting a king due to restrictions, it's time for everyone to do their part and accept restrictions for this once fabulous fishery.

Thank you for your time, and so the right thing,
Eric Spade

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Eric Spade
Eagle River
99577



February 18, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

My name is Eric Wallis. I served for 23 years in the Army and I am a two tour combat Vet. I retired in Alaska mainly for the fishing! I could have lived anywhere in the world, but I chose Alaska as my home!

The economy of the Kenai Peninsula relies on its salmon fisheries. However, the economics point to the sport-caught fisheries being the economic powerhouse, NOT the commercial fishery. Regardless, we need to rebuild the king salmon runs to support both economic engines. Are you willing to risk an entire species' survival to pull a few sockeye out of the water? Where is the logic in that?

The OEG is the OEG for a reason. The escapement threshold was set because that is the minimum number of salmon that need to enter the river so that the fishery can rebuild. I am not willing to give up on the Kenai River king salmon. Please vote no on Proposal 283.

Passing Proposal 283 prioritizes a small group of commercial fishing as one third of the set netters would qualify under the proposal. A vote in support of 283 gives a small group fishing preference, further risking the king salmon run in the Kenai River.

Currently ADF&G cannot reduce fishing restrictions until the OEG is achieved. If passed, Proposal 283 would allow projected escapements to be utilized rather than actual fish in the river. It's literally putting the cart before the horse; commercial fishing will be permitted before sufficient king salmon have actually made it into the river, based on the OEG.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Eric Wallis

Eagle River
99577



March 12, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous “over escapement” issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Erica McDaniel

Ernie Carlson
FV Desperado
PO Box 21
Chignik, AK 99564
(907) 749-4042



PC181
1 of 1

Alaska Board of Fisheries
Board Support Section
PO Box 115526
Juneau, AK 99811-5526

January 7, 2022

Dear Board of Fisheries,

Subject: PROPOSAL 282 (ACR 7)

As a lifelong Chignik resident and subsistence and commercial fishermen I support PROPOSAL 282. My concern is the viability/sustainability of Chignik's two sockeye runs. The repeated escapement shortfalls on the early run are alarming. For the last four years the early run has not met ADF&G's targeted escapement of 400,000 or the prescribed minimum escapement goal of 350,000. This is unprecedented. Chignik cannot survive economically or culturally at the current rate of persistent sockeye salmon run failures.

Respectfully I ask for Board to pass PROPOSAL 282 calling for the Area M Shumagins and Dolgoi Islands fisheries to be pared-back on fishing time starting on June 15th when the Chignik early-run sockeye escapement level set by the Department is not being achieved. This is reasonable knowing, per WASSIP, that Chignik sockeye salmon are harvested in both areas, and there are no terminal-sockeye runs in either area prior to late summer.

Under current regulations, the Shumagins and Dolgoi fisheries are not accountable for stock conservation or aiding terminal-area escapements. These deficiencies were part of why high-seas salmon fishing was stopped in the 1960's. Accountability and management of migrating sockeye salmon intercepted in the Shumagins and Dolgoi areas through July is urgently needed well beyond just limiting time, area, and gear.

According to 5 AAC 39.222, policy for the management of Alaska sustainable salmon fisheries, the burden of conservation should be allocated across user groups. It is time for this policy to be applied to the Shumagin and Dolgoi fisheries by passing PROPOSAL 282.

Thank you

Sincerely,

Ernie Carlson



Submitted By
Ernie Kirby
Submitted On
3/4/2022 8:11:32 PM
Affiliation
Bottom Line Charters

Phone
9073738234

Email
info@bottomlinecharters.us

Address
12725 E KAYE MARIE CT
Palmer, Alaska 99645

PROPOSAL 257, 5 AAC 58.0xx and 5 AAC 77.5xx. East Cook Inlet Razor Clam Sport and Personal Use Fishery Management Plan. Ernie Kirby owner/operator Bottom Line Charters, I support this proposal.

PROPOSAL 256, 5 AAC 77.518. Personal use clam fishery. Ernie Kirby owner/operator Bottom Line Charters, I support this proposal. As a charter operator who has taken people to the west side of Cook Inlet for the past 17 years this proposal is needed.

PROPOSAL 256, 5 AAC 77.518. Personal use clam fishery. Ernie Kirby owner/operator Bottom Line Charters, I support this proposal. As a charter operator who has taken people to the west side of Cook Inlet for the past 17 years this proposal is needed.



February 16, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

I live in Palmer and am an Alaskan for the sport fishing and nature. Alaska residents cannot experience the fishing that our parents and grandparents had access too because of over-fishing and mismanagement. We cannot decrease escapement goals or our children will be lucky to see salmon, especially king.

Strong escapement numbers are not being achieved, and this is being reflected in ever decreasing fish populations. there is zero scientifically valid reason to risk a single king salmon's opportunity to spawn.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Ethan DeBauche
Palmer



February 19, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

I'm against this proposal I live on the Kenai River and have seen the decline of the world famous Kenai king we need to do everything possible to protect the survival of this one of a kind fish. Also the use of centimeters as a scale of size is a great example of the smoke and mirrors in this proposal. We measure everything in the fish and game regulations in inches. Please vote no on this proposal.

The economy of the Kenai Peninsula relies on its salmon fisheries. However, the economics point to the sport-caught fisheries being the economic powerhouse, NOT the commercial fishery. Regardless, we need to rebuild the king salmon runs to support both economic engines. Are you willing to risk an entire species' survival to pull a few sockeye out of the water? Where is the logic in that?

Currently ADF&G cannot reduce fishing restrictions until the OEG is achieved. If passed, Proposal 283 would allow projected escapements to be utilized rather than actual fish in the river. It's literally putting the cart before the horse; commercial fishing will be permitted before sufficient king salmon have actually made it into the river, based on the OEG.

