AC Comments for AK Peninsula/Aleutian Islands
February 2-6, 2010

King Cove AC1
Nushagak AC2
Unalaska-Dutch Harbor AC3
Chignik AC4
Lower Bristol Bay AC5

RECEIVED
JAN 15 2010
BOARDS

King Cove Fish and Game Advisory Committee

Monday, December 28, 2009 @ 9:00AM
King Cove Harbor House

Meeting Minutes

1.Call to Order

Chairman Grant Newton called meeting to order at 9:00AM

2.Roll Call

Members Present: Grant Newton
Kenneth Mack
Edwin Bendixen
Alvin Newman
Bill Sager
Warren Wilson
Gary Mack

Members Absent: Corey Wilson
Joe Hogan

Harbor Master and other members of the community were present.

3.Approval of minutes from April 7, 2009 meeting

Minutes were read and approved

4.New Business

A.Election-Floor was opened for nominations to fill 3 expiring seats on the committee. Nominations were Kenneth Mack, Edwin Bendixen, and Bill Sager. All nominations were unanimously confirmed.

B.Review proposals for the 2010 fish board meetings.
1.Groundfish

101-support-Clarifies description of South Alaska Peninsula Area and adjacent Bering Sea/Aleutian Isl. Area.-Housekeeping

102-support-Repeal groundfish regs that allow harvest in S AK Pen, Bering Sea/Aleutian Isl, and Chukchi/Beaufort Areas at any time-This will reflect what is being done in practice.

103,104-support-58' vessel limit to harvest cod in state waters during Fed/State 610 parallel season-Bering Sea crab rationalization and the lack of LLP requirement allows larger than 58' vessels to fish in state waters before moving on to other fisheries.

105-support-Prohibit longline gear in state waters of S Pen during Fed/State 610 season-S Pen Fed/State 610 season has seen higher catches by big catcher/processors over the past

A/C COMMENT # 1

years that are capable of moving on to the Bering Sea p cod fishery. These larger catches have reduced catches of pot and trawl vessels from the local communities during the 610 season. This proposal and others limiting size of vessels and types of gear are meant to not only help local fishermen but also to keep the communities' tax revenues from going out of area.

106-support-Implement a 60 pot 5 jig machine limit in state waters for the Fed 610 cod season-The AC Committee prefers 58' limits and longline restrictions in state waters but supports this proposal as another way to make the area less attractive to larger non local vessels. On the other hand it was pointed out that these regs if adopted only in Western Gulf could cause an influx of 58' vessels from other state fisheries.

107-no action-this proposal was unclear to the committee.

108,109-support-50% of Fed WGOA TAC be the GHL for the Area M p cod season-The support for these proposals was strong by pot only vessels and mixed by trawl/pot vessels. Again without limited entry in the state water fishery that follows the Fed 610 season this could cause it to be one of the most $$$$ fisheries in the state for 58' vessels.

110-support-Implement a 7-day stand down to fish the Area M state cod fishery after leaving any Fed cod fishery-Looking for parity in all 58' vessels' opportunity to compete for limited cod resources.

111-support-Close Unalaska Bay to Pollock trawling during Bering Sea B season.

112,113-No Action

114-oppose-Allow larger than 60' vessels to fish in state waters cod fishery.

2.Salmon/Finfish

115-support-Salmon processors and buyers require participation in chum pool for South Unimak/Shumagin Isl June Salmon Fishery-Chum pools help to reduce chum catches by removing the individual gain for high catches of chums.

116-oppose-Reinstating 8.3% allocation of pre-season BB sockeye forecast.

117-support-Allow 120 mesh gear for drift and setnet during June fishery.

118,119,120,121,124-support-Some increase in harvest opportunity for all gear types in Post-June South Peninsula Fishery-Considering weather, tide timing, and darkness the 6/24hr and 3/36hr openings for the entire month of July do not provide adequate harvest opportunity of salmon that have been a part of the fishery in the past. Seiners are limited to daylight fishing and gillnetters (set &drift) are not as efficient at night but mostly need time as they are typically not big hit harvesters. The short openers restrict movement for all gear and add expenses (fuel & overhead) to get to and return from fishing areas. These

A/C COMMENT # 1

do or die openers often create safety issues when weather is a factor. The committee prefers a change that gives all gear types some increased opportunity. If proposal 119 was to include drift gillnet it might be a starting place.

122,123-oppose-Allow set gillnet more time in July-The committee prefers a change that gives all gear types some increased opportunity.

125-support-Allow the opportunity for all terminal areas to be opened by emergency order after July 6 if the department has escapements-No need to restrict the possibility of emergency openings in terminal areas by calendar.

126-support-Allow emergency opening post June for all South Peninsula Districts except Unimak-This allows for emergency openings within districts that the department deems to warrant more harvest opportunity.

127-support-repeal immature salmon test fishery or raise the threshold-Shumagins are not the only place in state where immatures may occur yet the only place in state where a test fishery exists.

128-oppose-Determine immature threshold differently and allow make up fishing time for closures due to immature presence-Not a problem figuring threshold differently, but fishing is allowed in other areas when tested areas are closed.

129-support-Allow fishing in October

130-support-Allow 150 mesh gillnets in Post June Fishery

131 to 141-no action

142,143-support-Open Dorenoi Bay before July 25-Surrounding areas can be opened.

144-support-Allow opening in Stepovak Bay after July 28

145,146-oppose-Change openings in Cinder River/Port Heiden/Ilnik Sections.

147,148,149,150,151,152-Oppose-In the Nothern District restrict openings/institute windows/manage on BB escapements/close outer Port Heiden-The Outer Port Heiden and Ilnik Sections are managed on escapements in those areas. There are provisions already in place for fishing restrictions if Ugashik escapements are low. Some percentage of Northern District sockeye are harvested in the BB salmon fishery. All Northern District sockeye systems have been meeting their escapement goals and the BB runs and harvest have been strong.

153-oppose-Allow seine gear in Ilnik-The department already has the ability to handle over escapement.

A/C COMMENT # 1

154-oppose-Reduce gillnet gear to 45 mesh in Northern District-These local systems mentioned have been meeting their escapement goals. This is not a conservation issue. The cost to the fishermen of the Northern District would be expensive with no quantified effect regarding escapements.

155,156-oppose-Allow set gillnet in Outer Port Heiden Section-Set gillnet would cause gear conflict

157-support-Pivot Outer Port Heiden north fishing line so it is perpendicular to beach-This enables a more orderly line fishery to occur.

158-Oppose-Allow seine to harvest allotted herring gillnet quota.

159-No Action-Allow seine in Adak Herring Fishery.

160,161,162-oppose-Allow set gillnet longer fishing gear.

163-No Action-Fresh water King limits.

3.Statewide Finfish

164-Oppose-With the abundance of salmon in the Area M region reducing subsistence to 40 vs the now 250 is unreasonable and inadequate to meet subsistence needs.

C. Committee and Public Discussion-Alvin Newman had attended the latest NPMC meeting regarding gear splits for Fed P-cod. The up coming tanner crab season in Area M was discussed with questions about legal cod trawl gear being aboard during tanner fishing. Unanimous decision for Grant Newton to attend Feb Alaska Board of Fish Meetings.

5.Adjournment 11:30AM

A/C COMMENT # 1

RECEIVED
JAN 13 2010
BOARDS

January 12, 2010

Alaska Board of Fish Members,

It has come to our attention that the board has reduced the time for public testimony during the Alaska Peninsula/Aleutian Islands meeting, February 2, from five minutes to three minutes. We understand that when many people attend the meeting and wish to testify it may be necessary to make changes. We are not a large group and three minutes is not sufficient time to give a presentation or develop a point.

The privilege to testify is an important part of our board process. The state, cities, boroughs, and various user groups spend ever-increasing funds and time to allow our public to attend these board meetings and testify.

We respectfully request that those testifying at the Alaska Peninsula/Aleutian Islands meeting be allowed 5 minutes.

Respectfully,

King Cove AC Committee

Thomas L Newton - Chair

City of King Cove

Henry Mack - Mayor

A/C COMMENT # 1

NUSHAGAK ADVISORY COMMITTEE
9 a.m. January 6, 2010
Dillingham City Council Chambers
DILLINGHAM, ALASKA

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES
Recording Secretary: Hans Nicholson

1. CALL TO ORDER
Chairman Hans Nicholson called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m.

2. ROLL CALL/ESTABLISH QUORUM
Members present at roll call were: Curt Armstrong, Dan Dunaway, Victor Sifsof, Hans Nicholson, Amelia Christensen, Frank Woods, Robin Samuelson, Wassillie Andrew-New Stuyahok, Joseph Clark-Clarks Point, Wasillie Tugatuk-Manokotak, Skin Wysocki-Koliganek, John Bavilla-Togiak. Chris Carr-Portage Creek by teleconference. Quorum established.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
After amendments, Amelia moved to adopt, Victor Sifsof seconds. Unanimous approval.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
After reviewing, Robin moves to approve the March 27 and October 30, 2009 meeting minutes, Dan seconds. Unanimous approval.

5. INTRODUCE STAFF AND GUESTS
The ADF&G staff present for all or part of the meeting included: Andrew DeValpine, Boards Support; Tim Sands, Area Biologists Commercial Fish; Jim Woolington, Area Biologist Wildlife Conservation; Justin Rogers, ADF&G Enforcement; Andy Aderman, TNWR; Members of the public, Jim Loiland-USDA, Robert Heyano, Joe Chythlook, John Bennett, Ofi Olson.

6 ELECTIONS and SEAT VILLAGE REPRESENTATIVES
Nominations were accepted to fill the expired seats of Curt Armstrong, Hans Nicholson, and Victor Sifsof. Victor advises the AC that he wishes to step down and that someone else can fill his seat. Nominations for Curt and Hans were accepted and voted unanimously for reelection. It was decided by the AC that the other at-large seat should be filled at the next regularly scheduled meeting. Officer elections will also take place then. Those village AC members in attendance were approved to participate at this

meeting with the understanding that their communities will send in appointment letters for the next meeting. Seating of village AC members for this meeting and election results were unanimously accepted.

