

For the Record, I'm Richard Yamada, representing the Juneau Douglas Advisory Committee. These comments were drafted by our chair, Kevin Maier, who is unable to attend.

Thank you Madam Chair and members of the Board for the opportunity to testify. I also want to thank board support staff for all the work that goes on behind the scenes, and to all of you for your engagement with this important work.

In what follows, I will report on our deliberations, distilling three separate 2-hour meetings in a way that will clarify our intent and amplify our submitted minutes. Our AC uses designated seats, and we represent a diversity of user groups (including personal use, sport, charter, and commercial). We had great attendance and substantial discussions at our fall meetings.

I'll describe some of the proposals we discussed, organizing our comments so they track with the agenda's groupings of proposals.

Let's start with group four and KING SALMON.

Our first two hour meeting was entirely focused on these proposals. The theme in our comments will be "caution"—that is, we urge the board to adopt proposals that help conserve king salmon stocks.

You'll see this theme reflected in the proposals we drafted and submitted as an AC, notably numbers 107, 116, 122, and 125. These represent some our ideas for how to protect king salmon stocks and angling opportunities for our constituents.

107 addresses concerns with king salmon caught offshore. 116 signals our preference to prioritize resident angling opportunity and to better account for the impact of the emergent bare-boat, non-guided angler take of the resource. 122 prohibits removing king salmon from the water when they must be released. Finally, proposal 125 would extend closures to protect stocks of concern. Notably, the Cross Sound area of 14a identified in proposal 125 is an important migration corridor and sees a lot of pressure from charter fishing. These all seem like common sense proposals and we are hoping for your support.

Additionally, we encourage you to oppose proposals 104, 105, 108, 113, and 124, all of which modify allocation of king salmon in ways we don't find helpful. Although some members abstained from voting due to lack of clarity, we voted to oppose these proposals by substantial margins.

After robust discussion, we narrowly voted to support 109, 110, 120, and 132, and to oppose 121. The high number of abstaining votes here suggest the complexity of establishing equitable and conservative allocation and management of king salmon in Southeast Alaska. We wish you luck tackling this tricky issue!



To help with this difficult work, we'd offer these three general principles that emerged in our deliberations and votes: 1) give the department tools to protect our imperiled king salmon stocks, 2) we hope you prioritize resident king fishing opportunity, and 3) we believe we should protect charter opportunity, but ensure that equitable allocation of king salmon doesn't impact troll and sport harvest.

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

For **group 5** proposals, you'll hear our general conservation message again.

I'll start with sport salmon and trout:

We had long discussions about sport methods and means, especially **proposal 138** that would prohibit snagging in the Mendenhall Refuge. We ultimately voted to support this proposal, but with an amendment that would exclude the waters of Fish Creek and Fish Creek Pond, popular places in the terminal harvest area to snag. We similarly voted to support proposal 139 to prohibit snagging in Statter Harbor.

We unanimously oppose proposals 140 and 141 that would drastically modify tackle regulations across the region.

We hope you will take up and support our proposal to protect our road-system steelhead run on Petersen Creek, voting in favor of proposal 149, that prohibits bait and mandates single-barbless hooks in this popular Juneau fishery.

As for bag limits and closures, we oppose the proposals to increase bag limits for trout in Southeast Alaska in 143/144. We are concerned that the department lacks adequate baseline data on trout stocks given declining funding for trout research.

We do not think the proposed closure of a section of the Situk outlined in 154 is the best solution to protect Steelhead, as this will shift pressure to boat-anglers and substantially limit access to unguided walking anglers.

Finally, I'll conclude with hatcheries: we do not support the controversial proposal 156 (to reduce egg take by 25%), though we did have an interesting discussion about Alaska's hatchery permitting process. We do, however, support proposal 164 to prioritize resident harvest of hatchery king salmon in terminal harvest areas.

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