The OEG is the OEG for a reason. The escapement threshold was set because that is the minimum number of salmon that need to enter the river so that the fishery can rebuild. I am not willing to give up on the Kenai River king salmon. Please vote no on Proposal 283.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Evan Harding

Kenai
99611



Submitted By
Ezekiel Brown
Submitted On
3/10/2022 3:34:34 PM
Affiliation

Phone
9075702725
Email
ezekiel.k.brown@gmail.com
Address
PO Box 1219
Cordova, Alaska 99574

Members of the Board, My name is Zeke Brown, I have lived and fished for sport, subsistence and commercially in Cordova and Prince William sound my whole life. I currently commercially fish for salmon, Tanner crab and shrimp trawl and pot fish in PWS. Proposal #237 Support Current reporting rate and accuracy is unacceptably low in this fishery especially considering the ghl is often exceeded. I would encourage the Board to require some sort of timely reporting so that this fishery can be more actively managed to prevent overharvest. Proposal #238 Oppose Proposal #239 Modify Pot limits per vessel has long been used in commercial, subsistence, and sport harvest in Alaska to limit harvest potential. Recently Shrimp fishermen in PWS have started exploiting this "spare pot" loophole in order to drastically increase the number of pots fished per vessel. Now vessels are regularly heading out with multiple permit holders aboard and multiple limits of shrimp pots which they call "spares". Once the vessel sets one permit holder's limit worth of shrimp pots they simply add marked buoys to their "spare pots" for the next permit holder on board and go set those. In this way they are capable of fishing far more gear per boat than was ever intended by the regulations. I encourage the board to take this opportunity to clarify the regulations which already clearly state a maximum of 5 pots per vessel to include any spare pots aboard the vessel. Proposal #240,#242,#246 Support The current spot prawn management plan does not differentiate sport, personal use and subsistence harvest in the TAH. Allowing sport and personal use harvest when the population is depressed below that which could support a commercial fishery should not be allowed as these user groups have the same priority under law. Noncommercial user group is the largest user of spot prawns in PWS and is often incapable of being managed to not exceed their GHL. Allowing the non commercial user groups to harvest a ghl when the population is under 110,000lbs TAH could put the species at risk of overfishing. I suggest the board adopt the following alternate language for proposal #242 to mirror the commercial fishing regulation: Modify 5 AAC 55.055. Prince William Sound noncommercial shrimp fishery management plan (a) The department shall manage the sport and other noncommercial shrimp fisheries in the Prince William Sound Area as follows: (1) the guideline harvest level for shrimp taken by pot gear in noncommercial fisheries is calculated as follows: [60 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL ALLOWABLE HARVEST FOR THE AREA] (a) When the total allowable harvest is greater than 200,000 pounds of spot shrimp by round weight, the guideline harvest level for the noncommercial pot gear fishery in the waters described in 5 AAC 31.210(a) is 50 percent of the total allowable harvest for the area. The department will, to the extent practicable, manage the fishery to allow no more than 50 percent of the guideline harvest level to be taken from any one statistical area. (b) When the total allowable harvest is greater than 110,000 pounds but less than 200,000 lb of spot shrimp by round weight, the guideline harvest level for the noncommercial pot gear fishery in the waters described in 5 AAC 31.210(a) is 60 percent of the total allowable harvest for the area. The department will, to the extent practicable, manage the fishery to allow no more than 50 percent of the guideline harvest level to be taken from any one statistical area. (c) When the total allowable harvest is less than 110,000 pounds of spot shrimp by round weight, all commercial and noncommercial pot gear fisheries will be closed except subsistence. (d) When the total allowable harvest is less than 110,000 but above 15,000 pounds of spot shrimp by round weight, the guideline harvest level for the subsistence pot gear fishery is 15,000 pounds which is the amount reasonably necessary for subsistence as determined by the board. (e) When the total allowable harvest is less than 15,000 pounds of spot shrimp by round weight all commercial and noncommercial pot gear fisheries will be closed Proposal 243 support Proposal #247 support The department has two mechanisms to manage harvest in this fishery, pot limits and opener length. However they manage almost solely using pot limits despite our requests otherwise. Commercial fishing is by definition a profit making endeavor and the department should manage fisheries to be harvested in the most efficient way biologically possible. The department's interference with the pace of this fishery in order to benefit a select few fresh market fishermen should not be allowed. Additionally the department's management has created a season that stretches far into salmon season and makes it hard for fishermen like myself that participate in the Copper River to participate. ADFG has begun making a habit in the spot prawn fishery of having a long closure during the last week of April, first week of May which results in a drastic reduction of fishing opportunity and eliminates almost half the opportunity available before the copper river opens may 15th. For example, in 2021 the Spot prawn fishery was open for a total of 112 days between April 15th and August 28th. The pace of the fishery was extremely slow but the department still had a 12 day closure from April 28th to May 10th. The department kept a pot limit of 30 pots until May 15th and then expanded it to 40 pots for the rest of the season. That excessive closure eliminated any fisherman who also fishes the Copper river's ability to participate in the second opening and unnecessarily increased the expenses for shrimp fisherman and processors who had to leave their boat and crew idle mid season. The extremely long season was due to the excessively low pot limit and shows the department's unwillingness to raise pot limits even with no biological or regulatory justification. For this fishery to be commercially viable we need to harvest the resource efficiently in 2 weeks tops. There is no way for me to pay for fuel, insurance and bait to go fish 25 pots at a maybe 2 lb per pot cpue. Proposal 248 Support As one of the few participants in this fishery I strongly urge the board to approve this proposal. This fishery has been underutilized for its entire existence with a good portion of the ghl going unharvested every year due to low participation. The department's claim of egg laying earlier in the season is unfounded in my experience. On the April 15th start date I have seen almost no egg-bearing females when compared with the fall season. While I agree they must lay their eggs at some point in the winter I have seen no evidence that it is between March 15th and April 15th. This fishery simply overlaps with too many other fisheries at its current start date for me to participate in it fully and the bad weather and lack of ice production from local processors in the fall makes it hard to participate in that season. Proposal 250 Support Gear conflict with noncommercial users is becoming more and more of an issue