6B NEW BUSINESS

1) Staff Reports

ADF&G Commercial Fisheries-Tim Sands. In his report, Tim mentions that the 2010 season outlook will be available sometime in March. Currently, there is interest from processors to take pinks and silvers in the fall this year, he suggests that we could add this topic to the Chinook preseason meeting sometime in early March. Much of the preseason discussion was addressed at the last NAC meeting and was decided not to go over it again.

Hans appoints Robin Samuelson to chair the Nushagak AC subcommittee preseason Chinook/pink/coho meeting. The public meeting will be well publicized and most likely will be at the ADF&G conference room once the final date is finalized.

Andy Aderman-USFWS. Andy reports that the Nushagak Peninsula Caribou Herd Planning Committee will be meeting sometime in January to decide if there will be a hunt this year. The Refuge is still estimating about 670 Caribou on the peninsula. Wolf collaring efforts continue to provide information to where the packs are as well as where they range. Moose numbers are considered healthy in 17A and considerations to liberalize the hunt in the future are a possibility if those populations maintain their rate of growth.

Hans recognizes AC member Victor Sifsof, who is now stepping down, for his many years on the NAC. Victor joined the AC sometime in the 1980's. He's seen a lot of change in-region over time during his tenure. Hans wishes Vic the best in the future and thanks him for his diligent service while he was on the committee. Everyone respects Vic for his wisdom and long service on the AC. Everyone stands and gives him a round of applause.

Justin Rogers-ADF&G Enforcement. Justin reports that overall, citations on average were down both during the commercial fishing and hunting seasons. His department has experienced personnel shortages and they can only do so much. During the fall hunt, river patrols this year indicate that hunter numbers have declined. They didn't issue any meat salvage citations. During the winter hunt, most of the hunters focused their hunt activity southwest of Dillingham. There was snow the first two weeks, but melted. Hunter effort was down the last two weeks as the snow melted during the warm spell. The Wood River did not freeze, so all the hunt effort was west of the river.

Justin indicated that the Bristol Bay enforcement outlook for the coming season doesn't look like any major changes. They are still short on personnel and try to do the best they can with limited resources.

A/C COMMENT # 2

Jim Woolington-ADF&G Wildlife. Jim had given out all the fall harvest numbers and information during the October meeting. He reports that winter hunter registration rose significantly from previous years with 313 registered hunters and is still waiting for hunters to send in their permit harvest reports. There are still a few fall permit reports that he is waiting on before he can summarize harvest numbers.

This years Caribou calf/cow ratio's jumped. This year they are at 31/100 cows and are at their highest level since the 1990's. This is encouraging and feels that the herd is turning around and will hopefully begin to grow again. Overall, health has improved and is a reflection of an improvement of habitat over time. The herd peaked in 1996 at over 200,000 caribou. Jim feels that the large herd concentrated in 17b,c were contributing factors in habitat degradation.

Some committee members are still concerned about wolf and bear populations and their effect on the large game animals that local communities depend on. Jim indicated that with the radio collaring efforts on wolves, they are learning a lot more. Harvest is dependent on traveling conditions and most harvest occurs by snow machine.

Brown bears along the Nushagak River have increased as well as in all of Unit 17, there is a heavy presence everywhere. When asked, he responds that it is virtually impossible to count bears because of their behavior as they are not very visible and would be cost prohibitive. He acknowledges that it's important to control predators. Reducing bear populations would be difficult because most bears are taken by non-resident hunters and most people are not interested in harvesting one.

Break at 11:15 am
Back to order at 11:29 am

2) BOG Proposals

Proposals 28, 29,30. Robin moves to adopt Dan seconds.

- Proposal would eliminate non-resident hunting in predator control areas.
- Committee felt that displaced hunter effort would move to Unit 17 competing with local hunters and could ultimately and could negatively affect our big game resources.
- Hunt season and bag limits could be negatively effected.
- Effect would be like squeezing a balloon. Hunter effort will pop up somewhere else.

*** Committee votes unanimously to oppose.**

Proposal 32 Robin moves to adopt Dan seconds.

- Hot issue for a long time.
- Committee feels that the population objective should be a range from between 10,000 – 15,000.

*** Committee votes unanimously to support.**

A/C COMMENT # 2

Proposal 33 Robin moves to adopt Dan seconds.

- Committee favors a higher objective than the department's recommendation.
- Questions the science on how the population objective ranges are chosen.
- Committee feels that if the objective is too low, it could preclude any predator control efforts.
- Committee favors the 10-15000 range over the department's recommendation.
- Too high a number raises range carrying capacity issues. Too low raises sustainability issues and harvest opportunity for hunters.
- 6000 is too low. Current habitat may justify that number right now but if habitat continues to improve and the herd grows, the lower end of the range should be higher.
- Current data indicates poor to improving range, calf/cow and bull/cow ratios low but likely to improve. Overall health of caribou improving. These indicators show that the herd is likely to grow and the lower end of the range should be higher.
- Right now caribou populations do not justify Tier II.
- Committee is concerned that the recommended range would affect intensive management plan. Committee members are concerned that if the range is too low, we will never get to predator management.

*** Robin moves to amend and change the range to 10,000 – 15,000. Frank seconds.**

*** Committee votes unanimous in support of the amendment.**
*** Committee votes 10 to support and 1 opposed to proposal 33 as amended.**

Proposal 35 Robin moves to adopt, Amelia seconds.

- Sealing is done by department biologists.
- Concern on quality control. Everyone recognizes the need for consistent, mythological, and systematic quality control for record keeping.

***Committee votes unanimous to oppose.**

Proposal 36 Robin moves to adopt, Dan seconds.

- Committee feels that this proposal is the same as 35, but with different species.
- A CITES Tag is required
- Committee references discussion in #35.

*** Committee votes unanimous to oppose.**

Proposal 38 Robin moves to adopt Dan seconds.

- CITES Apendix II Species.
- The department is not in favor of sale because of past abuse.

Committee votes unanimously to oppose.

Proposal 39 Robin moves to adopt, Dan seconds.

- Tanned bear hides are considered trophies and are illegal to sell.
- Unit 17 has high bear populations, committee recognizes the need to increase harvest.
- Plenty of safeguards in regulation in place already.
- Current regulations allow sale of handicrafts – same as Federal Regs.
- Committee recommends consideration and approval of proposal based on abundance of brown and black bears by GMU's. Some GMU's could be impacted because of low bear populations as in Unit 17 where we don't have many black bears.
- Effect of proposal could reduce bear populations.

Dan moves to amend proposal 39 to include considerations by GMU's based on abundance of brown/black bears and to support the first option in the proposal. (Whole hide.) Frank seconds.

*** Committee votes unanimously in support of the amendment**
*** Committee votes unanimous in support of Proposal 39 as amended.**

Proposal 40 Robin moves to adopt, Frank seconds.

- Committee feels that commercialization is a concern.

*** Committee votes unanimously to oppose.**

Proposal 41 Robin moves to adopt Dan seconds.

- Committee feels that "disease" is a broad definition. Opens the door to discretionary opinion.
- Also opens the door to be "subjective" in harvesting.

*** Committee votes unanimously to oppose.**

Proposal 42 Robin moves to adopt, Dan seconds.

- Committee feels that if adopted, effect of the proposal would "muddy the waters", or confuse the definition on waste.
- The department has good laws on waste, salvage requirements, etc.

*** Committee votes unanimously to oppose.**

Proposal 43 Robin moves to adopt, Frank seconds.

- Committee references discussion and action on proposal 42.

*** Committee votes unanimously to oppose.**

Proposal 124 Robin moves to adopt, Joseph seconds.

- Reauthorization has to be done every year.
- Intent is to encourage harvest.

A/C COMMENT # 2

*** Committee votes unanimously to support.**

Lunch break at 12:47 pm
Back to order at 2 pm

3) Area M Finfish Proposals

Proposal 116 Robin moves to adopt, Dan seconds.

- In years of low abundance, it would help us.
- Would reinstate prior regulation in place.
- Would prevent over harvest especially in poor years when forecast is poor.
- Committee hopes that the chum cap would be reinstated.
- Proposal would add North Peninsula.
- Area M Genetics are not available yet, hopefully in 1-½ years.

* Committee votes unanimously to support.

Proposal 117 Robin moves to adopt, Curt seconds.

- Committee is opposed because the effect of the proposal would allow fishing deeper in the water column. Studies show increased chum and coho harvest deeper. This proposal has the potential to effect chum stocks in Bristol Bay and Western Alaska.
- Deeper nets would allow increased harvest of multi-species of salmon.
- Some Western Alaska chum fisheries are a stock of concern.
- Catch records indicate that harvesters are already doing very well.
- The June fishery is a mixed stock fishery. Board should take a look at the sustainable fishery policy for considerations to stocks of concern that are harvested.

* Committee votes unanimously to oppose.

Proposal 118 Robin moves to adopt, Frank seconds.

- This is a mixed stock fishery, Bristol Bay stocks are in the area.
- Records show 241,000 salmon harvest during the post-June fishery in the Shumagin Islands.
- Board needs to consider the sustainable fisheries policy because of the impact of the proposal would have to whose fish are caught in this mixed stock fishery.
- Fishery should not be expanded.
- There are migrating Coho's in the area during this timeframe.
- The last 4 years harvest of coho increased from 10,000 harvest to over 300,000.
- Study by the department shows that there are migrating coho and transitioning the area.
- The effect of the proposal would allow them to fish harder in late July, increasing harvest of coho.

* Committee votes unanimously to oppose.

Proposal 119 Robin moves to adopt, Dan seconds.

- Committee references earlier comments.

* Committee votes unanimously to oppose.

Proposal 120 Frank moves to adopt, Robin seconds.

- Same issues.
- This is a mixed stock fishery. The Board should consider the mixed stock, sustainable fishery policy.

* Committee votes unanimously to oppose.

Proposal 121 Frank moves to adopt, Robin seconds.

- Committee references earlier discussion and action.

* Committee votes unanimously to oppose.

Proposal 122 Robin moves to adopt, Dan seconds.

- This proposal comes up every cycle.
- This is a mixed stock fishery, they don't need more time. Will harvest more.
- This is a fight between gear types.
- Need to keep July fishery status quo because of coho harvest.
- Set netters are being unfairly penalized.
- Don't mind if set netters go first if they are not harvesting Western Alaska coho stocks.

* Committee votes 4 to support, 4 oppose, 1 abstain.

Proposal 123 Robin moves to adopt, Dan seconds.

- Should take a look at the post-June harvest in comparison to total harvest.
  Post June S. Pen. Harvest: 179,000 coho
  8 million pinks
  366,000 sockeye

* Committee votes unanimous to oppose.

Proposal 124 Robin moves to adopt, Curt seconds.

- Committee is opposed because this would authorize a wide-open post-June fishery.
- There is a documented presence of Bristol Bay pinks/chums in the area.
- Proposal is unclear on area. Can get tricky to harvest own stocks. Could support if targeting own local stocks, terminal areas.

7/11

A/C COMMENT # 2

* Committee votes unanimous to oppose.

Proposal 125 Robin moves to adopt, Frank seconds.

- Effect of proposal would allow targeting of Chignik stocks.

Robin moves to amend to allow fishing in terminal areas for Area M fish. No interception of Bristol Bay or Chignik fish to occur with the adoption of this regulation. Will not support if there is evidence that would indicate a presence of Bristol Bay or Chignik stocks. Frank seconds.

* Committee votes unanimous to support the amendment.
* Committee votes unanimous to support proposal 125 as amended.

Proposal 126 Frank moves to adopt, Robin seconds.

- Same concerns as in 125.

Frank moves to amend to support 126 with the same caveat and criteria as in 125. The department will demonstrate that terminal stocks are in the area.

* Committee votes unanimous to support the amendment.
* Committee votes unanimous to support proposal 126 as amended.

Proposal 127 Robin moves to adopt, Joseph seconds.

- Committee feels that this is irresponsible. One individual has witnessed immature sockeye caught in seines during this timeframe.
- Regulation in (i) on page 132. Committee member is opposed because Bristol Bay has always supported the 100 immature/set. In some years the immature harvest is staggering.
- Passage would kill immatures that are worthless on the market.

* Committee votes unanimously to oppose.

Proposal 128 Robin moves to adopt, Frank seconds.

- Proposal would do away with the 100 immatures/set in regulation.
- Discussion on how the 100 immatures/set are counted?
- References prior discussion on immature harvest.

* Committee votes unanimously to oppose.

Proposal 130 Robin moves to adopt, Dan seconds.

- Committee members reference studies that show increased harvest of chum lower in the water column using deeper nets.
- Recommendations to consider the mixed stock, sustainable fish policies and reference to migrating stocks in the area were discussed.

* Committee votes unanimously to oppose.

8/11

A/C COMMENT # 2

Proposal 131 Frank moves to adopt, Robin seconds.

- This proposal is seen every cycle.
- What are they catching? We think that they are catching immature salmon and wonder what the effect would be if restrictions were removed?

* Committee votes unanimously to oppose.

Break at 3:24 pm
Back to order at 3:30 pm

Proposal 140 Robin moves to adopt, Frank seconds.

- Committee is of the opinion that this is a mixed stock fishery. They harvest Bristol Bay pinks/coho .
- During July 6-Aug 31, BB coho are migrating through the area.
- Even Chignik fishermen are now fishing the capes.
- Caution should be exercised, they could be impacting their own stocks of concern.
- Discussion on impact to local streams and rivers near Perryville and Chigniks.

Committee votes unanimously to oppose.

Proposal 141 Robin moves to adopt, Frank seconds.

- Same comments as in proposal 140

* Committee votes unanimously to oppose.

Proposal 145 Robin moves to adopt, Frank seconds.

- Lower Bristol Bay proposal. Would give additional BB fishermen opportunity to fish. Just changes the weekly fishing schedule to fish through the weekend.

* Committee votes unanimously to support.

Proposal 147 Robin moves to adopt, Frank seconds.

- Discussion on fishermen outside terminal areas chocking off escapement.
- Mixed stock fishery.

* Committee votes unanimously to support.

Proposal 148 Robin moves to adopt, Frank seconds.

- Discussion about windows prior to 2003. Committee favors that concept to reinitiate windows to allow fish to pass through.

* Committee votes unanimously to support.

Proposal 149 Frank moves to adopt, Robin seconds.

- Committee discusses salmon cap prior to 2003.

9/11

A/C COMMENT # 2

- Genetic work should have been completed by this cycle, but was not.
- Catch records indicate that harvest has gone up especially when the Outer Port Heiden section was added.
- Effect of the proposal would reduce harvest.

* Committee votes unanimously to support.

Committee requests to take up 151 before 150.

Proposal 151 Robin moves to adopt, Frank seconds.

- This is a mixed stock fishery.
- When Robin was on the Board, Johnny Christen from Port Heiden came to the board requesting that the Outer Port Heiden section be closed because of the presence of mixed stocks. Johnny indicated that with his fishing experience, fish are going in both directions.
- During the last board cycle, the board rewrote one of Roland's proposals and opened up Outer Port Heiden to Area M fishermen.

Robin moves to amend with a first preference to close the Outer Port Heiden section and a second option to allow Area T fishermen in.

* Committee votes unanimously in support of the amendment.
* Committee votes unanimously in support of Proposal 151, as amended.

Proposal 150 Robin moves to adopt, Frank seconds.

Motion by Robin to amend language with preference for the amended proposal 151. Frank seconds.

* Committee votes unanimously in support of the amendment.
* Committee votes unanimously in support of 150 as amended.

Proposal 152 Robin moves to adopt, Wasillie seconds.

- Committee discussion about support for concept and effect of the proposal.

* Committee votes unanimously to support.

Proposal 153 Robin moves to adopt, Frank seconds.

- Currently, no seine fishery is authorized on the North Peninsula. Concern about getting their foot in and spreading.
- Discussion on pro's/con's on allowing fishing in the lagoon affecting escapement, openings/closures in the Ilnik district.

* Committee votes unanimously to support.

A/C COMMENT # 2

Proposal 154 Robin moves to adopt, Frank seconds.

- Discussion on effect to terminal areas on the North Peninsula.
- Concern on and reference to the mixed stock, sustainable fish policy, etc.

* Committee votes unanimously to support.

Proposal 155 Robin moves to adopt, Skin seconds.

- After discussion, committee wants to amend.

Robin moves to amend, to Oppose the concept of 155, however; to Support if the Board allows Area T & M fishermen to fish the overlap area. Frank seconds.

* Committee votes unanimously to support the amendment.
* Committee votes unanimously to support 155 as amended.

Proposal 157 Robin moves to adopt, Frank seconds.

- Committee references discussion on 154, 155.

Robin moves to amend to close the Outer Port Heiden section. Frank seconds.

* Committee votes unanimously to support the amendment.
* Committee votes unanimously to support 157 as amended.

Proposal 160 Robin moves to adopt, Frank seconds.

- Proposal would increase their efficiency
- Reference to mixed stock, sustainable fish policies.

* Committee votes unanimously to oppose.

4) AC Representation at BOF, BOG Meetings

Hans advises the committee that he will be traveling out of state and will be unavailable for the Area M and BOG meetings. He asks if anyone could attend? Asks Dan if he could attend the meetings to represent the AC? Robin will be attending for BBEDC, Frank for BBNA. Dan will consider and get back with Hans.

5) Set next meeting date and place.

Call of the Chair.

6) Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 4:44 pm.

These meeting minutes provided courtesy of the Bristol Bay Native Association

11/11

A/C COMMENT # 2

UNALASKA-DUTCH HARBOR AC

FAX COVER SHEET
Frank Kelty Chairman
PO Box 162
Unalaska, Alaska 99685
Phone (907) 581-7726
Fax (907)581-4469
Unalaska Cell (907)359-7753
Anchorage Cell (907) 903-8183
E-Mail fkelty@ci.unalaska.ak.us

RECEIVED
JAN 19 2010
BOARDS

To: State of Alaska Board of Fisheries- Attn Board Support

Date: 1-15-2010

Fax: 1-907-465-5526

From: Frank Kelty, Chair Unalaska- Dutch Harbor AC

Subject: Unalaska Dutch Harbor AC Comments on proposals in Group A & C for Board of Fisheries meeting on 2-2-10 in Anchorage, AK Alaska Peninsula and Aleutian Islands Finfish proposals.

Thank You

Frank Kelty

Pages 4

AC COMMENT # 3

UNALASKA/DUTCH HARBOR FISH AND GAME ADVISORY COMMITTEE
PO Box 162
Unalaska, AK 99685

January 14, 2010

Vince Webster, Chairman
Alaska Board of Fisheries
PO Box 115526
Anchorage, Alaska 99811-5526

Subject: Comments on Committee A & C Proposals by the Unalaska/Dutch Harbor Advisory Committee.

Committee A Proposals:

#101-5AAC28.550 Description of South Alaska Peninsula Area; and 5 AAC 28.600 Bering Sea -Aleutian Island Area. This proposal clarifies South Alaska Peninsula and Bering Sea–Aleutian Island fishing areas submitted by ADFG. Unalaska Advisory Committee supported the proposal by a vote of 8-0.

#102- 5AAC 28.560 Fishing Seasons for South Alaska Peninsula; 5AAC28.610 Fishing Seasons for Bering Sea- Aleutian Island Area and 5AAC 28.710 Fishing Seasons for Chukchi-Beaufort Area. This ADFG proposal repeals a regulation that allowed groundfish to be taken at anytime in state waters in the above listed areas. Unalaska Advisory Committee supported the proposal by a vote of 8-0.

#103-5AAC 28.577. South Alaska Peninsula Area Pacific Cod Management Plan. This proposal limits vessel size to 58 feet in the parallel groundfish fishery and allows the commissioner to open and close the fishery by emergency order. Unalaska Advisory Committee opposed the proposal by a vote of 8-0. Unalaska does not want local vessels 58' and over to lose the opportunity to fish in area 610 during the parallel fishery.