in the commercial spot prawn fishery as well as enforcement of commercial fishing boats hauling noncommercial pots and selling that shrimp. This would also be a much better time for many participants including myself and the local processors to be fishing as it doesn't overlap with the summer salmon season as badly. Concerns of gear loss due to ice are overblown, there is plenty of ice moving during the current opener in April and I have not lost any gear to ice. Proposal 251 Oppose I am opposing this proposal due to Section F which would make it illegal to fish a floating processor in these shrimp fisheries. Small scale floating processors have been harvesting in this fishery since it reopened in 2010 and should not be excluded. The best quality and highest value shrimp are frozen at sea and allowing floating processors to work with other fishermen to freeze their own catch as well as others only benefits this fishery. I personally was planning on registering my boat as a floating processor for the 2022 season and working with a couple other shrimpers to purchase and process their catch until I saw this proposal. This proposal is another example of the department exceeding their authority in order to benefit a certain type of commercial fisherman over another. With the reporting requirements in this proposal there is no reason the department can't manage floating processors as well. Proposal 252 support Allowing catcher boats to also act as tenders is allowed in salmon under the transporter regulation and that should be mirrored in shrimp fisheries. Fresh shrimp needs to be frozen or sold within three days of harvest. It makes no sense for 50 shrimp boats to all run back and forth to town every three days when they could simply consolidate their catch on one boat. The low volume in these fishery's make it difficult to afford a dedicated tender vessel and consequently this would greatly increase the profitability of this fishery. This would also increase the ability for processors from further ports such as Cordova to compete in the market which could drive prices paid to fishermen up. Proposal 253 Support This bycatch regulation needs to be changed as it is foolish to be required to throw shrimp overboard as deadloss. The department's own data shows no harvest of spot shrimp in this fishery since 1996 yet they oppose this proposal due to it increasing spot harvest? Currently a fisherman, if they wanted to, could throw every pink shrimp they catch overboard and it would not contribute to their bycatch allowance. The idea that fishermen currently keep low value pink shrimp and throw spot prawns over is ludicrous. This regulation will in no way increase spot harvest; it will simply help stop the wanton waste of pink shrimp by not requiring them to be discarded dead whenever they are harvested in excess of 20%. Proposal 254 Support The department has the ability to put observers on shrimp trawl boats and has in the past. I personally have not seen any king or tanner crab mortality from this fishery in the western sound. As far as I know there is no king crab population in eastern Prince William sound and the department currently bottom trawls the area frequently to do tanner crab surveys. If it's ok for the department to trawl this area targeting tanner crab why shouldn't commercial fisherman be allowed to trawl it to target shrimp as has been done in the past? If evidence of tanner crab mortality was to result from this small scale fishery I would be the first to call for it's closure.



Submitted By
Filimon basargin
Submitted On
3/10/2022 10:55:47 AM
Affiliation

Phone
9072991560

Email
Philbasargin@gmail.com

Address
Pobox 2884
Homer, Alaska 99603

Hello Mr. Chair an boardmembers I Filimon Basargin am an owner of a Kodiak tanner permit an due to the January 15th opening date I have lost multiple seasons due to frozen harbor in homer an launch ramps an other various implications all due to extreme weather an ice build up!It is making it next to impossible to make it out of homer harbor an challenging the weather to kodiak.It would really help us out if the opening date would be moved to February 1st where it would be far less challenging an a safer trip an fishery for the future. Please consider looking into this! Thank you! God bless!



February 22, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

I strongly oppose Proposal 283!!!! SAVE THE KINGS!!!!!!
Instead of catering to the demands of the greedy commercial fisherman, do what is right for the sportsfisherman who bring the money into the state!

The standard should remain that meeting the conservation needs of the weakest stocks is more important than avoiding the upper limit of another species. Passing 283 would indicate that the Board has abandoned weak-stock management principles.

Currently ADF&G cannot reduce fishing restrictions until the OEG is achieved. If passed, Proposal 283 would allow projected escapements to be utilized rather than actual fish in the river. It's literally putting the cart before the horse; commercial fishing will be permitted before sufficient king salmon have actually made it into the river, based on the OEG.

The OEG is the OEG for a reason. The escapement threshold was set because that is the minimum number of salmon that need to enter the river so that the fishery can rebuild. I am not willing to give up on the Kenai River king salmon. Please vote no on Proposal 283.

The Optimal Escapement Goal (OEG) is a higher threshold intended to not only halt salmon decline but also allow the fishery to recover. The Sustainable Escapement Goal (SEG) is the absolute bare minimum number of fish needed for the species to survive and does nothing to improve the fishery. Ultimately, if Proposal 283 is passed, survival of the king salmon fishery in the Kenai River is further threatened.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Floyd Ring

Discovery Bay
94505



Submitted By
Francis Estalilla
Submitted On
2/13/2022 5:19:53 PM
Affiliation
Angler

PROPOSAL 283... **AGAINST.** At a time when late run Kenai chinook are at historic lows, this is simply the wrong proposal at the wrong time. Board members, ask yourselves... why even consider going down this path when the entire unfished run-size failed to scratch the lower bound SEG in the past three years? Bottom line, Kenai kings are in trouble. It is incumbent upon you to do EVERYTHING in your power to increase their numbers. If anything, you should be giving ADFG even MORE prescriptive guidance to achieve escapements spread within the full range of the OEG to help restore the iconic Kenai kings to historic abundance... NOT letting them fall through the escapement floor! In contrast, this ill-conceived proposal seeks yet again to LOWER the conservation bar for a horribly depleted stock... but wait, only for the "special" people. A double standard for conservation is the last thing the late run kings need. This foolish proposal only increases the risk that the conservation objective WILL NOT BE MET in 2022. If that should occur, four consecutive years of escapement failure is certain to place this population in a "stock of concern" status. Do you really want that blood on your hands? Please.... **JUST SAY NO!** Submitted by Francis V Estalilla, MD



February 23, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

I've lived on the peninsula and fished the Kenai river since the 1990's and have watched the run of large Kings get decimated by commercial fishing, the set netters being the worst offenders. Lower the number of spawners and you guarantee that the large Kenai Kings will never return.

Passing Proposal 283 prioritizes a small group of commercial fishing as one third of the set netters would qualify under the proposal. A vote in support of 283 gives a small group fishing preference, further risking the king salmon run in the Kenai River.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Frank casey

Clam Gulch
99568



Frank Kashevarof Jr.
P.O. Box 52
Seldovia, AK 99663
(907) 351-5617

Alaska Board of Fisheries
P.O. Box 115526
Juneau, Alaska 99811

January 3, 2022

Subject: Proposal 282

Dear Alaska Board of Fisheries,

I support Proposal 282. Its adoption would better insure that the Chignik early-run remains sustainable for future generations. The issue is that our early-run escapement is not being met. This has been the situation for the past four years even with total annual closures, through June and July, of the entire Chignik Management Area.

Proposal 282 is is totally grounded on stock conservation. Since the Shumagin Islands and Dolgoi Area fisheries harvest Chignik-bound sockeye salmon, through July based on the Department's WASSIP report, it is prudent that these fisheries share in the responsibility for Chignik's early-run escapement being met.

Fishing time in Shumagin Islands and Dolgoi Area would be reduced, under Proposal 282, only if the Chignik early-run is not expected to meet the mid-point of the Department's escapement goal. This is not too much to ask. Chignik is dependent on the viability of the early-run for subsistence, culture, and economic sustainability.

Best regards,

Frank Kashevarof Jr.

Best regards,

Frank Kashevarof Jr.



February 26, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

We have dear friends that live in There, and we come to visit them so I can enjoy fishing. I gladly pay the fees to fish. And I enjoy the fish for the year! When I am fishing I see many people enjoying the time fishing, friends and the treasurer of having the treasure of salmon to enjoy year around.

The economy of the Kenai Peninsula relies on its salmon fisheries. However, the economics point to the sport-caught fisheries being the economic powerhouse, NOT the commercial fishery. Regardless, we need to rebuild the king salmon runs to support both economic engines. Are you willing to risk an entire species' survival to pull a few sockeye out of the water? Where is the logic in that?

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Frank Vonada

Lower Lake
95357



March 03, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

I have been an Alaskan resident, sports fisherman, for most of the last 39 years. During those years the Kenai King fishery has been decimated and miss managed so that commercial fishing for reds could occur, while ignoring the harvest of by-catch king salmon. Please do not pass Proposition 283.

Currently ADF&G cannot reduce fishing restrictions until the OEG is achieved. If passed, Proposal 283 would allow projected escapements to be utilized rather than actual fish in the river. It's literally putting the cart before the horse.. Don't punish most of the residents of Alaska to placate a few commercial fisherman,.

The OEG is the OEG set escapement threshold because that is the minimum number of salmon that need to enter the river so that the fishery can rebuild. I am not willing to give up on the Kenai River king salmon. Please vote no on Proposal 283.

As sport and subsistence fishermen like myself and my neighbors, know what needs to be done to protect the Kenai River king salmon. When the escapement numbers are not being achieved, there is zero scientifically valid reason to risk a single king salmon's opportunity to spawn.

The economy of the Kenai Peninsula relies on its salmon fisheries. However, the economics point to the sport-caught fisheries being the economic powerhouse, NOT the commercial fishery. Regardless, we need to rebuild the king salmon runs to support both economic engines. Are you willing to risk an entire species' survival to pull a few sockeye out of the water? Where is the logic in that?

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Fred king
38434 Down Riggers St
Kenai
99611-5936

Email address: alasking@gci.net
Phone number: 9073492997



February 24, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

Most sportfishers know what needs to be done to protect the Kenai River king salmon. When the escapement numbers are not being achieved, there is zero scientifically valid reason to risk a single king salmon's opportunity to spawn.

The Optimal Escapement Goal (OEG) is a higher threshold intended to not only halt salmon decline but also allow the fishery to recover. The Sustainable Escapement Goal (SEG) is the absolute bare minimum number of fish needed for the species to survive and does nothing to improve the fishery. Ultimately, if Proposal 283 is passed, survival of the king salmon fishery in the Kenai River is further threatened.

The economy of the Kenai Peninsula relies on its salmon fisheries. However, the economics point to the sport-caught fisheries being the economic powerhouse, NOT the commercial fishery. Regardless, we need to rebuild the king salmon runs to support both economic engines. Are you willing to risk an entire species' survival to pull a few sockeye out of the water? Where is the logic in that?

Kenai River king salmon have not been meeting spawning objectives for years, and Proposal 283 potentially allows the commercial harvest of kings when we haven't clearly met the lower escapement goals.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Fred Larson

Anchorage
99502



February 24, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

I have been a resident of Alaska since 1979. I have a place on the Kenai River and have been there since the early 1980's. The Kenai Kings were abundant and provided much recreation for residents and tourists. During my time on the Kenai I have seen the King population continually decrease until now there aren't any Kings or I should say very few Kings coming back to the Kenai River. If we want Kenai Kings to recover we need to stop some of the commercial fishing that prevents Kings from entering the Kenai. I commercial fished for several years and fishing for Reds we would catch Kings that were supposed to be returned to the waters where they were caught. Unfortunately during my commercial fishing we were only able to return 1 or 2 Kings to the water as the rest became pinned in the nets and because of the tides they would drown. I realize the people that commercial fisherman that fish as part of their living want to fish for Reds no matter what happens. If we want Kings to return to the Kenai River, something needs to be done, like closing the river to King fishing for an extended period of time so they can recover. I am currently against the proposal 283.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

G. Bruce Talbert

Sterling
99672



January 26, 2022

Garrett Olsen
3107 SW 171 Street
Burien, WA 98166

Alaska Board of Fisheries
P.O. Box 115526
Juneau, Alaska 99811-5526

Subject: Proposal 282 (ACR 7)

Dear Alaska Board of Fisheries,

Proposal 282 calls for reduced fishing time in the Dolgoi Islands and Shumagins if the Chignik early sockeye run is not making escapement.

As a Chignik commercial fisherman for 38 years, I support the proposal.

Area M's south side is principally a sockeye and chum salmon interception-fishery in June and July, and within the eastern reach Chignik-bound sockeye are harvested in the Dolgoi and Shumagin waters (F&G WASSIP study). Chignik's early-run has failed for the last four years by providing no fishery and inadequate escapements. Proposal 282 offers one solution to the problem. Other measures could be appropriate. I see Proposal 282 as a minimum step in the right direction.

When Proposal 282 was presented to the Board as ACR 7, several months back, a few suggested that the proposal could be allocative. Nothing in the proposal is allocative. It was brought to the table for the sake of conservation and sustainability of the Chignik early-sockeye salmon run. Chignik stakeholders have been doing their part, and now is the time for Area M to assist be by reducing their interception of Chignik sockeye salmon when there is an escapement shortfall. Under the Board's Policy for Sustainable Salmon Fisheries, it is justified and ethically appropriate.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Garrett Olsen



February 16, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

Stop allowing bycatch of king salmon. Our run is almost gone!!

Kenai River king salmon have not been meeting spawning objectives for years, and Proposal 283 potentially allows the commercial harvest of kings when we haven't clearly met the lower escapement goals.