#104-5AAC28.570. Lawful gear for South Alaska Peninsula. This proposal limits vessel size in the parallel groundfish fishery to 58-foot vessels. Unalaska Advisory Committee opposed this proposal by a vote of 8-0. Unalaska does not want local vessels 58-foot and over to lose the opportunity to fish in area 610 during the parallel groundfish fishery.

#105- 5AAC28.570. Lawful gear South Alaska Peninsula area. This will exclude longline gear from South Alaska Peninsula Area parallel fisheries in state waters. Unalaska Advisory Committee opposed the proposal by a vote of 8-0. Unalaska AC does not want vessels home-ported in Unalaska that use longline gear to lose the opportunity to fish with longline gear in area 610 during the parallel fisheries in state waters.

#106- 5AAC 28.570. Lawful gear, for the South Alaska Peninsula Area. This proposal imposes 60-pots or 5-jig machine limits in the parallel Cod fishery in the Western Gulf of Alaska. Unalaska Advisory Committee opposed the proposal by a vote of 8-0. Unalaska does not support gear restrictions in area 610 during the parallel Pacific Cod fishery.

#107- 5 AAC 28.577 (b) (e) (g) South Alaska Peninsula Area, Pacific Cod Management Plan. This proposal modifies allowable gear and vessel size for the parallel Pacific Cod fishery. Advisory Committee opposed the proposal 8-0. Unalaska AC did not support the opening and closing by emergency order and the limitations on the gear that will be allowed during the parallel Pacific Cod fishery.

#108-109 5 AAC 28.577- 5 AAC28.777 (e) South Alaska Peninsula Area Pacific Cod Management Plan. This would increase state water Pacific Cod harvest percentage to 50% of the WG 610 Pacific Cod allocation area. Unalaska Advisory Committee opposed the proposal 8-0. Unalaska does not support this as it would disenfranchise larger vessels with reduced TAC amounts in the federal water and in the parallel Pacific Cod groundfish fisheries.

#110- 5AAC28.577. South Alaska Peninsula Area Pacific Cod Management Plan. This proposal would implement a 7-day stand down period in order to fish in state waters in area 610 after completing fishing in federal waters. Unalaska Advisory Committee opposed the proposal 8-0. Unalaska does not support this as it would disenfranchise vessels that fish in federal waters, and it would allow vessels that only fish in state waters a 7-day head start on fishing activities.

#111- 5AAC 28.650. Closed waters, in the Bering Sea – Aleutian Islands area. This proposal would close the waters of Unalaska Bay to groundfish fishing with trawl gear. Unalaska Advisory Committee supported this proposal by a vote of 8-0.

#112- 5-AAC 28.632 Groundfish Pot Storage Requirements for Bering Sea-Aleutian Island area. This ADFG proposal would clarify the amount of time a vessel operator has to get the gear into a water storage area. Unalaska Advisory committee supported this proposal by a vote of 8-0.

#113- 5ACC28.647 Aleutian Islands District Pacific Cod Management Plan. This proposal specifies that pot gear for groundfish can be fished on longline or fished single pot style. Unalaska Advisory Committee supports this proposal by a vote of 8-0.

#114- 5-AAC 28.647 Aleutian Islands district Pacific Cod Management Plan. This proposal allows pot vessels of 100 feet or less to participate in the B season cod fishery if less than 50% of cod TAC has been harvested by August 1. Unalaska Advisory Committee amended the vessel size limit to 125 feet, which was the original size limit for pot vessels in that area during the B season before being changed to 58 feet. This amended proposal was supported by the Unalaska Advisory Committee by a vote of 8-0.

Committee C Proposals:

#158- 5 AAC27.655 (a) (3).Dutch Harbor Food and Bait Herring Fishery Allocation Plan. This proposal changes the fishery by adding a new section (3) stating that once the seine quota is harvested and there is still remaining gillnet quota left, the seine fleet may harvest the remainder of the quota. Unalaska Advisory Committee strongly opposed this proposal by a vote of 8-0. This proposal as written would impact local gillnet fishermen's opportunities to harvest their small 240ST allocation.

#159-5AAC 27.657 Alaska Peninsula-Aleutian Island Herring Management Plan. This proposal allows up to 500MT in the Adak Herring fishery to be harvested using either gillnets or seine gear. This proposal was discussed by the Unalaska Advisory Committee, but no action was taken.

Regards

Frank Kelty, Chair
Unalaska/Dutch Harbor AC

AC COMMENT # 3

Chignik Advisory Committee
January 19, 2010

Johnny called meeting to order
1:17 pm January 19, 2010

Chairman, Johnny Lind called meeting to order at 1:17 pm January 19, 2010

Advisory Committee members present:
Shane Macauly, Chignik Bay
John Jones, Chignik Lagoon
Gary Anderson, Chignik Lagoon
Stephen Shangin, Ivanof Bay
Jerry Yagie, Ivanof Bay
Marvin Yagie, Perryville
Andy Shangin, Perryville

Guests
Chignik Lagoon: Don Bumpus, Al Anderson, Clem Grunert, Rodney Anderson
Bruce Barrett, Chignik Regional Aquaculture Association
Chuck McCallum, Fishery Advisor for the Lake and Peninsula Borough
George Anderson, Chignik Fisherman

ADFG Staff Present
Andrew DeValpine, Southwest Region Board Support Regional Coordinator
Mark Stichert, Assistant Kodiak/Alaska Peninsula Shellfish/Groundfish Management
Todd Anderson, Chignik Assistant Area Management Biologist
Mary Beth Loewen, Fishery Research Biologist
Aaron Poetter, Ak Pen/Aleut Islands Area Mgmt. Biologist, Sand Point
Jeff Wadle, Regional Finfish Management Supervisor
Mark Witteveen, Finfish Research Supervisor

Agenda approved 7-0

Mark Stichert, ADF&G staff, reports on groundfish proposals 101 – 114
101 &102 are housekeeping and have no effect on Chignik
103 & 104 want to restrict vessels to 58 feet during the federal parallel fishery and would directly effect the part of the western gulf that is in the Chignik management area and could indirectly affect the rest of the Chignik management area.
105 seeks to exclude long line gear from the federal parallel fishery and would directly affect the part of the Western Gulf that is in the Chignik management area and could indirectly affect the rest of the Chignik management area.
106 – 107 limit pot and jig gear in the parallel fishery
108 – 109 increase the GHL to 50%
110 would implement a 7 day stand down and has no effect on Chignik

Area M fishermen worry that with LLP's being removed from the fishery might cause more boats to move into the state waters where they don't need LLP's.

Proposals 101-114 – ***No Action – by Unanimous consent***

Proposal 115 – Require participation in the Chum Pool
Todd Anderson – This is outside of board authority
Motion to adopt: M/Stephen; S/Gary
This does not affect Chignik.
Proposal 115 – ***No action – by Unanimous consent***

Proposal 116 - Reinstate 8.3% allocation
Department comments – Department is neutral on the allocative aspects but opposes aspects that restrict North Pen management of prominent local stocks.
Motion to adopt
M/Shane Macauly
S/Stephen Shangin
Comments:

- The proposal would result in a greater interception of Chignik bound sockeye salmon unless the Shumagin Islands were limited to the historic 1.5% and the South Unimak assigned the remaining 6.8%.
- In late June and through July, Chignik bound sockeye migrate through the Shumagins per Eggers 1987 tagging study, and an increased interception would cause economic hardship and potential escapement issues for the Chignik socks, in particularly the Black Lake run.
- The Chignik lakes stocks are already fully allocated in inshore commercial and village subsistence fisheries.
- If Area M intends to target Bristol Bay sockeye then most of the fishing effort and harvest should be west of the Shumagins in the Unimak District and NOT in eastern waters of Area M.

Motion to **amend** 116 to reinstate the Shumagin Island GLH of 1.5% and Unimak GLH 6.8% of the Bristol Bay forecast. M/John jones; S/Shane Macauly
Unanimous Support for the amendment
Friendly motion to amend 116 to be affective only though June 30
Proposal 116 supported as amended, ***7-0***

Proposal 117 – Increase depth of drift and set gillnet from 90 to 120 meshes
Motion to adopt: M/Stephen Shangin; S/John Jones
Comments:

- The proposal would result in a higher chum catch and therein further complicate management issues for Western Alaska chum stocks.
- The proposal would expand an existing interception fishery.

- There is no provision in the proposal for conservation accountability which is inherent in all terminal stock fisheries (e.g. escapement goals).
- Because there are no underutilized salmon stocks in Western and Central Alaska the proposal, if approved, would result in a "taking" from terminal stock fisheries including Chignik.

Proposal 117 – ***Opposed 0-7***

Proposals 118-124 are all related and call for increased time for fishing in the Post June management plan schedule. All would increase the interception of non-local sockeye stocks including Chignik sockeye stocks.
Motion to adopt 118 – 125 as a block: M/John Jones; S/Shane Macauly.

Comments on Proposal 118

- The purpose of proposal 118 is to double the fishing time for set and drift gillnet fishers in the post June South Peninsula fishery (Unimak and South Central, South Eastern and South Western Districts).
- The fishery is currently limited because of interception issues mainly dealing with sockeye salmon which is the target species. Pink salmon are not the primary species as implied but is used simply for an excuse to harvest more traveling fish (sockeye).
- The proposal would result in a much greater harvest of non-local sockeye and Coho salmon.
- IF the intent is to harvest more pink salmon then proposed would have been a required gillnet mesh reduction to about a 4.5 inch mesh size not a radical expansion of fishing time.
- The proposal is intended to authorize further targeting of sockeye salmon by gillnet fishers.
- Chignik sockeye salmon runs would be harmed.
- The proposed 24-hr closures are essentially meaningless from a stock conservation perspective as it would take much longer than 24hrs for migrating salmon to recruit into the districts and escape before another harvest period starts.
- The proposal represents a blatant attempt to harvest non-local salmon, mainly sockeye including those destine to Chignik.