Passing Proposal 283 prioritizes a small group of commercial fishing as one third of the set netters would qualify under the proposal. A vote in support of 283 gives a small group fishing preference, further risking the king salmon run in the Kenai River.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Gary Canterbury

Kenai
99611



To: AK BOF
Statewide meetings
March 2022

From: Gary Hollier
Kenai, AK

Subject Fry Data
in Skilak & Kenai Lakes
and then combined

Fall of 2020 - 53,991,990

Fall of 2021 - 13,694,448
of which 50% were
1 year holdovers from
2020

Year	Category	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value
2017	Skill	21,741,420	3.07E+12	1,753,433	0.98990	0.8177	0.1722	1089	3.17E-09	4.20E-03	7.00E-04	21,521,810	3.0127E+1						
	Ken	1,288,687	2.11E+10	145,264	0.9968	0.9935	0.003	924	1.70E-07	9.36E-06	9.18E-06	1,284,504	2.0965E+1						
	Both	23,030,107	3.10E+12	1,759,440								22,806,313	3.0337E+1						
2018	Skill	18,210,862	1.57E+13	3,968,251	0.98426	0.7104	0.2739	1438	1.71E-06	3.20E-03	3.20E-03	17,924,223	1.5256E+1						
	Ken	1,475,864	2.23E+10	149,397	0.9939	0.9800	0.007	1140	2.45E-05	6.77E-05	4.40E-05	1,466,861	2.2101E+1						
	Both	19,686,726	1.58E+13	3,971,063								19,391,084	1.5278E+1						
2019	Skill	7,031,576	6.97E+11	834,989	0.96612	0.6950	0.2709	797	3.65E-06	3.20E-03	3.08E-04	6,793,346	6.5094E+1						
	Ken	2,065,176	3.26E+10	180,434	0.9915	0.9915	0.000	473	4.05E-06	4.05E-06	0.00E+00	2,047,705	3.2025E+1						
	Both	9,096,752	7.30E+11	854,262								8,841,051	6.8297E+1						
2020	Skill	42,073,699	5.89E+13	7,673,023	0.99507	0.9930	0.0021	797	5.15E-08	3.53E-06	3.50E-06	41,866,275	5.8296E+1						
	Ken	11,121,053	1.40E+12	1,182,216	0.99952	0.9970	0.002	473	1.05E-07	4.16E-06	4.04E-06	11,115,715	1.3963E+1						
	Both	53,194,752	6.03E+13	7,763,563								52,981,990	5.9693E+1						
2021	Skill	11,885,750	2.13E+12	1,458,767	0.98311	0.4780	0.5049	524	3.80E-07	9.41E-03	3.52E-03	11,685,000	2.0568E+1						
	Ken	2,011,964	4.54E+10	212,982	0.99875	0.6870	0.312	3185	4.46E-06	2.11E-03	9.73E-02	2,009,449	4.5266E+1						
	Both	13,897,714	2.17E+12	1,474,232								13,694,448	2.1020E+1						

Original Message
From: Frothingham, Alyssa (DFG)
<alyssa.frothingham@alaska.gov>



Sent: Wednesday, February 16, 2022 8:45 AM

To: Marston, Brian H (DFG)
<brian.marston@alaska.gov>

*TO: Alaska BOF
statewide meeting
March 2022*

Subject: RE: Registration

*From: Gary Hollier
Kenai, AK
Subject: Area Registration
and permits / statistical area*

Stat #	24421	24422	24431	
24432	24441	24442	Grand Total	
<i>North K-Beach</i>				
Count of cfec permits	107	116	59	
49	59	38	428	

NKB

-----Original Message-----

From: Marston, Brian H (DFG)
<brian.marston@alaska.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, February 16, 2022 8:23 AM

To: Frothingham Alyssa (DFG)



Table 1. Late-run Kenai sockeye salmon brood table. Note: Hidden enhanced was not subtracted to estimate spawners.

Brood Year	Spawners	Adult Return											Return per Spawner	Return per Spawner	Total Harvest	Harvest Rate		
		0.2	1.1	0.3	1.2	2.1	0.4	1.3	2.2	3.1	1.4	2.3					3.2	2.4
1968	115545				169641	894	0	657176	77265	0	1456	53737	0	0	0	960169	8.3	
1969	72901	0	894	0	37929	7740	0	209347	94190	0	10719	66771	3356	0	0	430947	5.9	
1970	101794	0	1548	0	65999	6143	0	195322	136422	0	0	136620	8869	0	0	550923	5.4	
1971	406714	0	4472	0	57003	10019	0	338382	299554	0	10340	266227	0	0	0	986397	2.4	
1972	431058	0	5738	0	564078	17738	0	1656310	182117	0	1140	120729	0	0	0	2547851	5.9	
1973	507072	0	8966	0	153573	0	0	1825724	87313	0	0	50410	0	0	0	2125986	4.2	
1974	209836	0	0	0	59726	1710	0	488947	94517	0	0	143167	0	0	0	788067	3.8	
1975	184262	0	0	0	162573	0	0	623465	209203	0	0	60132	0	0	0	1055373	5.7	
1976	507440	0	1391	0	457669	6092	0	804033	95053	1142	2930	136815	0	888	0	1506012	3.0	
1977	951038	0	41798	0	212799	3251	0	2421274	67308	0	18530	347053	0	607	3112620	3.3		
1978	511781	0	0	0	136820	0	0	3250866	67217	0	38048	285747	6343	0	0	3785040	7.4	
1979	373810	0	1295	29452	259051	4699	0	565799	149644	0	11216	292947	4810	2125	0	1321039	3.5	
1980	615382	0	3655	18199	218853	2613	690	1597876	271442	0	14942	545024	0	0	0	2673295	4.3	
1981	535524	825	0	7818	301195	2217	0	1244961	295294	0	6783	605230	0	0	0	2464323	4.6	
1982	755672	4413	1392	36636	803813	1950	2978	7661502	297352	0	23314	744869	0	9482	0	2766442	12.7	
1983	792765	1216	0	22901	795150	0	0	4465204	262695	0	49747	3878906	0	10975	0	9486794	12.0	
1984	446297	0	0	2383	547,407	4,517	0	1,662,723	701,759	7,674	19,946	905,800	6,291	609	0	3,859,109	8.6	
1985	573,761	0	4,130	4,862	314,370	20,065	0	1,568,911	297,302	0	4,858	372,746	678	0	0	2,587,921	4.5	
1986	555,207	1,727	4,959	15,702	390,370	3,222	2,037	834,890	140,049	0	11,395	752,587	0	8,200	0	2,165,138	3.9	
1987	2,011,657	0	5,664	48,620	771,535	4,509	0	7,009,121	300,271	0	105,416	2,096,054	1,114	14,322	0	10,356,627	5.1	
1988	1,212,865	1,133	4,331	1,146	0	150,926	7,079	0	1,491,076	292,223	596	21,861	573,931	2,853	4,544	0	2,546,639	2.1
1989	2,026,619	3,919	0	16,807	352,278	77,839	0	2,469,188	555,383	1,407	17,207	948,211	0	16,440	0	4,458,679	2.2	
1990	794,616	1,133	3,459	5,931	222,285	13,834	0	771,248	189,043	0	10,973	283,961	2,423	3,405	0	1,507,693	1.9	
1991	727,146	1,592	4,331	10,275	662,798	22,619	0	2,764,304	251,886	1,839	17,583	689,932	2,928	2,958	3,030	4,436,074	6.1	
1992	1,207,382	0	2,610	8,468	345,350	10,423	0	3,442,905	140,639	0	19,992	293,917	2,775	4,497	0	4,271,576	3.5	
1993	997,693	0	0	14,950	288,883	7,055	0	816,311	196,799	1,642	12,461	330,508	14,864	6,306	0	1,689,779	1.7	
1994	1,309,669	0	1,762	0	484,075	77,318	0	1,727,282	439,229	1,822	17,644	291,648	9,532	0	2,322	3,052,634	2.3	
1995	776,847	0	3,402	8,637	429,006	16,262	0	1,039,246	154,844	0	15,060	230,897	0	2,266	610	1,899,870	2.4	
1996	963,108	0	0	13,177	254,663	26,314	0	1,532,580	157,933	0	25,384	246,751	2,554	2,402	0	2,261,757	2.3	
1997	1,365,676	0	1,765	0	230,281	16,857	0	2,141,616	327,806	1,220	16,829	873,668	0	10,985	6,095	3,626,402	2.7	
1998	929,090	0	3,740	3,017	701,989	12,436	0	2,710,969	314,136	1,356	30,290	677,566	6,351	3,477	0	4,465,328	4.8	
1999	949,276	1,833	0	11,713	499,236	4,232	0	3,957,730	426,477	0	18,160	807,582	14,996	10,825	2,279	5,755,063	6.1	
2000	696,899	4,396	634	19,641	562,552	7,454	0	4,988,074	123,670	0	67,227	1,253,952	2,279	23,772	4,682	7,058,333	10.1	
2001	738,229	0	0	12,693	133,740	4,837	0	1,102,407	103,974	0	52,226	279,858	4,682	3,540	0	1,697,957	2.3	
2002	1,126,616	1,906	38	13,104	281,726	10,825	0	2,837,840	156,677	0	95,584	227,610	0	3,403	0	3,628,712	3.2	
2003	1,402,292	0	0	4,682	213,585	23,772	0	1,267,159	150,560	0	20,902	235,750	3,403	0	0	1,919,813	1.4	
2004	1,690,547	0	0	7,289	315,905	14,785	0	1,764,966	239,153	0	8,272	858,115	4,316	8,142	15,658	3,236,600	1.9	
2005	1,654,003	0	0	3,403	148,984	3,403	0	1,598,266	168,314	0	23,800	2,857,849	0	0	0	4,804,018	2.9	
2006	1,892,090	0	7,048	4,316	841,212	101,060	0	2,438,848	340,712	0	79,654	1,172,388	0	21,043	0	5,006,280	2.6	
2007	964,243	4,316	8,272	0	498,542	71,399	0	2,151,603	739,778	0	21,043	876,917	0	0	6,808	4,378,678	4.5	
2008	708,805	0	8,142	0	591,917	11,447	0	1,987,848	261,588	0	0	519,456	0	0	0	3,380,397	4.8	
2009	848,117	0	22,894	0	438,640	14,150	0	2,160,200	246,112	0	14,894	903,197	0	9,368	0	3,809,455	4.5	
2010	1,038,302	0	6,983	13,616	416,994	27,232	0	1,671,965	314,687	0	21,515	1,121,581	0	28,965	1,939	3,625,388	3.5	
2011	1,280,733	0	13,616	0	895,559	18,713	0	2,119,496	185,225	0	45,340	1,221,727	3,113	8,197	1,047	4,512,033	3.5	
2012	1,212,921	0	0	2,230	240,206	10,283	0	1,057,626	75,078	0	24,788	57,899	0	0	0	1,468,110	1.2	
2013	980,208	0	1,938	992	147,848	8,094	0	586,542	184,646	0	6,686	171,698	0	0	0	1,108,445	1.1	
2014	1,218,342	1,530	3,468	0	662,868	37,164	0	2,956,384	104,727	0	8,254	34,198	0	1,077	0	3,809,669	3.1	
2015	1,400,047	881	2,179	0	292,337	9,627	0	1,231,517	97,176	0	18,845	614,731	0	4,728	959	2,272,980	1.6	
2016	1,119,988	0	983	2,337	1,019,327	0	0	2,649,780	180,518	0						3,711,842	2.591,855	
2017	1,071,064	271	939	6,072	490,759	19,313										2,595,720	1,524,656	
2018	886,761	2,716	8,530													1,566,210	679,450	
2019	1,457,031															3,542,442	2,085,411	
2020	1,505,940															2,394,018	888,078	
2021	2,241,825															3,992,341	1,750,516	
Mean (1975-2013)	982271	710	3999	9270	403097	17253	146	2213024	253592	479	25962	744371	2469	5670	1156	3681198	4.2	

Genetic estimates of stock-specific harvests.

Preliminary age composition catch allocation model estimates of stock-specific harvests.

Average of 1968 to 2015



Table 1. Kaslof sockeye salmon brood table.