Comments on Proposal 119

- The purpose of Proposal 119 is - for the post June SP fishery, reconfigure the current openings beginning July 6th to permit seiners more daylight operating hours and optimize travel by having a 12-hr opening followed by 12-hr closure followed by another 12-hr opening and then a 36-hr closure. The sequence would then repeat through July 20th. This would apply only to the seine fleet and presumably the drift gillnet fleet but set netters would be permitted to fish during the 12-hr closures. Current regulation permits up to 6-24hrs openings w/48 hr, closures between openers.
- Possible Comments:

- The proposal calls for optimizing fishing opportunity and therefore stands as an expansion of the existing fishery for the seine fleet at minimum and as proposed, set gillnetters would remain under the current regulation.
- Traveling, non local fish would have more risk of being harvested as the closures between gear types would not always be concurrent.
- This represents an expansion of an interception fishery and is not needed to harvest local sockeye stocks, and as for pinks, terminal area provisions fully exist.
- By spreading the existing 48 closure to one 12h and one 36 closure, traveling fish have a lesser chance of escaping the fishery. The conservation element that currently exists would therefore be compromised.
- During July there are lots of daylight hours even within Area M and therefore, status quo should be fine. We suspect the daylight argument is simply an excuse for wanting to improve boat or crew efficiency.

Comments on Proposal 120

- Purpose of proposal 120 is to modify the post-June Management Plan for the South Peninsula by expanding fishing time with 48hr openings followed by 24h closures.
- The current regulations provide 6-24hr openings w/ 48 hr closures between openings through July 21 and then 3-36hr fishing periods w/ 48 hr. closings between openings through July 31.
- Would allocate sockeye away from Chignik to Area M as the proposal if adopted would double the fishing time --- 100% beyond the current regulation.
- No surplus non-local stocks exist. All terminal stock fisheries are fully developed and therefore the proposed action would be a clear "taking" from terminal stock fishers.
- There is no viable conservation element in the proposal as 24hr is too short of a period for traveling fish to avoid being harvest in the wide geographic reach of the SP.
- The proposal would expand the existing SP post June interception fishery.
- There is no need to expand fishing time to harvest local stocks because any and all surpluses can be harvested in terminal waters under current regulations.
- All areas are sustaining a serve economic downturn and that includes Chignik.
- The proposal would increase the July harvest of Chignik bound sockeye salmon by nearly 100%.

Comments on Proposal 121

- The purpose of Proposal 121 is to expand fishing time by nearly 200% in the SP post June fishery.
- Current regulations provide 6-24hr opening w/ 48 hr closures between openings through July 21 and then 3-36hr fishing periods w/ 48 hr. closing between openings through July 31.
- This represents a blatant attempt to expand interception fishing in the SP post-June fishery.

AC COMMENT # 4

- Three days openers followed by 2 day closures would nearly triple the harvest of non-local sockeye salmon.
- The proposal would have a major impact on migrating Chignik sockeye salmon.
- Three times the number of Chignik sockeye would be harvested than presently occurs.
- This could easily cause subsistence and escapement issues in some years for Chignik and potentially other areas.

Comments on Proposal 122

- The Purpose of Proposal 122 is to expand fishing time for the set netters in SP waters of Area M post June.
- Set net fishers are asking for longer fishing periods and earlier openings because of what is perceived as restricted harvest opportunity under current regulations.
- The proposal calls for expansion of an existing interception fishery and there is no historic basis/justification for such an expansion.
- All salmon stocks are fully allocated in shore-based fisheries, and if this proposal were approved it would result in a "taking" from terminal stock fishers.
- An increase take of Chignik bound sockeye would occur as it is well established that Chignik sockeye migrate through the Shumagins and other SP districts.

Comments on Proposal 123

- The purpose of proposal 123 is to expand fishing time for the set netters in SP waters of Area M post June by exempting them from any July closures.
- Set net fishers want special treatment to where they would be permitted continuous fishing time beginning July 6th. The long and short is that they would not be closed when other gear types were restricted.
- This would be a major expansion of the post June setnet fishery and result in a greater Chignik-bound sockeye harvest by SP gill netters.
- This proposal if approved would result in a "taking" from terminal stock fishers in Chignik and elsewhere.
- SP set netters want an open ended fishery absent of any and all conservation provisions. This is counter to the intent and provisions of the Sustainable Fisheries Policy.

Comments on Proposal 124

- The purpose of Proposal 124 is to expand the opportunity to harvest pink and chums in the SP post June fishery.
- This is a non-descript proposal that opens the door for the BOF do anything it deems beneficial to increase the local pink and chum salmon fishery in Area m.
- If Area M fishers are interested in increasing local pink and chum salmon harvest numbers they should have terminal bays managed more aggressively.
- The proposal appears to be an attempt to expand interception fishing on non-local sockeye salmon including Chignik destine stocks.
- The proposal says one thing but we all know that it means more interception fishing on Coho and sockeye salmon.

AC COMMENT # 4

Proposals 118 – 124 Opposed 0-7

Proposal 125 – Allow fishing in terminal areas beginning July 6th if fish are present.
Motion to adopt. M/ Gary Anderson; S/ John Jones
Comment: This is not necessary to ensure adequate harvest of local stocks
Proposal 125 – Opposed 0-7

Proposal 126 – Extend terminal areas
Motion to adopt. M/Gary Anderson; S/Stephen Shangin.
The Department is opposed to biological aspects as it would allow the targeting of non local stocks.
Comments:

- The purpose of proposal 126 is to expand terminal area harvest areas in the SP to include all of the South Central and Southwestern Districts and most of the Southeastern District of Area M.
- Effectively this would greatly expand terminal harvest areas to permit the targeted exploitation of transient, non-local sockeye salmon and other traveling fish in SP outside waters.
- There is no factual basis to justify expanding well established terminal areas for the purpose of local stock management.
- The intent of this proposal is to willfully expand the post June interception fishery.
- All salmon stocks are fully allocated in shore-based fisheries, and if this proposal were approved it would result in a "taking" from terminal stock fishers.
- An increase take of Chignik bound sockeye would occur as it is well established that Chignik sockeye migrate through the Shumagins and other SP fishing districts.

Proposal 126 – *Opposed 0-7*

Proposals 127 & 128 both seek to liberalize restrictions on harvesting immature salmon
Motion to adopt 127 & 128. M/Stephen Shangin; S/Gary Anderson
Comments:

- The Purpose of Proposal 127 and 128 is to repeal the immature test fishery or raise the threshold to 700-800 immatures per set.
- The Shumagins is a nursery area for juvenile salmon especially during July. Current regulations close purse seine fishing when seine sets average 100 or more juvenile salmon, excluding pink salmon.
- The proposal reflects a callus attitude and willful disregard for salmon conservation.
- Immature salmon are not marketed in Area M and therefore all immature caught are discarded and the mortality is essentially 100%.

- Forgoing or minimizing the harvest of immatures is important for overall resource health and is economically justified.
- The current 100-immature fish limit works well and is reasonable and to expand it to a level 600% or more would be at best an imprudent action.

Proposals 127 & 128 – ***Opposed 0-7***

Proposal 129 – Concurrent fishing periods in October
Motion to adopt: M/Gary Anderson; S/John Jones
Comment: Public was concerned about late season subsistence opportunities. ADF&G staff noted that there has been no commercial fishery in October and that by regulation the salmon season does not extend past September 30.
Proposal 129 – ***Opposed 0-7***

Proposals 130&131 are both gear changes.

Motion to adopt proposal 130 – Increase depth from 90- 120
M/Shane Macauly; S/
Comment: A 67% increase in net depth will likely cause a substantial boost increase in the SP June chum salmon harvest. This is because chum salmon are generally assumed to be deeper in the water column than sockeye salmon.
Proposal 130 - ***No Action – by Unanimous consent***

Proposal 131 – No minimum mesh size
Motion to adopt: M/Shane Macauly; S/
Comment: Anytime you have a gill net fishermen reducing the size of his mesh it reduces interception of Chignik stocks.
Proposal 131 – ***Support 7-0***
Motion to reconsider Proposal 131
M/Gary Anderson. S/John Jones.
Motion to reconsider passes unanimously
Comment: Because of uncertainty about the potential impact on Chignik sockeye stocks when small Chignik sockeye stocks are transiting the Area M waters this proposal was opposed.
Proposal 131*: Opposed 1-6*

Proposals 132 – 138 all seek to extinguish or severely diminish the 300,000 and 600,000 minimum harvest allocation to Chignik as imposed in the SEDM plan.
Motion to adopt 132 – 138 as a block: M/Gary Anderson; S/John Jones

In the early 1980's, the BOF recognized Chignik as a terminal-stock harvest area with two sockeye salmon runs being the early run or Blake Lake run and the second or Chignik Lake run. The BOF acknowledged that to maintain a reasonably viable fishery

in the Chignik area that a specific sockeye salmon harvest preference or allocation was justified. In accordance, a 300k harvest minimum was assigned to the Chignik fishery for the pre-July 8th period and an additional 300k for a 600k total for the Chignik fishery through July 25th.

Comments on Proposal 132
Proposal 132 calls for putting an end to Chignik's 300,000 and 600,000 minimum allocation.

- The harvest guarantees which have long historic standing are essential for maintaining any semblance of a viable Chignik salmon fishery and industry.
- Chignik is geographically isolated with minimal employment and other opportunities; the proposal if adopted would be culturally and economically devastating to Chignik.
- Dropping the harvest goals would be precedent setting and prompt a similar proposal by Kodiak fishers for the Igvak area.
- The BOF intended for the 300k minimum harvest goals for Chignik to be just as important as the percent allocation given to the SEDM fishers.
- Chignik permits are currently at an all time low. Recently a permit sold for less than $70k which is substantially lower than the record high of nearly $0.5 million. Clearly, this illustrates the marked downturn in the Chignik fishery and why the 300k and 600k harvest goals are essential.
- Trident's requirement for RSW has had an effect on the number of active permits in the Chignik fishery. RSW is costly and with escalating insurance and other operating expenses, it is quite difficult to profit in the current Chignik fishery. Coupled with Black Lake habitat issue, the Chignik fishery has become very risky.

Comments on Proposal 133
Proposal 133 would gut the existing pre July 26th SEDM Salmon Management Plan by removing ALL ties to Chignik sockeye salmon and opening the SEDM area to a sequence of 3 days open and two days closed.