Brood Year	Spawners	Adult Return													Return per Spawner	Run	Total Harvest	Harvest Rate		
		0.2	1.1	0.3	1.2	2.1	0.4	1.3	2.2	3.1	1.4	2.3	3.2	2.4					3.3	
1968	90,958				86418	115		42653	14079			2588				145853	1.6			
1969	46964	0	231		12833	204		85255	6389			5484		522		110919	2.4			
1970	38797	0	0		38507	299		8744	69392			51297		0		168239	4.3			
1971	91887	0	0		36811	268		107438	101308			49258		0		295083	3.2			
1972	115486	49	494		115995	0		103393	114377			38332		0		372639	3.2			
1973	40880	0	473		119001	2433		176558	38748			4521		0		341734	8.4			
1974	71540	0	2753		206299	0		80966	34636		1350	16890		0		342896	4.8			
1975	48884	0	0		180735	0		114556	20631		0	8677		0		321500	6.6	121242	72358	
1976	142058	440	1801		246019	0		368132	33934		0	41369		0		691693	4.9	377033	234975	
1977	158410	0	4087		149225	0		358492	51558		0	46809		0		610171	3.9	391215	232805	
1978	119165	0	0		172123	465		364997	104687		0	53408		0		695679	5.8	459937	340772	
1979	155527	0	2465		407690	0		204991	112060		0	2937	52479	1199		783821	5.0	303099	147572	
1980	188314	0	0		264207	577		485118	258171		0	3504	71144	0		1082721	5.7	400433	212119	
1981	262271	0	0		854061	1742		679270	220031		0	95613	236	2489		1853442	7.1	559968	297697	
1982	184204	0	2187		529984	267		345805	266602		1718	141028	0	0		1287592	7.0	626472	442268	
1983	215730	748	0		348596	484		353642	239227		244	65366	0	0		1008308	4.7	924183	708453	
1984	238413	0	709		255882	382		163788	252891		1476	90632	934	0		766694	3.2	635243	396830	
1985	512827	0	143		62021	129		133572	123311		769	49795	0	0		369740	0.7	1656695	1143868	
1986	283054	0	0	596	101750	0		232645	189244		0	150016	0	0		674252	2.4	1506147	1223093	
1987	256707	0	656	775	133031	162		330225	248546		0	174387	0	0		887782	3.5	1058045	801338	
1988	204336	214	0		159892	738		197694	173302		0	133336	0	0		665176	3.3	994511	790175	
1989	164952	0	0		63863	590		189085	145680		0	113166	0	0		512385	3.1	544439	379487	
1990	147663	0	567		147703	0		110369	174950		0	68223	0	0		501812	3.4	452927	305264	
1991	233646	0	0		222798	0		414977	205588		0	102874	0	0		946237	4.0	606635	372989	
1992	188819	0	386		185940	0		453802	122402		1496	51892	0	0		815919	4.3	889417	700598	
1993	151801	0	0		145659	0		155518	125775		1801	92168	441	0		521361	3.4	610403	458602	
1994	218826	0	0		195201	1883		297531	196873		0	74041	0	0		765529	3.5	615804	396978	
1995	202,428	682	388		237,182	373		190,926	56,162		1,141	42,235	1,019	491		530,599	2.6	621,669	419,241	
1996	264,511	0	0		208,276	1,202		377,605	109,373		1,958	53,153	0	0		751,566	2.8	874,728	610,217	
1997	263,780	0	403		217,593	707		279,338	118,996		0	65,542	0	0		682,580	2.6	824,737	560,957	
1998	259,045	0	1,386		206,816	4,941		264,189	248,417		1,194	65,365	0	0		792,308	3.1	532,835	273,790	
1999	312,481	0	1,542		279,767	1,343		224,666	511,584		0	139,448	538	0		1,158,888	3.7	826,369	513,888	
2000	263,631	0	2,972		614,279	1,272		468,763	191,547		0	109,599	0	0		1,388,432	5.3	531,010	267,379	
2001	318,735	966	1,287		420,057	1,918		573,939	515,285		0	114,216	0	0		1,627,669	5.1	751,059	432,324	
2002	235,732	0	4,747		663,235	7,708		292,890	222,994		0	58,449	0	0		1,250,022	5.3	667,235	431,503	
2003	353,526	0	10,152		517,851	1,852		603,710	282,320		1,989	142,431	0	0		1,560,304	4.4	862,230	508,704	
2004	523,653	0	7,406		622,458	2,836		501,436	298,674		0	58,286	0	0		1,491,097	2.8	1,420,613	896,960	
2005	360,065	0	5,672		128,287	24,088		255,738	255,738		0	209,155	0	0		878,678	2.4	1,227,018	866,953	
2006	389,645	0	8,066		226,513	12,034		249,075	207,535		0	41,424	0	0		744,647	1.9	1,879,917	1,490,272	
2007	365,184	1,719	8,596		110,448	21,782		66,847	237,982		0	37,013	0	0		484,387	1.3	1,157,209	792,025	
2008	327,018	0	11,741		215,278	28,080		268,221	318,776		0	31,544	0	0		873,640	2.7	1,575,445	1,248,427	
2009	326,283	0	42,815		346,060	11,636		324,152	227,315		0	83,653	0	0		1,035,630	3.2	1,104,972	778,689	
2010	295,265	1,906	19,460		467,313	29,448		409,452	415,209		720	32,518	639	929		1,377,594	4.7	818,623	523,358	
2011	245,721	4,191	18,970		246,611	12,219		97,688	188,641		954	117,098	0	0		686,373	2.8	809,736	564,015	
2012	374,523	2,232	5,522		143,497	9,406		152,743	191,458		0	4,671	0	0		509,530	1.4	632,426	257,903	
2013	489,654	0	7,664		284,613	32,073		74,533	247,799		0	3,170	0	0		649,852	1.3	1,003,071	513,417	
2014	440,192	0	22,034		376,236	9,182		195,978	81,837		2,913	12,071	0	0		700,251	1.6	1,102,934	662,742	
2015	470,677	0	4,743		317,073	5,803		434,680	34,300		0	24,048	0	120		820,766	1.7	1,174,899	704,222	
2016	239,981	0	9,391	825	359,785	0		234,081	52,526	0								480,774	240,793	
2017	358,724	96	331	509	594,828	10,763												801,902	443,178	
2018	388,009	0	8,718															717,164	329,155	
2019	373,416																	613,252	239,836	
2020	541,651																	845,000	303,349	
2021	516,859																	925,474	408,615	
Mean (1975-2010)	253,794	185	3,879	38	286,328	4,407	0	313,946	207,871	0	582	82,235	106	134	0	899,718	3.9	816,931	563,137	0.66

Genetic estimates of stock-specific harvests.
Preliminary age composition catch allocation model estimates of stock-specific harvests.
Average of 1968 to 2014



Table 1. Susitna sockeye salmon brood table.