- The SEDM is an historic interception fishery area for Chignik bound sockeye salmon. The latest tagging study conducted in the SEDM verified Chignik bound sockeye salmon as overwhelmingly dominant.
- The proposal to change historic management of the SEDM pre-July 26th fishery has no foundation and would cause major expansion of a long-standing sockeye interception fishery.
- The change is not needed to ensure adequate local-stock harvests.
- If adopted, the proposal would clearly be a "taking" from Chignik and remove the SP conservation tie to the Black Lake and Chignik Lake sockeye runs. This would be contrary to the BOF Policy for Management of Mixed Stock Fisheries.

Comments on Proposal 134
Proposal 134 would change the stock assignment in the SEDM pre-July 26 fishery from 80% Chignik bound sockeye to 40% or eliminate, all together, the current 80% assignment.

- The SEDM Plan for the pre-July 26th fishery is founded on the results of the 1963 tagging study. Analyses of that work clearly shows that 80% of the fish tagged were Chignik bound sockeye salmon.
- The foundation of the current long-standing SEDM is the 1963 tagging study results which clearly define that the majority of the sockeye salmon tagged were Chignik bound fish.
- To adopt a lower stock composition estimate would result in a "taking" from Chignik and other areas. This is because the harvest of transient non-local sockeye would be allowed to increase proportional to the change (drop) in the assigned Chignik stock composition.
- The effect of the proposal would be the expansion of an historic sockeye interception fishery by a factor of at least two. This would be contrary to BOF policy for management of mixed stock fisheries.
- Older pre 1960's tagging work is not suitable for reallocating this 40+ year old interception fishery. The older studies were unreliable for reasons including differential tag recovery efforts, tag loss factors and inability to asses for milling behavior from final destination.
- The BOF established the SEDM plan based on the most current and reliable information at the time being the 1963 tagging study, which was peer–reviewed and published.

Comments on Proposal 135

Proposal 135 would change the SEDM plan to where the 300k and 600k Chignik harvest thresholds are reduced according to a formula based on the number of active permits in the CMA.

- The 300k and 600k thresholds were established by the BOF to reasonably ensure that the economic vitality of the Chignik salmon fishery is maintained and remains anchored to the two natural Chignik lakes sockeye runs.
- Possible Comments:
- Area M fishes should understand that the number of permits fished in the Chignik area is a function of run strength and marketing conditions. It merely just that simple, and certainly there is no conspiracy or intent to forego any harvest or delay or prevent the Igvak or SEDM interception fisheries.
- The proposal is considered a blatant ploy to gut the economic vitality of Chignik.
- Economic conditions are grim in the Chignik area and fewer permits are being fished because of well below average returns to Black Lake and Chignik Lake.
- There is not enough sockeye salmon returning to Chignik to support all the permits available and this problem is not uncommon elsewhere including Areas M and K.
- If the proposal were adopted, Chignik permit values would decline further and less and less Chignik fishers would risk gearing-up and participating in the CMA fishery.
- No harvest slowdown or escapement surpluses have been caused by fewer permits being fished in the CMA, and therefore the proposal for changing or reducing the historic 300k and 600k thresholds is absent of credibility. Chignik permits are

currently at an all time low. Recently a permit sold for less than $70k which is substantially lower than the record high of nearly $0.5 million. Clearly, this illustrates the marked downturn in the Chignik fishery.

Comments on Proposal 136
This proposal is virtually the same as Proposal 135

Comments on Proposal 137
The purpose of proposal 137 is to allow SEDM to fish 2 days once 200k sockeye were harvested in the CMA and another two days after another 200k were taken. The current 300k and 600k thresholds would be eliminated

- The BOF set the 300k and 600k values to help ensure economic vitality in the Chignik salmon fishery and to promote conservation of the two Chignik sockeye runs.
- If ADF&G had taken an active role in restoring Black Lake, Chignik may not be experiencing relatively low runs today, and the 300k and 600k thresholds may not be a concern to SEDM fishers.
- The proposal would cause further economic hardship to Chignik when sockeye returns are low.
- Chignik should not be penalized in years when Black and Chignik Lakes runs are weak.
- If the proposal were adopted, Chignik fishers would see permit values declining further and less and less fishers willing to risk gearing-up and participating in the CMA fishery.
- No harvest slowdown or escapement surpluses have been caused by fewer permits being fished in the CMA, and therefore the proposal for changing or reducing the historic 300k and 600k thresholds is absent of credibility.
- Adoption of the proposal would result in a "taking" from Chignik fishers when Chignik runs are weak.
- SEDM fishers could assist in the restoration efforts for Black Lake and therein help improve the two Chignik runs which would lead to improvement in the SEDM fishery.

Comments on Proposal 138
The purpose of proposal 138 is to eliminate the 300k and 600k Chignik harvest provisions from the SEDM plan.

- The SEDM plan has been in effect for decades and this includes the 300k and 600k harvest guarantee established specifically to help safeguarding the economic vitality of the Chignik area and its fishery when poor or low terminal runs occur.
- SEDM fishers should acknowledge that they are mainly exploiting traveling fish and while they have an allocation to harvest Chignik sockeye salmon the allocation is contingent on certain threshold being met and specifically that includes the 300k and 600k terminal harvest guarantees for Chignik. To ask for their deletion would suggest greed and cherry picking of plan elements for self serving interests.

- Removing the 300 and 600k harvest guarantees would harm Chignik at a time when its fishery is depressed due to low returns, a damaged lake system habitat, and poor market conditions.
- SEDM should work with the Department to better manage their own stocks and that includes the Orziniski sockeye run. In-house restoration and enhancement options are available to SEDM fishers provided there is willingness to focus on terminal stock management issues instead of always trying to wrangle more traveling fish from terminal stock fisheries.

ADF&G staff is asked "Is there a foregone harvest in Chignik that merits this because of number of active permits in Chignik?" Todd Anderson, ADF&G, answers that "No, there is no forgone harvest in Chignik". This answer quashes the reasoning in these proposals.

Proposals 132 – 138*: Opposed 0 - 6*

Proposal 139 – Clarify description of closed water
Dept proposals - housekeeping action
Comment: This would add a quarter mile of beach that they could fish but it is in the SEDM and fish harvested there would be counted toward the SEDM allocation and so would not increase interception of Chignik bound stocks.

Proposal 139 – *No Action by Unanimous consent.*

Proposals 140 & 141--- Re-Open Kupreanof Point
Comments on Proposal 140

- Proposal 140 would re-open closed waters in the Kupreanof Point area bordering Area M and Chignik. It has a provision providing for an EO closure of the area should a Coho conservation and/or subsistence issue arise.
- A similar proposal was submitted by Chignik fishermen to the BOF at the last Chignik meeting (1/10-12/08) and there was some support from Chignik fishers at that time. The BOF indicated willingness to reopen the area provided Area M fishers were in agreement too which is why the proposal is on the table now.
- Support, never universal among Chignik fishermen, has eroded since the last Board cycle. Continued weakness of Chignik runs is part of the reason why some Chignik fishermen do not want to risk increasing interception pressure on Chignik stocks by Area M fishermen fishing at Kupreanof Point.
- The onslaught of so many Area M proposals to the Board of Fisheries calling for increasing interception of non-local sockeye stocks, including Chignik sockeye, has also undercut the spirit of cooperation that is a significant part of working out a compromise for Kupreanof Point.
- Area M will have the advantage when the wind blows the right direction - that five mile beach is a beautiful lead. Chignik will not benefit.

Comments on Proposal 141

Proposal 141 is very similar to # 140 above which calls to reopen Kupreanof Point waters to Area M and Chignik fishers. However, it does not address the issue of Coho conservation.

Proposals 140 & 141*: Opposed 0-6*

Proposals 142 & 143 - Open Dorenoi Bay to commercial fishing.
Comment: There was considerable uncertainty about whether this new area was to be managed as a part of the NWSS which would increase the harvest of non-local stocks including Chignik bound sockeye stocks.

Proposals 142 – 143*: Opposed 0-6*

Proposal 144 Modify closed waters of Stepovak Flats Section
Comment: This could threaten area M stocks but is not expected to impact Chignik stocks.

Proposal 144 – ***No Action by unanimous consent***

Proposals 160-162 Increase leads for gill nets
Motion to adopt: M/Gary Anderson; S/John Jones
Comment: Increased lead will increase impact of nets on the non local sockeye stocks.

Proposals 160-161*: Opposed 0-7*

Motion to adjourn
5:34 pm

AC COMMENT # 4

January 12, 2010
Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee
Pilot Point City Board Room

1. ***Call to Order 12:12pm***

2. ***Committee Participants***

Daniel Kingsley, Chairperson	Pilot Point
Tim Enright, Treasurer	Ugashik
William Albecker	Ugashik
Myra Olsen	Egegik
Eddie Clark	Naknek
Roland Briggs	Ugashik
Nancy Flensburg-Alternate	Ugashik
Mark Kosbruk-Alternate	Port Heiden

Absent:

Rick Reynolds-Alternate	Pilot Point
Bobby Christensen	Port Heiden
Robert Dresszen	Ugashik Lakes

Guests:

Art Woinowsky	Ugashik
Victoria Briggs	Ugashik
Chuck McCallum	Lake & Peninsula Borough
Gerta Kosbruk	Port Heiden
Lynn Carlson	Port Heiden
Emil Christensen	Port Heiden
Brent Johnson	State Troopers
Byron Wise	VPSO-Pilot Point
Ernie Weiss	Manager-City of Pilot Point

3. ***Approve Agenda:***
Committee member Eddie Clark asked that we add Area M representation be added to the agenda. Motion to Approve-Roland Briggs. Second Tim Enright, Unanimously Approved.

4. ***Approval of Minutes from October 28, 2009 Meeting.***
Motion to Approve - Tim Enright. Second Roland Briggs. Unanimously Approved

5. ***Introductions:***

Lem Butler, ADF&G Game Biologist GU9
Paul Salomone, ADF&G Commercial Fisheries Biologist
Andrew Devalpine, ADF&G Board Support

6. ***New Business:***

Chairperson, Daniel Kingsley, asked Paul Salomone to give the committee a brief over-view about the results of the Bristol Bay Boards that occurred in December, 2009. Mr. Salomone explained that both drifters and set netters can own two permits but only set netters can operate two permits. In addition, Mr. Salomone explained that prior to June 25th drifters on the east side of Bristol Bay can transfer between district during the "free week" without District registration restrictions Set netter do not have to drop a "blue" card at all on the east side of Bristol Bay. Mr. Salomone also went on to explain that the Department has the authority of time and area after June 1 to close down portions of a District to prevent excessive interception.

Mr. Salomone gave an explanation of why the three year the Western Alaska Salmon Stock Identification Project (WASSIP) genetic stock study is complete for Bristol Bay and not for the stocks on the North Peninsula. Hence, Mr. Salomone warned us that the preliminary data from this study should not be discussed at this Board meeting until the full three years of genetic analysis is completed in 2012.

Advisory committee member,Roland Briggs, asked about how past scale analysis data compared to the genetic analysis data in Bristol Bay. Mr. Salomone said that surprisingly enough the results were fairly close. In addition, Mr. Salomone stated that the interception of North Peninsula stocks in Bristol Bay was very minimal. In addition, Mr Salomone conveyed that the North Peninsula Department also felt if any proposal passed with "super exclusive or exclusive" terminology probably would require a review by the Limited Entry Commission concerning the legality of Area T permits in Area M as it pertains to the Limited Entry Act.

ADF&G game biologist, Lem Butler, explained to the advisory committee members about the status of the predator control program for Game Unit 9 and the time-line for action on Federal Subsistence Proposals. Mr. Butler stated that the Federal Subsistence Proposals are still in draft form and after public comments will be finalized sometime in March, 2010. In addition, the Department has two proposals in-front of the Game Board dealing with predator control in Game Unit 9. The Department is attempting to come up with a management plan for the Southwestern Alaska caribou herd by the March, 2010 board meeting. Mr. Butler went on to explain that the Department is attempting to gain a cooperative agreement with the Federal biologists to implement some of the predator control measures on Federal land and felt confident that finally something could be agreed upon.

7. ***Board of Fish Proposals:***
Commercial Fisheries:

Proposal 29 – 5 ACC 39.120(d). Registration of Commercial Fishing Vessels. Allow Area T permits in Alaska Peninsula Area. January 1 – December 31 as follows:

T Bristol Bay Area (5 ACC 06.100) and January 1 through December 31 (**JUNE 30**), the inter-Cinder River (**AND**) Inter Port Heiden, and **OUTER PORT HEIDEN** Sections of the Alaska Peninsula Area August 1 through December 31, the **OUTER** Cinder River, and (INTER PORT HEIDEN), Ilnik section (AND THAT

AC COMMENT # 5

PORTION OF THE ILNIK SECTION WITHIN ILNIK LAGOON AND ALL WATERS INSIDE THE SEAL ISLANDS) of the Alaska Peninsula Area (5 ACC 09.200)(a)(2), (3).

The Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee voted ***5 in favor and 2 abstained*** for the adoption of Proposal 29.

Department:

- Mr. Salomone reiterated that the North Peninsula Department personnel feel that the North Peninsula salmon fishery is fully allocated and the fishery cannot absorb any additional fishing effort from Area T. The Bristol Bay Department personnel is neutral on this proposal because of the allocative nature of the proposal.

Pros:

- Allow for Area T fishermen to participate in the early July chinook fishery in the Inter & Outer Port Heiden and Inter & Outer Cinder Sections. Also, may allow for a "exclusive" sockeye fishery in the Inter & Outer Port Heiden and Inter & Outer Cinder River Sections with a specific exit date of July 6th.

- Roland Briggs felt that the North Peninsula fisheries managers might be open to allowing a small local fleet of Area T participants. Committee member, Myra Olsen, also suggested that only "resident Area T" fishermen could participate.

- Allow local Area T fishermen and residents of Port Heiden the opportunity to caught salmon on the Outer Port Heiden Section because nothing is making it into the Inter Port Heiden Section.

Cons:

- Adoption of this proposal might allow for too many Area T fishermen the opportunity to participate in the Inter & Outer Port Heiden July sockeye fishery.

- No chinook, coho, and very few sockeye are making it into the Inter-Port Heiden Section once the Outer Port Heiden Section opens to Area M fishermen.

Proposal 30 – 5 ACC 39.120(d). Registration of Commercial Fishing Vessels. Allow Area T permits in Alaska Peninsula Area. January 1 – December 31 as follows:

T Bristol Bay Area (5 ACC 06.100) and January 1 through **December 31** (JUNE 30), the Inter Cinder River and Inter Port Heiden Sections of the Alaska Peninsula Area and August 1 through December 31, the (CINDER RIVER, AND INTER PORT HEIDEN SECTION AND) that portion of the Ilnik Section within Ilnik Lagoon and all waters inside the Seal Islands of the Alaska Peninsula Area (5 AAC 09.200)(a)(1),(2),(3).

AC COMMENT # 5

The Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee voted ***5 in favor and 2 abstained*** for the adoption of Proposal 30.

Department:

- Mr. Salomone reiterated that the North Peninsula Department personnel felt this proposal was allocative in nature and they would remain neutral on the adoption of this proposal. However, Mr. Salomone said Mr. Murphy, ADF&G North Peninsula Area Biologist, was open to the opportunity to harvest Port Heiden and Cinder River stocks to control escapement.

Pros:

- Allow for Area T fishermen to participate in the late June and early July chinook fishery in the Inter Port Heiden and Inter Cinder River Sections. With the present North Peninsula "north" line at the North Cape (Port Heiden) absolutely no fish are making it into the inter Port Heiden Section.

- Allow local Area T fishermen and residents of Port Heiden the opportunity to caught salmon in the Outer Port Heiden Section because nothing is making into the Inter Port Heiden Section.

Cons:

- Allow for too many Area T fishermen the opportunity to participate in the Inter Port Heiden and Inter Cinder River July sockeye fishery.

- No reason to open Inter Port Heiden in late June and early July if the Area M north line is not moved back to Stroganoff to allow fish into Inter Port Heiden.

Proposal 116 – 5ACC 09.365. South Unimak and Shumagin Islands June Salmon Management Plan: and 5 AAC 09.369. Northern District Salmon Fisheries Management Plan. Reinstate the 8.3 percent allocation of the pre-season Bristol Bay sockeye salmon forecast as follows:

The combined sockeye salmon catch in the South Unimak and Shumagin Islands June fishery and the North Peninsula District salmon fishery before July 15th is not to exceed 8.3 percent of the predicted Bristol Bay harvest.

The Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee voted ***unanimously in favor*** for the adoption of Proposal 116.

Department:

- Mr. Salomone reiterated that the North Peninsula Department personnel felt this proposal was allocative in nature and they would remain neutral on the adoption of this proposal. The Bristol Bay Department personnel is also neutral on this proposal because of the allocative nature of the proposal.

Pros:

- Prevent the over harvest of specific Bristol Bay sockeye stocks resulting in escapement goals not being achieved.

- Afford the Bristol Bay stocks some form of protection from an all out Area M slaughter.

- Reduce the interception of AYK chum and chinook salmon.

Cons:

- None.

Proposal 117 – 5 AAC 09.331(a)(b). Gill net specifications and operations. Modify the depth of drift and set gill net gear as follows:

5 AAC 09.331(a) – delete reference to the Unimak and Southwestern Districts in subsection (3) and add a new subsection as follows: "in the Unimak and Southwestern Districts, no drift gill net may exceed 120 meshes during the South Unimak and Shumagin Islands fisheries described in 5 AAC 09.365."

5 AAC 09.331(b)(1) – delete reference to the Unimak, Southwestern, South Central, and Southeastern Districts in subsection (1)(C) and add a new subsection as follows: "in the Unimak, Southwestern, South Central, and Southeastern Districts, a set gill net may not exceed 120 meshes in depth during the South Unimak and Shumagin Islands fisheries described in 5 AAC 09.365.

The Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee voted ***unanimously to oppose*** the adoption of Proposal 117.

Department:

- Mr. Salomone reiterated that the North Peninsula Department personnel felt this proposal was allocative in nature and they would remain neutral on the adoption of this proposal.

Pros:

- Increase harvest opportunity for Area M fishermen.

Cons:

- Increase the over harvest of specific Bristol Bay sockeye stocks resulting in escapement goals not being achieved.

- Increase the interception of AYK chum and chinook.

Proposal 145 – 5 AAC 09.320. Fishing Periods. Amend the weekly opening and closing times in the Cinder River Section as follows:

(3) in the Cinder River Section, **salmon may be taken only from 6:00 am Thursday until 6:00 pm on Saturday prior to June 1 and after August 1.** In the (OUTER PORT HEIDEN), inner Port Heiden, and Ilnik Sections, salmon may be taken only from 6:00 am Monday until 6:00 pm on Wednesday, except that before June 20 in that portion of the Ilnik Section within the Ilnik Lagoon and all waters inside Seal Island, salmon may be taken from 12:00 noon Monday until 11:59 pm Wednesday.

The Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee voted ***unanimously in favor*** for the adoption of Proposal 145.

Department:

The Department was neutral on this proposal. However, they have a very small staff during this period of the year and could not monitor district registration numbers or compliance with district participation restrictions.

AC COMMENT # 5

Pros:

- Fresh fly-out markets for coho could be maintained without having to transport fish on the weekends. Transporting fish on the weekends is more expensive and risky for the shipper.

Cons:

- Enforcement nightmare.
- The Department would like catch numbers by the end of the week to make management decisions concerning the next week's potential openings or closures.

Proposal 146– 5 AAC 09.320(3). Fishing Periods. Amend the weekly opening and closing times in the Cinder River Section as follows:

in the Cinder River Section, **salmon may be taken only from 6:00 am Thursday until 6:00 pm on Saturday.** In the (CINDER RIVER), Outer Port Heiden, and Ilnik Sections, salmon may be taken only from 6:00 am Monday until 6:00 pm on Wednesday, except that before June 20 in that portion of the Ilnik Section within the Ilnik lagoon and all waters inside Seal Island, salmon may be taken from 12:00 noon Monday until 11:59 pm Wednesday

The Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee voted ***unanimously in favor*** for the adoption of Proposal 146.