Brood Year	Spawners	Adult Return											Return	Return per Spawner	Run	Total Harvest	Harvest Rate				
		0.2	1.1	0.3	1.2	2.1	0.4	1.3	2.2	3.1	1.4	2.3						3.2	2.4	3.3	
1999														0	0						
2000										589	28,113	0	0	0	0	28,703					
2001						0	157,173	26,403	0	268	49,897	1,147	230	0	0	235,117					
2002			12,182	231,804	0	0	367,152	33,646	0	2,021	61,425	896	0	0	0	709,126					
2003		7,774	1,733	15,076	101,249	2,336	896	260,130	29,321	0	1,538	27,171	0	0	244	447,468					
2004		8,112	1,414	24,588	57,372	3,617	0	140,590	40,724	0	0	71,592	212	0	0	348,222					
2005		2,951	5,409	5,867	91,176	4,328	0	71,973	15,750	244	965	32,992	0	0	0	231,655					
2006	415,791	5,867	3,097	10,482	98,345	3,413	0	299,940	22,049	0	5,247	37,337	0	0	0	485,777	1.2	465,772	49,981	0.11	
2007	322,718	30,716	3,169	90,136	65,062	21,191	0	130,741	39,321	698	819	29,663	0	0	0	411,517	1.3	580,297	257,579	0.44	
2008	299,736	1,745	4,456	7,028	79,149	11,240	0	219,616	17,708	0	2,184	30,239	0	0	413	373,777	1.2	448,856	149,120	0.33	
2009	207,409	4,910	5,247	9,950	95,723	15,322	0	102,628	39,237	0	413	53,351	413	0	0	327,192	1.6	320,359	112,950	0.35	
2010	184,472	9,691	18,823	4,341	120,288	0	0	331,872	17,837	0	985	41,585	232	0	0	545,655	3.0	306,140	121,668	0.40	
2011	307,681	5,078	980	27,133	142,781	7,531	0	211,428	25,261	319	1,087	51,512	0	273	0	473,384	1.5	538,537	230,856	0.43	
2012	135,948	2,063	1,433	23,119	93,567	11,517	0	192,001	32,594	0	0	1,766	0	0	0	358,060	2.6	320,917	184,969	0.58	
2013	219,130	15,396	6,224	2,686	117,455	0	0	97,288	31,749	221	0	7,351	0	0	0	278,370	1.3	417,316	198,186	0.47	
2014	161,770	538	552	0	140,357	444	0	139,056	1,409	0	360	13,928	0	0	0	296,644	1.8	304,974	143,204	0.47	
2015	367,871	0	648	172	111,980	0	0	134,931	26,439	0	356	68,062	0	0	0	342,587	0.9	585,240	217,369	0.37	
2016	293,401	0	1,005	0	71,773	347	0	153,306	18,232	0						429,634		136,232		0.32	
2017	200,850	0	1,969	0	169,236	0										398,425		197,575		0.50	
2018	161,027	0	1,946													272,746		111,719		0.41	
2019	172,949															260,972					
2020	200,705															249,747					
2021	334,034															411,138					
Mean (2006-2010)	286,025	10,586	6,958	24,388	91,714	10,233	0	216,960	27,230	140	1,929	38,435	129	39	59	428,784	1.6	424,285	138,260	0.33	

Genetic estimates of stock-specific UCI CF harvests.
Preliminary age composition catch allocation model estimates of stock-specific UCI CF harvests.
Complete brood year returns.
Average 2006 to 2014



March 02, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

My home is on the lower Kenai River near river mile 12. I am a retired ADF&G biologist who spent 20 years working to preserve and protect anadromous fish habitat and populations throughout South Central Alaska including Kenai Peninsula. My last five years of service were at the Kenai River Center. I urge the Board of Fisheries to vote No on Proposal 283. This valuable King Salmon resource cannot be managed in such a way that any of the five salmon species or other resident fish population is put at risk of decline or extinction by any user group allocated access to these resources.

Currently ADF&G cannot reduce fishing restrictions until the OEG is achieved. If passed, Proposal 283 would allow projected escapements to be utilized rather than actual fish in the river. It's literally putting the cart before the horse; commercial fishing will be permitted before sufficient king salmon have actually made it into the river, based on the OEG.

Kenai River king salmon have not been meeting spawning objectives for years, and Proposal 283 potentially allows the commercial harvest of kings when we haven't clearly met the lower escapement goals.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Gary Liepitz

Kenai
99611



February 16, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

Do not reduce the escapement goals for Kenai River King salmon. Goals have already been reduced to a level which is endangering the sustainability of this fishery. No

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Gary Tanghe

Sterling
99672



March 08, 2022

Dear Board of Fish,

Currently ADF&G cannot reduce fishing restrictions until the OEG is achieved. If passed, Proposal 283 would allow projected escapements to be utilized rather than actual fish in the river. It's literally putting the cart before the horse; commercial fishing will be permitted before sufficient king salmon have actually made it into the river, based on the OEG.

Most sportfishers know what needs to be done to protect the Kenai River king salmon. When the escapement numbers are not being achieved, there is zero scientifically valid reason to risk a single king salmon's opportunity to spawn.

The standard should remain that meeting the conservation needs of the weakest stocks is more important than avoiding the upper limit of another species. Passing 283 would indicate that the Board has abandoned weak-stock management principles.

Kenai River king salmon have not been meeting spawning objectives for years, and Proposal 283 potentially allows the commercial harvest of kings when we haven't clearly met the lower escapement goals.

I thank the Board for the historic actions taken in 2020 to protect the Late Run Kenai River king salmon. Modifications like 283 threaten those protections and is the first step in a slippery slope to lighten the burden of conservation for some users, while maintaining restrictions on others. It disregards the principles of weak stock management and overemphasizes tenuous "over escapement" issues. Finally, this proposal promotes the financial interests of a few entities over the clear need to conserve a species. I oppose Proposal 283 and ask the Board of Fisheries to vote No on this proposal. Stay the course and protect the kings.

Geoff Lundfelt

Anchorage
99507