Department:

- The Department was neutral on this proposal. However, they have a very small staff during this period of the year and could not monitor district registration numbers or compliance with district participation restrictions.

Pros:

- Fresh fly-out markets for coho could be maintained without having to transport fish on the weekends. Transporting fish on the weekends is more expensive and risky for the shipper.

Cons:

- Enforcement nightmare.
- The Department would like catch numbers by the end of the week to make management decisions concerning the next week's potential openings or closures.

Proposal 147 – 5 AAC 09.320 Fishing Periods. Restrict openings in the Northern District unless local escapement goals are met as follows:

No openings to the commercial fishing in the Area M Northern District unless local escapement goals are met, thus reducing the amount of migrating barriers in Northern Area M District waters.

The Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee was ***unanimously opposed*** for the adoption of Proposal 147.

Department:

The Department has biological concerns with the adoption of this proposal.

Pros:

- Allows for some protection of Port Moller and Port Heiden salmon stocks from being over-harvested.

Cons:

- All of the escapement for a specific river system will come from the front end of the run and all the harvest would come from the back end of the run.

Proposal 148 – 5 ACC 09.320 Fishing Periods. Institute windows in the Northern District as follows:

Allow commercial fishing non-barrier "windows" during scheduled openings, thus reducing the amount of migrating barriers in the Northern Area M District.

The Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee voted ***unanimously in favor*** for the adoption of Proposal 148.

Department:

The Bristol Bay Department is neutral because of the allocative nature of the proposal.

Pros:

- Allows for some protection of Port Moller and Port Heiden salmon stocks from being over-harvested.
- Maintains genetic variability in the escapement.

Cons:

- Less fishing opportunity for the Area M fleet.

Proposal 149 – 5 AAC 09.369. Norther District Salmon Fisheries Management Plan. Modify the management of the Ilnik Section as follows:

That portion of the Ilnik Section northeast of Unangashak Bluffs to Stroganoff Point is managed on a basis of the Kvichak River conservation concerns and...Before July 5th, in the Ilnik Section northeast of Unangashak Bluffs a weekly total harvest cap of 100,000 sockeye salmon will be allowed. Fishing will be limited to a maximum of 24 hours continuous fishing and must be followed by at least a 24 hour closure. The Outer Port Heiden Section will be closed June 20th until July 15th.

The Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee voted ***unanimously in favor*** for the adoption of Proposal 149.

Department:

The Department is neutral on this proposal because of the allocative nature of the proposal.

Pros:

- Provides for some type of protection for migrating Bristol Bay stocks of concern.

Cons:

- Less fishing opportunity for the Area M fleet.

Proposal 150 – 5 AAC 09.310. Fishing Seasons. Close the Outer Port Heiden Section to gill net fishing from June 20 to July 15 as follows:

The Outer Port Heiden Section is closed to all gill net fishing between June 20th until July 15th.

The Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee voted ***unanimously in favor*** for the adoption of Proposal 150.

Department:

- The Department is neutral on this proposal because of the allocative nature of the proposal.

Pros:

- Allows fish to enter Inter Port Heiden and Inter Cinder River. Escapement numbers can be controlled by "exclusive" Area T fishermen.
- Increases the economic opportunities for Port Heiden and Pilot Point residents to sustain their proposed processing plants.
- Increase the local subsistence opportunities.

Cons:

- Some over-escapement concerns if ex-vessel price for coho and chinook salmon decline dramatically.

Proposal 151 – 5 AAC 09.310. Fishing Seasons. Close the Outer Port Heiden Section as follows:

5 AAC 09.310 Fishing Seasons.
(a) In the Northern District, salmon may be taken as follows:
(2) Port Heiden Sections:
(b) Outer Port Heiden: closed (from May 1 through September 30)

The Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee voted ***unanimously in favor*** for the adoption of Proposal 151.

Department:

- The Department is neutral on this proposal because of the allocative nature of the proposal.

Pros:

- Allows fish to enter Inter Port Heiden and Inter Cinder River. Escapement numbers can be controlled by "exclusive" Area T fishermen.
- Increases the economic opportunities for Port Heiden and Pilot Point residents to sustain their proposed processing plants.
- Increase the local subsistence opportunities.

Cons:

- Some over-escapement concerns if ex-vessel price for coho and chinook salmon declines dramatically reducing the Area T participation in the Inter Port Heiden and Inter Cinder River Sections.

AC COMMENT # 5

Proposal 152 – 5 AAC 09.366 Post-June Salmon Management Plan for South Alaska Peninsula. Modify the Northern Districts Fisheries Management Plan as follows:

If the Ugashik escapement falls behind the escapement curve by one day, Outer Ilnik and Outer Port Heiden can only fish their weekly schedule. If Ugashik continues to fall behind the escapement curve by 2 days. The openings in the Outer Ilnik and Outer Port Heiden sections will be limited to 48 hours per week. If Ugashik falls behind by 3 days behind the escapement curve Outer Ilnik and Outer Port Heiden will be closed.

The Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee voted ***5 in favor and 2 opposed*** for the adoption of Proposal 152.

Department:

- The Department is neutral on this proposal because of the allocative nature of the proposal.

Pros:

- Implementation of windows to protect Ugashik escapement numbers when lagging behind the desired curve.
- Prevent continuous fishing by the Area M fleet when Ugashik is behind the escapement curve.

Cons:

- Restricts flexibility of Area M biologists to manage their North Peninsula escapement numbers.
- Why expand the Area M fishery when Area M biologists do not have the data, like Bristol Bay, to know what stocks they are fishing on?

Proposal 153 – 5 AAC 09.330(3) Gear. Allow purse seine gear inside Ilnik Lagoon as follows:

Purse seine will be allowed in the Inner Ilnik Section.

The Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee voted ***unanimously to oppose*** the adoption of Proposal 153.

Department:

- The Department is neutral on this proposal because of the allocative nature of the proposal.

Pros:

- Affords the managers another tool to control escapement into the Ilnik River.

Cons:

AC COMMENT # 5

- Seines in shallow waste disturb the bottom vegetation vital for smolt survival.

Proposal 154 – 5 AAC 09.330. Gear. Change the gear mesh depth to 45 meshed in the Northern District as follows:

Adopt fishing gear mesh depth limit of 45 meshed deep for the Area M Northern District, thus reducing the amount of migrating barriers in the Northern Area M District waters.

The Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee voted ***unanimously in favor*** for the adoption of Proposal 154.

Department:

- The Department is neutral on this proposal because of the allocative nature of the proposal.

Pros:

- Reduce the over-harvest of Bristol Bay bound stocks of concern.
- Reduce the number of "feeder" cohos and chinook salmon being caught at night.

Cons:

- None.

Proposal 155 – 5 AAC 09.330(10). Gear. Allow set gill net gear in the Outer Port Heiden Section as follows:

Outer Port Heiden Section: with drift gill net (AND SET GILLETS) only.

The Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee voted ***6 opposed and 1 in favor*** for the adoption of Proposal 155.

Department:

- The Department is neutral on this proposal because of the allocative nature of the proposal.

Pros:

- Expanding economic opportunity for Area M set netters.

Cons:

- Expanding gear type and area for an inter-mixed stock fishery.

AC COMMENT # 5

Proposal 156 – 5 AAC 09.331(8). Gill net specifications and operations. Change seaward gill net distance in the Cinder River, Port Heiden, and Ilnik Sections as follows:

In the Cinder River, Port Heiden and Ilnik Sections of the Northern District, a person may not place a seaward end of a set gill net further than one-half mile from the mean high tide mark. (**PERMANENT VEGETATION LINE OF THE BEACH**), EXCEPT THAT IN THE SEAL ISLANDS A PERSON MAY NOT PLACE THE SEAWARD END OF A SET GILLNET FURTHER THAN ONE-HALF MILE FROM THE MEAN HIGH TIDE MARK).

The Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee voted ***5 opposed and 2 in favor*** for the adoption of Proposal 156.

Department:

- The Department is neutral on this proposal because of the allocative nature of the proposal.

Pros:

- Allows set gill net fishermen the opportunity to fish on the outside beaches further seaward of the mean high tide mark.

Cons:

- Set gill nets would be able to fish on outside beaches in areas traditional used by the drift gill net fleet.

Proposal 157 5 AAC 09.369(1) Northern District Salmon Fisheries Management Plan. Change the angle of the boundary line in the Outer Port Heiden Section as follows:

Amend 5 AAC 09.369(1) to read as follows: "The Outer Port Heiden Section is open from June 20th through July 31 to commercial fishing in those waters west of a line from 57°05.52'North Latitude 158o 34.45'West Longitude to 57°08.85' North Latitude 158°37.5' West Longitude (158° 36.00' WEST LONGITUDE).

The Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee voted ***unanimously to oppose*** the adoption of Proposal 157.

Department:

- The Department is neutral on this proposal because of the allocative nature of the proposal.

Pros:

- None.

Cons:

AC COMMENT # 5

- Would promote over-the-line competitive fishery much like Egegik north line fiasco.

8. *Old Business:*

Andy Devalpine, ADF&G Board Support, explained the proposed changes to the fish and game board cycle scheduling. The one disadvantage for Bristol Bay is that the Advisory Committees would have to have their proposals to the Board in May prior to knowing what the actual summer harvest and escapement numbers. Mr. Devalpine explained that committee members could get their written comments to him or the committee chair.

Guest participant, Art Woinowsky, asked Mr. Devalpine if the advisory committees and general public would still have access to the tools like agenda changes and out of cycle proposals etc. Mr. Devalpine stated that all the tools currently utilized by the Board process would still be in-place.

9. *Time and Place of Next Meeting:*
Prior to October 31, 2010
Pilot Point City Conference Room
Pilot Point, Alaska

10. Adjournment: 3:15 pm
Motion to Adjourn by Daniel Kingsley, Second Roland Briggs.

Minutes Prepared by Daniel Kingsley
Minutes Distributed by BBNA

AC COMMENT # 5